United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 145 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, OCTOBER 26, 1999 No. 147

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. OSE).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 26, 1999.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DOUG OSE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 19, 1999, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 25 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 9:50 a.m.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER) for 5 minutes.

EL SALVADOR'S DRIVE TO PRIVATIZE SHOULD BE RECOGNIZED AS A JOB WELL DONE

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I have a longstanding interest in the growth and prosperity of one of our most important Central American neighbors, the Republic of El Salvador. Today, I would like to recognize the impressive privatization process that is going on in El Salvador, with a particular emphasis on the country's successful privatization program.

El Salvador embarked on a major program to privatize the key national industries nearly a decade ago. Since that time, the state electric company known as CEL, for Comision Hidrolectrica del Rio Lempa, has been a consistent leader in the country's privatization process.

In 1998, CEL auctioned off 75 percent of the shares of four state-owned electrical distribution companies for more than $586 million, representing the most money earned to date in any privatization in the region.

One of the three winning bidders in this sale was a well-known Arlington, Virginia, based energy firm called AES Corporation.

Last June, this successful privatization program continued with CEL auctioning off the majority shares in three state-owned thermal generation facilities, Acajutla, Soyapango, and San Miguel, to private investors. The winning bid in this sale, $125 million, came from another well-known company in the U.S., Duke Energy, which is based in my home State of North Carolina. As I speak, Duke is already making plans to invest more than $75 million in upgrades to these facilities.

The most recent sale represents a win/win situation for both El Salvador and the U.S. This investment will not only mean more jobs and more income for people in North Carolina, but will also mean more consistent, cost effective energy for people of El Salvador.

El Salvador's privatization process, which also includes the state telephone company and pension plan, has been successful because political parties and labor unions put aside their differences and decided to work together to lead the country into a bright and secure economic future.

This unity and sense of purpose is proof positive that El Salvador has indeed come a long way since the war-torn 1980s. Other countries in the region, and beyond, should be encouraged to follow in the footsteps of El Salvador.

In closing, I would like to extend our best wishes to El Salvador for a job well done, as well as wish the country, and particularly President Francisco Flores, continued success in the drive to privatize and bring increased prosperity to the people of El Salvador.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 10 a.m.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 4 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until 10 a.m.

☐ 1000

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order at 10 a.m.

PRAYER

The Reverend Stuart York, Rosemead Christian Church, West Covina, California, offered the following prayer:

Father, we praise and thank You for Your patience, grace and mercy that allow us one more day to serve You and the Nation.

Today we celebrate the life of John Chafee. May Your divine comfort and the legacy of the man as a husband, father, grandfather and statesman give strength and solace to Virginia and to the family.

Please bless and protect President Clinton, his family, Cabinet, staff and our Armed Forces serving around the world.

Today we feel heavy burdens. Earthquakes, hurricanes and floods have brought death and devastation to thousands at home and abroad. The innocent victims of violence, crime, injustice, hate and prejudice cry out for help.

But this we know, the faintest cry from the loneliest heart in the remotest part of the planet will not go unheard. Even now You are marshaling the forces of nations and peoples to rescue the perishing and care for the dying.

You brought every Member of this House here for a time such as this, 435 good, dedicated, caring people who really want to make the right decisions for the people who sent them here. However, tremendous pressures are bombarding them. Some pressures are of the purest motives. Others are of greed, selfishness and partisanship. Give each Member the wisdom to know what is right, the strength to do what is right and the courage to reject those who would compromise the integrity of this high office. Remind us that it is not always easy to do the right thing but it is always the right thing to do.

And, Father, let the family members and loved ones, especially Mrs. Chafee today, know that they too are true American heroes. They pay a high price keeping the home fires burning while giving strength and support for these representatives to carry on the responsibility of government.

God, use us to bless America. To You be honor and glory in all things. In Christ's name, Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. TIAHRT led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agreed to the following resolution:

S. RES. 206

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of the Honorable John H. Chafee, a Senator from the State of Rhode Island.

Resolved, That Senator Chafee's record of public service embodied the best traditions of the Senate: Statesmanship, Comity, Tolerance, and Decency.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That when the Senate adjourns today, it stand adjourned as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Senator.

WELCOME TO THE REVEREND STUART YORK

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

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, it is a special honor for the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY MILLER) and me to welcome Pastor Stuart York and his wife Alicia into the Chamber. We want to express our appreciation to him for the very inspiring words of prayer that he offered us.

Pastor York has dedicated his life to spiritual guidance and to public service. He served as pastor in churches in Missouri, Oklahoma and California, and in California he has been pastor, as the Speaker said, of the Rosemead Christian church for the past 11 years. He also was President of the Missouri Christian Convention and is chairman of the board of trustees at St. Louis Christian College where he graduated.

Pastor York and his wife Alicia have five children, Anna, Tammy, Wendy, Joshua and Rebekah. As a resident of West Covina, he has been active as a leader in local government and various charitable organizations. In fact, I on more than a few occasions have seen him play the role of Santa Claus. I am very proud to have him here in Washington, D.C. I join my colleagues in the House in thanking our distinguished guest chaplain for bringing us this very inspirational message today.

IRS OUT OF CONTROL

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. America's income tax is not only un-American, it is socialism at its best. It promotes dependency, penalizes achievement, kills jobs, kills investment, and subsidizes illegitimacy. It is out of control, Members of Congress. If that is not enough to tax your Social Security from cradle to the grave they keep busting our balsam and taxing us even when we die.

Beam me up here, Mr. Speaker. I say it is time to literally abolish both the IRS and the progressive un-American socialistic income tax.

Audit this. I yield back the socialism of our income tax program.

CALL FOR OVERSIGHT HEARINGS INTO GROWING BODY PARTS INDUSTRY

(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, I read an article in World Magazine this week entitled ''Harvest of Shame'' about a new and growing industry in America. This industry trafficks in body parts, parts of babies' bodies, organs and tissues of aborted babies. This business provides fee for services schedules listing the prices they charge for almost any body part you can think of, eyes, livers, brains, thymuses, blood, among other things.

Mr. Speaker, we are not talking about the People's Republic of China. We are talking about the United States of America. Now we know why the partial birth abortion procedure was developed, to give this industry whole body parts. The direction our country is going, the exploitation of innocent and voiceless people, children, babies, for the supposed benefit of the rest of us is shocking. We should be outraged not only because it is a violation of Federal law but because this callous disregard of human life is very real, very grotesque, it is growing steadily and it is done in the name of research. Apparently money talks and many are listening.

Mr. Speaker, oversight hearings should be held immediately on this issue.

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTION CALLING FOR RATIFICATION OF CEDAW

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I am here today because of an alarming pattern of inaction on the part of the Senate. After voting down the comprehensive nuclear test ban and trying to kill the nomination of Senator Carol Moseley-Braun to be ambassador of New Zealand, one Member in particular is continuing to hold the United Nations convention on eliminating all forms of discrimination against women, or CEDAW, hostage. CEDAW formalizes women's equality and promotes women's inclusion in business, government and other economic and social sectors. CEDAW has absolutely nothing to do with family planning or abortion, and more than 160 countries have already ratified this important treaty supporting basic human rights for women. The United States in fact is the only industrialized democracy that has not ratified CEDAW. This is a disgrace.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in the House to cosponsor my resolution calling on the Senate to ratify CEDAW in this Congress.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KOLBE). The Chair will remind all Members they should avoid admonishing the other body to take action or not to take action.

REPUBLICANS COMMITTED TO PROTECTING SOCIAL SECURITY

(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, for the first time in 30 years, we have an historic opportunity to do what is right for America. We have an opportunity to pass a budget that does not dip into the Social Security trust fund.

Republicans are committed to protecting Social Security for future generations of Americans. However, the Democratic leadership seems to have other priorities. They seem to believe that spending the Social Security surplus would be a political victory for them. They would rather score political points than secure America's future.

Today I rise to urge my friends on the other side of the aisle to put their partisan agenda aside and join with the Republicans in saving and preserving 100 percent of the Social Security trust fund. Help us pass a budget that would put an end to the 30-year raid on Social Security. Work with us to put partisanship aside and do the right thing for all Americans and their future.

I yield back the balance of my time and 100 percent of the Social Security trust fund.

CALLING FOR INCREASED ACCESS TO HEALTH CARE FOR PEOPLE OF COLOR

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

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, this body will soon be voting on the conference report to the Labor-HHS appropriations bill. This gives us the opportunity to greatly improve the health of people of color.

As we prepare to enter the 21st century, the poor, African-Americans and other ethnic minorities are essentially no healthier than they were at the opening of this one. There remains a gaping divide between whites and people of color in heart disease, cancer, diabetes, infant mortality and HIV/AIDS.

The Congressional Black Caucus was able to mount an unprecedented initiative to target $156 million to communities of color across this country to address the state of emergency that exists with respect to HIV/AIDS and access to care. Although we made an impact, we need to do much more to increase access to the resources needed to raise the health status of minorities in this country.

I appeal to this Congress to respond by fully funding the President's requests for health, by increasing the funding for the CBC initiative to $349 million, health disparities to $150 million and including the $35 million for AIDS in Africa.

My colleagues, health care delayed is health care denied. Let us not deny hundreds of millions of Americans their right to good health.

ANNOUNCING FORMATION OF THE BUILDING A BETTER AMERICA CAUCUS

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

Mr. GARY MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, just by looking around at our homes, our offices, our roads and our local infrastructure, we can see that construction has an important impact on our lives. The U.S. construction market totaled $652 billion in 1998 which was 8.13 percent of our gross domestic product, which is GDP. Construction employed 5,970,000 workers with a payroll of $160 billion in 1998 which is about 6 percent of the Nation's nonfarm, private sector employment. The construction industry is comprised of nearly 2 million small and large firms. Construction is larger than the automotive and steel industries combined.

Because construction is such an important part of our everyday lives, I have started the Building a Better America Caucus. The purpose of the caucus is to educate Members of the Congress on building-related issues that impact our districts and our constituents, from affordable housing to airport construction.

I urge all my colleagues to support our Nation's builders by joining the Building a Better America Caucus and supporting commonsense legislation to build a better America.

REPUBLICAN CONGRESS WILL STOP THE RAID ON SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that the Federal Government wastes billions of dollars every year through bureaucratic mismanagement. Add waste, fraud and abuse to the equation and we are talking about some pretty big dollars. That is money that could be used in a much more worthwhile way for strengthening the Social Security trust fund.

We have a choice here in Congress. Do we want to continue the old Democrat practice of raiding the Social Security trust fund to pay for big government programs while overlooking waste, fraud and abuse just as they did the last time they had control of this body? The answer is ''no.''

For too many years, Democrats in Washington raided Social Security while making no effort to hold government agencies accountable for how they spent the taxpayers' money. I am proud to say that the Republican Congress will hold the bureaucracy accountable. We will make them find ways to eliminate waste, fraud and abuse. And better yet, we will stop the raid on the Social Security trust fund.

□ 1015

PASS THE LABOR-HHS BILL

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, time is fast approaching for this Congress to do its business. There are at least five appropriations bills that we have not yet addressed. We call it deadlock; but in my town of Houston, we cannot afford any more deadlock as it relates to our children. Violence continues. Just this past week we lost a young middle schooler through a violent act in his school, struck down by a screwdriver to his head.

There is a great need for attention to our children, for stopping the violence, for intervention; and we need to pass a Labor-HHS bill that will provide more funding for mental health.

I will be offering before the session ends the Give-a-Kid-a-Chance Omnibus Mental Health Bill, which provides access to mental health services for all of our children, to make sure that our community health clinics provide a holistic approach to the treating of the parent, the child, the support system around that child, the community, in order to understand that ending violence with our children is a community effort, a community affair, and mental health is not bad, it is good.

Pass the Labor-HHH bill and provide more funding for mental health services in America.

DAY 152 IN THE LOCKBOX BILL HOSTAGE SITUATION

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

Mr. VITTER. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday we reached a milestone in the wait for the other body to consider the lockbox bill this House passed on May 26. Sunday was day 150 since the Lockbox bill of the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER) to protect Social Security from the Congressional big spenders passed this House by the overwhelming vote of 416 to 12.

That is right. On Sunday, when President Clinton's supporters were on TV talk shows accusing the Republican Congress of threatening Social Security, it was exactly 150 days since those very Clinton supporters took the Lockbox bill hostage. They refused to allow a vote to stop the raid on Social Security forever. Now it has been 152 days since this body passed the Lockbox bill, and the other body has not acted.

Mr. Speaker, House Republicans are committed to stopping the raid on Social Security, now and in the years to come. We hope the President will join

us by offering real leadership to pass a real Lockbox bill.

REPUBLICAN BUDGET PLAN MAKING WRONG DECISIONS

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, the Republican leadership's budget plan does not make the tough decisions that we were sent here to make. Instead, it makes wrong decisions. According to their own, their own accounting office, the Republican leadership has already spent $13 billion from Social Security. In fact, they have picked the lockbox.

This money should not be spent. It should be kept in the Social Security Trust Fund so that we are prepared when the baby-boomers retire. No amount of rhetoric can change the facts. The Republican leadership is spending Social Security, despite the priorities of the American people.

This budget is a windfall for special interests, billions of dollars for military equipment that the Pentagon does not even want. Billions more will go for corporate welfare that opens public lands to oil and timber interests. Yet the budget cuts funding for smaller classes, which would improve discipline and give children more individual attention. It also cuts funding for police officers that have reduced crime in our neighborhoods. It ignores the fact that our seniors need a moderate Medicare program with a prescription drug benefit. It is irresponsible and poorly planned.

PROTECTING THE SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUND

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

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, it is crunch time. After today, eight of the 13 spending bills will be signed into law. Seventy percent of our budget will be law. The remaining five spending bills will complete the financial responsibility for the U.S. Government. When we are done, we will have balanced the Federal budget without spending one cent of the Social Security surplus.

Using bogus ground rules, some liberals are saying that we have already spent the Social Security surplus. It is not true. But, Mr. Speaker, if they are so concerned, they should vote for our across-the-board 1.29 percent savings. That will protect the Social Security Trust Fund. All you have to do is crunch about 1 cent out of every dollar of Federal spending, discretionary spending, and we will save it.

It is crunch time, Mr. Speaker, time to crunch Government waste and save the Social Security Trust Fund.

CONGRATULATING THE MEN AND WOMEN OF THE SPANISH AMERICAN LEAGUE AGAINST DISCRIMINATION

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the men and women of the Spanish-American League Against Discrimination, SALAD, who are dedicated to promoting the intellectual, educational, economic and social progress of Hispanics, as well as other ethnic groups.

As many of us enjoy the peace and prosperity of our Nation's economic growth, some have blinded ourselves to the persisting culture of bigotry which can be aimed at Hispanics and other minority groups.

For 25 years the hard working group at SALAD has sought to defend Hispanics and others from this mistrust. With the assistance of SALAD, communities are learning that given a level playing field, Hispanic Americans, and, indeed, all Americans, can achieve their goals, if they educate themselves, work hard, and never give up on their dreams.

I congratulate the Spanish American League Against Discrimination, and especially its president and founder, Dr. Osvaldo Soto, on SALAD's 25th Silver Anniversary.

COMMITTING ENOUGH MONEY TO THE EDUCATION OF OUR CHILDREN

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the entire appropriations process has been short circuited because of the Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill. This is wrong. It is the very last appropriations bill that we are going to be considering. In fact, it should have been marked up and dealt with the first, instead of last. And here it is, being brought to the floor without going through the Committee on Rules. It was crafted in some back room, and it is squeezed into a conference committee report that was already vetoed by the President, the District of Columbia Appropriations Act. Now, is that not the tail wagging the dog?

Education appropriations is so important to the whole country, and yet we are going to piggyback the District of Columbia appropriations bill out of the conference committee. The bill has a 1.4 percent cut in education spending, which works out to be $400 million. The funding for education is $100 million below what the President asked for and $700 million below what our colleagues in the Senate passed.

This bill would eliminate one of our most important initiatives, class size reduction, by making it into a $1.2 billion block grant.

I had the opportunity yesterday to be in Houston before I came back to Washington, and saw the success of Title I funding and bilingual funding in our Houston schools.

HANDS OFF THE SOCIAL SECURITY SURPLUS

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest to my colleague from Texas, because he proves a seminal point in this budget debate: there is no program under the aegis of the left that is worthy of realizing any savings.

That is the bottom line. This entire debate is about our friends of the liberal persuasion wanting to spend more and more and more and more of the American people's money.

Now, what we are talking about is a fairly generous sum, over $1.7 trillion, in this year's budget. We simply say hands off the Social Security surplus. Do not spend it on non-Americans, as the President wants to do in vetoing our foreign aid bill. Let us put our Nation's interests first. Let us be good stewards of the American people's tax dollar.

For every $10 spent, we can realize a savings certainly of 13 cents. But, then again, Mr. Speaker, I understand this is Washington; and, then again, there are those who will defend waste.

NO MEANS NO WHEN IT COMES TO PROTECTING SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, as the White House said it best, John Podesta, the Chief of Staff, said, ''The Republicans' key goal is not to spend the Social Security surplus.'' That comes from the leading liberal Democrat over there.

Indeed, that is what we have done. This chart right here shows, particularly on the bottom part, that we have in fact not spent any of the Social Security surplus. It is very important.

But now where are the Democrats on this process? Well, here is the minority leader. ''The Democrats will spend a little bit of the money.'' He is saying that we should not try to do it, but we are going to have to do it.

That is the difference right now between the Democrats and the Republicans. Republicans are saying, ''No means no. We don't want to spend any Social Security money for balancing the budget.'' The Democrats are saying, ''Let's spend a little bit of it.''

Now, what is our way of getting around it? We say that out of every $10 in spending, ten bucks, we are asking the Federal Government agencies to save 13 cents. That is all it is, save 13

cents. To give an example, the President went to Africa last year and took 1,700 people. Two would have had to stay at home under our plan.

JOINING TOGETHER TO SAVE SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am going to try to give a quick 1-minute summary. For the 40 years before the Republicans took the majority in this House, spending of the United States Government increased faster than inflation every year. Now we are starting to bring that spending increase down, and we have balanced the budget without using Social Security money for the first time in 40 years this year.

Despite the fact that we have reduced discretionary spending as a percent of GDP for the past five years we are still using 20.8 percent of the gross domestic product of this country in spending and running this Federal Government, the highest spending in history, the highest rate of taxation in history. Now we are asking departments just to try to hold the line, to increase efficiency, to get rid of some waste and some fraud and some abuse in their spending.

You have heard the figure one percent. That is how much we need to reduce what is authorized. It is 0.8 percent of outlays, 0.8 percent reduction in what is now expected to be spent. We are saying to those administrators, directors, department heads, try to look at efficiencies to save 8 cents out of every $10. Correct and stop some of the fraud and abuse. Mr. Speaker, they can do it. Let us do it. Let us join together. Let us save Social Security.

A PENNY SAVED IS RETIREMENT SECURED

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

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to set the record straight. Despite the accusations being lodged by the Democrat tax-and-spend caucus, the Republican plan to save Social Security for millions of Americans does not mandate cutting any government programs. It does not touch Medicare, Medicaid, veterans' pensions, food stamps, or any other important benefits program.

Instead, it makes the heads of Federal agencies more accountable for how they spend the taxpayers' hard-earned money. We are telling them we think they can do better and we are telling them they must work to eliminate waste, fraud, and abuse in their agencies, because if they don't, they will jeopardize the retirement security for three generations of Americans.

No longer will Congress stand idly by as the Washington big spenders live like parasites off the retirement dollars of working Americans. The Republican Congress will set aside 1 penny of every Federal dollar to meet our commitment to the American people. A penny saved is retirement secured.

SECURING SOCIAL SECURITY FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, Sunday the Democratic leader of the Congress, RICHARD GEPHARDT, showed his party's true colors. While the Republican majority has made a commitment to the American people to spend not a penny of the Social Security surplus, the Democratic leader feels differently. He said yesterday, ''We really ought to spend as little of it as possible.''

Is that not grand? ''As little as possible.'' We all know what that means. It means that the Democrats here in Congress want to spend more money on government and use what is left for Social Security.

That is just not good enough. We can meet our commitment to our Nation's retirees by setting aside barely a penny, a penny, of every dollar that government spends. It is that simple.

While the bureaucrats in Washington might be upset that they will have to eliminate some waste, fraud, and abuse in their agencies, the American people will be happy to know that their retirements are secure. Let us just do it.

NATION AWAITS ADMINISTRATION'S PLAN FOR SAVING SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. OSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, as I did last week and previous days, to again request that the administration deliver to the House its plan for Social Security.

Now, I saw the report in the newspaper this weekend about the President's pending delivery; but, in fact, there is nothing here yet. We are now on day 299 from when I first got here, still looking for that plan.

Mr. Speaker, we have reserved H.R. 1 for this purpose. We are still waiting. Talk is talk, and action is action. Now is the time for action.

I ask that the administration finally deliver its plan for Social Security. The Nation awaits.

□ 1030

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KOLBE). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings 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.

Rollcall votes on postponed questions may be taken in two groups, the first occurring before debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules, and the second after debate has concluded on remaining motions.

TWO YEAR EXTENSION OF PERIOD FOR ADMISSION OF AN ALIEN AS A NONIMMIGRANT

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3061) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to extend for an additional 2 years the period for admission of an alien as a nonimmigrant under section 101(a)(15)(S) of such Act, and to authorize appropriations for the refugee assistance program under chapter 2 of title IV of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3061

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

SECTION 1. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

In light of the increasing problem of alien smuggling into the United States, it is the sense of the Congress that the Attorney General should use the provision of nonimmigrant status under section 101(a)(15)(S) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in a greater number of alien smuggling investigations per year than has been done in the past.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATION FOR ADMISSION OF "S" VISA NONIMMIGRANTS.

Section 214(k)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1184(k)(2)) is amended by striking ''5'' and inserting ''7''.

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR REFUGEE ASSISTANCE.

Section 414(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1524(a)) is amended by striking ''1998 and 1999'' and inserting ''2000 through 2002''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Texas. 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 the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3061 reauthorizes two longstanding important immigration programs, both of which ran out in

September and may not properly continue until they are reauthorized.

Authorization for 250 ''S'' visas per year, which are used by the Justice Department to obtain the testimony of informants in international organized crime cases, ran out on September 13, 1999, and no visas may be issued until it is reauthorized.

Since its initiation in 1994, the ''S'' visa has proved to be a valuable tool for law enforcement. According to the Justice Department, the agency is currently involved in a number of ongoing criminal investigations where the ''S'' visa would be useful, and time is of the essence. H.R. 3061 reauthorizes the program, and also expresses the sense of Congress that ''S'' visas should be used in more investigations of alien smuggling, which is a growing and serious problem.

H.R. 3061 also reauthorizes the refugee resettlement program that assists refugees to the United States by providing job training, language training, and other services. The bill creates no new funding or regulatory requirements. It simply reauthorizes two important existing programs.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3061.

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Violent Crime Control Act of 1994 created a new ''S'' nonimmigrant visa classification. It permits up to 300 foreign nationals a year to enter the United States to provide information that is needed for the investigation and prosecution of criminal and terrorist organizations.

The Violent Crime Control Act also permits the Attorney General to grant lawful permanent resident status to the foreign nationals who provide this assistance. This is available in cases where the information supplied substantially contributes to the prevention of an act of terrorism or to the success of an important criminal investigation or prosecution. This is necessary because many of these people are in danger in their home countries after they have cooperated with an investigation or testified in a criminal proceeding.

This is also helpful because of the use of our particular law enforcement and justice system that requires the information these individuals may provide us in order to safeguard the lives of the American people.

One of the people who provided information under this program was a flight attendant who was in a plane on which a bomb had been placed. Her testimony led to the conviction of a major terrorist and other members of his terrorist organization. Another person in this program was an individual in a central European capital who provided critical information about Russian organized crime syndicates. Another example is a group of hearing-impaired Mexicans who provided information about being smuggled into the United States by a family-based crime organization. When they arrived, they were forced to work without pay selling trinkets on the street.

The bill also expresses the sense of Congress that the visas should be used in a greater number of alien smuggling investigations than has been done in the past. The ''S'' visa program ended on September 13, 1991. H.R. 3061 would extend the availability of this program for another 2 years, through September 13, 2001.

This bill also reauthorizes the Refugee Resettlement Assistance Program, which is administered by the Department of Health and Human Services Office of Refugee Resettlement. Loss of these funds would be a disaster to the refugees who have come to our country seeking a safe haven from persecution.

Appropriations to fund this program are currently authorized through FY 1991. H.R. 3061 would continue the authorization to FY 2002.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that these are worthy requests being made by H.R. 3061, and it will assist those in our government to protect refugees, but as well, to avoid the devastation of terrorism.

With that, I would urge my colleagues to vote to support this important bill.

Mr. Speaker, the Violent Crime Control Act of 1994 created a new ''S'' nonimigrant visa classification. It permits up to 300 foreign nationals a year to enter the United States to provide information that is needed for the investigation and prosecution of criminal and terrorist organizations.

The Violent Crime Control Act also permits the Attorney General to grant lawful permanent resident status to the foreign nationals who provide this assistance. This is available in cases where the information supplied substantially contributes to the prevention of an act of terrorism or to the success of an important criminal investigation or prosecution. This is necessary because many of these people are in danger in their home countries after they have cooperated with an investigation or testified in a criminal proceeding.

One of the people who provided information under this program was a flight attendant who was in a plane on which a bomb had been placed. Her testimony led to the conviction of a major terrorist and other members of his terrorist organization. Another person in this program was an individual in a Central European capital who provided critical information about Russian organized crime syndicates. Another example is a group of hearing-impaired Mexicans who provided information about being smuggled into the United States by a family-based crime organization. When they arrived, they were forced to work without pay selling trinkets on the street.

The bill also expresses the sense of Congress that the visas should be used in a greater number of alien smuggling investigations than has been done in the past.

The S visa program ended on September 13, 1999. H.R. 3061 would extend the availability of this program for another two years, through September 13, 2001.

This bill also reauthorizes the Refugee Resettlement Assistance Program which is administered by the Department of Health and Human Service's Office of Refugee Resettlement. Loss of these funds would be a disaster to the refugees who have come to our country seeking a safe haven from persecution. Appropriations to fund this program are currently authorized through FY 1999. H.R. 3061 would continue the authorization through FY 2002.

I urge you to vote for this important bill.

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. 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 Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3061.

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.

URGING UNITED STATES TO SEEK GLOBAL CONSENSUS SUPPORTING MORATORIUM ON TARIFFS AND SPECIAL, MULTIPLE, AND DISCRIMINATORY TAXATION OF ELECTRONIC COMMERCE

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 190) urging the United States to seek a global consensus supporting a moratorium on tariffs and on special, multiple, and discriminatory taxation of electronic commerce, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 190

Whereas electronic commerce is not bound by geography and its borders are not easily discernible;

Whereas transmissions over the Internet are made through packet-switching, making it impossible to determine with any degree of certainty the precise geographic route or endpoints of specific Internet transmissions and infeasible to separate domestic from foreign Internet transmissions;

Whereas inconsistent and inadministrable taxes imposed on Internet activity by subnational and national governments threaten not only to subject consumers, businesses, and other users engaged in interstate and foreign commerce to multiple, confusing, and burdensome taxation, but also to restrict the growth and continued technological maturation of the Internet itself;

Whereas the complexity of the issue of domestic taxation of electronic commerce is compounded when considered at the global level with almost 200 separate national governments;

Whereas the First Annual Report of the United States Government Working Group on Electronic Commerce found that fewer than 10,000,000 people worldwide were using the Internet in 1995, that more than 140,000,000 people worldwide were using the Internet in 1998, and that more than 1,000,000,000 people worldwide will be using the Internet in the first decade of the next century;

Whereas information technology industries have accounted for more than one-third of

real growth in the United States' Gross Domestic Product over the past three years;

Whereas information technology industries employ more than 7,000,000 people in the United States, and by 2006 more than half of the United States workforce is expected to be employed in industries that are either major producers or intensive users of information technology products and services;

Whereas electronic commerce among businesses worldwide is expected to grow from $43,000,000,000 in 1998 to more than $1,300,000,000,000 by 2003, and electronic retail sales to consumers worldwide are expected to grow from $8,000,000,000 in 1998 to more than $108,000,000,000 by 2003;

Whereas the Internet Tax Freedom Act of 1998 enacted a policy against special, multiple, and discriminatory taxation of the Internet and electronic commerce, and stated that United States policy should be to seek bilateral, regional, and multilateral agreements to remove barriers to global electronic commerce;

Whereas the World Trade Organization, at its May 1998 ministerial conference, adopted a declaration that all 132 member countries ''will continue their current practice of not imposing customs duties on electronic transmissions;''

Whereas the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development and industry groups issued a joint declaration at an October 1998 ministerial meeting on global electronic commerce opposing special, multiple, and discriminatory taxation of the electronic commerce and the Internet;

Whereas the Committee on Fiscal Affairs of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development has stated that neutrality, efficiency, certainty, simplicity, effectiveness, fairness, and flexibility are the broad principles that should govern the taxation of electronic commerce;

Whereas the United States has issued joint statements on electronic commerce with Australia, the European Union, France, Ireland, Japan, and the Republic of Korea opposing special, multiple, and discriminatory taxation of electronic commerce; and

Whereas a July 1999 United Nations Report on Human Development urged world governments to impose ''bit taxes'' on electronic transmissions, raising concerns that U.S. policy against special, multiple, and discriminatory taxation of the Internet may be undermined: Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) urges the President to seek a global consensus supporting—

(A) a permanent international ban on tariffs on electronic commerce; and

(B) an international ban on bit, multiple, and discriminatory taxation of electronic commerce and the Internet;

(2) urges the President to instruct the United States delegation to the November 1999 World Trade Organization ministerial meeting in Seattle, Washington to seek to make permanent and binding the moratorium on tariffs on electronic transmissions adopted by the World Trade Organization in May 1998;

(3) urges the President to seek adoption by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, and implementation by the group's 29 member countries, of an international ban on bit, multiple, and discriminatory taxation of electronic commerce and the Internet; and

(4) urges the President to oppose any proposal by any country, the United Nations, or any other multilateral organization to establish a ''bit tax'' on electronic transmissions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Concurrent Resolution 190.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, today I join my colleagues in their support of House Concurrent Resolution 190. This resolution urges the President to seek a global consensus in support of a permanent international ban on tariffs on electronic commerce and an international ban on certain e-commerce taxes.

The Internet and electronic commerce are vital to continued global economic growth and prosperity. Information technology is driving the U.S. economic growth, increasing profit, creating higher-paying jobs, and expanding opportunities for all Americans.

As we prepare for the upcoming round of global trade negotiations to be launched next month in Seattle, we face an era of rapid change in global commerce. Increasingly, electronic commerce has supplanted the old transAtlantic cable and telephone lines, and now serves as the preferred method of communication, which in turn facilitates trade.

The number of people in the world using the Internet has grown from 3 million in 1995 to 200 million users today, and may reach 1 billion by 2005.

In the United States, electronic commerce totalled in excess of $50 billion in 1998, and is projected to reach $1.4 trillion by 2003. By 2006, almost half of our work force either will be employed by information technology services and products businesses, or will be intensive users of these businesses. We should refrain from taking measures that could inhibit the growth of e-commerce and access to information technology.

These lines of communication should remain barrier-free, not subject to tariffs or taxes or burdensome regulations. We must seek consensus with our trading partners on this issue.

I understand that some countries who are in earlier stages of economic development have concerns about establishing a permanent moratorium on such tariffs and taxation. I hope that the United States will continue to advocate a permanent ban, instead of a mere extension of the current temporary one. Our response should be to convince these countries that information technology has important applications for speeding growth in developing regions, as Internet access reduces the obstructions entrepreneurs, artisans and small businesses face in finding customers and managing paper flow.

Electronic commerce puts developing countries on an equal footing with developed countries, and it leapfrogs many of the infrastructure barriers that these countries face in traditional commerce.

I further note that it does not help to build this consensus when the United States seeks to put controversial nontrade issues on the Seattle agenda about which devoping countries are justifiably wary. Raising such issues means that the trade aspects of our agenda become more problematic to achieve.

We must seek to develop a lasting consensus among developed and devoping countries alike for the promotion of global trade. The administration must find common ground and forge ahead to increase global trading opportunities, which in turn pave the way to greater prosperity for all.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the concurrent resolution before us today. The ability to engage in commerce over the Internet has revolutionized the way we and the world conduct business. It has integrated and opened markets and spread consumer products, technological and medical advances to the farthest reaches of the Earth.

Books and magazines are now a touch away for many of us, no matter where we live. Clearly, it has transformed our economy, and is in the process of transforming the economies of the rest of the world. We need to continue this process and this progress and ensure that e-commerce is allowed to grow and develop.

Currently, WTO members have agreed to a moratorium on the imposition of duties on electronic transmissions. That moratorium may be made permanent, as this resolution urges.

I would also urge my colleagues in voting for this resolution to consider how we can ensure that more Americans, including our schoolchildren, are positioned to capitalize on the benefits of this new technology-driven global economy.

According to this resolution, more than 1 billion people will be using the Internet in the next decade. That 1 billion needs to include the entire United States working and school-age population. In fact, that is an issue I think that we should have addressed in this legislation, had this legislation been brought to the floor in the normal House procedure.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, I support the legislation before us today. I do hope that the House leadership would find some way of bringing issues that are in the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means to the committees of jurisdiction so that we can have hearings, we can invite those people that have the responsibility, and handle these in the way that we should.

I am afraid that the suspension calendar more and more is being used as a press organ of the majority, rather than the committees that have been structured for this purpose.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the ranking Democrat on the Subcommittee on Telecommunications, Trade, and Consumer Protection, and I ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to allocate the remainder of the time.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) will control the remainder of the time.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to our distinguished friend and colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. COX), the author of this very important piece of legislation, House Concurrent Resolution 190.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. I also thank the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Texas, for permitting this resolution to come to the floor under expedited circumstances. It is, of course, because of the impending meeting of the World Trade Organization in Seattle on November 30 of this year that we wish Congress to be on record now, in advance, on this very important topic.

□ 1045

I would also like to recognize the important contribution to this legislation by a gentleman from the other body, our former colleague, the Senior Senator from the State of Oregon, Mr. WYDEN, who has in fact introduced a resolution identical to this in the other body, Senate Concurrent Resolution 58.

It was just 1 year ago, October of 1998, that he and I worked on the Cox-Wyden Internet Tax Freedom Act, which is now the law of the land.

The initiative we are considering in the House today, House Concurrent Resolution 190, takes the principle of the Internet Tax Freedom Act; that is, that information should not be taxed and we should keep special exactions that discriminate against electronic commerce off of the Internet, and applies to it to the international arena.

This resolution before us has three main elements. First, no tariffs on the Internet. Our legislation calls on the World Trade Organization, which will be meeting, as I said, in late November, 1999 in Seattle, to enact a permanent moratorium on E-commerce tariffs. This will preserve the taxation status quo. It will not take bread off the plate of any nation. Because, at present, none of the WTOs, more than 130 member nations, currently has such a tariff. This is the time to act before bad things happen.

The second important piece of this resolution is that it establishes the principle of no multiple or discriminatory foreign taxes on electronic commerce. Our legislation calls on the OECD, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development and its 29 member countries to subscribe to the principle of no multiple discriminatory or special Internet taxes.

Third, our legislation condemns the bit tax proposal of the United Nations and calls for a permanent ban on such Internet specific taxes. A bit tax, for those who have not been following this closely, is literally a tax on every bit of information, all the digital 0s and 1s. The more 0s and 1s, the greater the file size, the greater the tax. It is an obviously discriminatory levy aimed at electronic commerce.

Let me explain why this legislation is so important. Centuries ago, when the Moors still ruled Spain, there was a small seaport about 20 miles from Gibraltar. The Mediterranean seas off of this port were ruled by a ruthless band of pirates. Their success in raiding trading ships was such that merchants who traveled the area began to think of paying tribute to these pirates as just a cost of doing business. So the merchants began to refer to these payments by the name of a nearby seaport, Tarifa. It is from that that we get the name tariff in today's vocabulary.

In the years since then, the practice of imposing tariffs has, of course, become far more commonplace and has been taken over by governments. But a tariff, nonetheless, retains an element of piracy, the unwelcome exaction of unnecessary fees.

Today, the Internet is the vehicle for over $50 billion annually in trade and goods and services. This trade today is conducted free of piracy. The purpose of this resolution is to keep it that way. It is especially important to preserve this no taxes policy since the Internet's commercial potential is greater than that of any previously existing medium of trade.

A global free trade zone on the Internet will have immediate advantages for Americans, for workers who manufacture and for workers who provide services and for consumers, because U.S. firms excel in the information and media services that flourish on the Internet.

Last year, U.S. exports associated with licensing fees and royalties earned $37 billion. U.S. imports in this category were $11 billion. That is the biggest trade surplus we enjoy in any category of our trade.

Americans use the Internet more than citizens of other countries. We in our Nation account for roughly half of the world's usage of the Internet; that is, as of September of this year.

But making the Internet a tariff-free zone will also help our trading partners. As we all know, free trade benefits both buyer and seller. Keeping tariffs off the net, moreover, will accelerate its development in foreign countries and permit the citizens of foreign nations to share in the Internet's benefits and the access to global markets that it provides.

As I said, there is an urgency to the passage of this legislation. This year, the ministerial meeting of the WTO will occur on November 30. At least year's meeting in May 1998, the United States successfully negotiated and achieved a 1-year standstill of the application of tariffs to E-commerce. This was a disappointment to those of us who were urging a permanent ban.

We now have the opportunity to take that 1-year moratorium and extend it and make it permanent; and that is the purpose of Congress going on record today to urge the administration to take this action, and, moreover, to let the ministers of all of the member nations of the World Trade Organization understand that this is the policy, not just of the Executive Branch, but of the United States Congress as well.

This resolution calls on the President to work with all nations to enact a permanent moratorium on electronic commerce tariffs at that upcoming WTO ministerial meeting.

Lastly, on this subject of bit taxes, tax collectors around the globe are still talking openly about this special new Internet tax called a bit tax. This is the most discriminatory kind of tax that could be levied against the Internet. It will establish for us in this area what we already know to be true generally that the power to tax is the power to destroy. Outlawing bit taxes worldwide, as we have already done in the Internet Tax Freedom Act for our Nation, is vitally important.

I wish once again to thank my colleagues for attaching the same urgency to this as do I, and my colleague in the Senate, Mr. WYDEN, for acting on this in such an expedited fashion.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution. One of the most important, prominent features of the globalizing economy at the dawn of this new century is the rapid rise of the Internet as a mode of commerce.

The Internet is not only a meeting place for buyers and sellers, it is an important channel of distribution. Thus, for instance, computer software can be sent from a supplier to a customer at the speed of light. Providers of services such as information technology can assist customers thousands of miles away.

So far, the Internet has remained free of tariffs and nontariff barriers to trade. Those latter nontariff barriers are important issues to consider in this instance, and in others. Some may be tempted to attach new trade-impeding regulations to this new technology. We should resist that temptation at this relatively early stage in the development of the Internet as a mode of commerce.

This resolution urges the administration to seek a global consensus on making the existing moratorium on special E-commerce tariffs and taxes permanent. I support that endeavor.

While I vote for this resolution, I want to join the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) in expressing disappointment in the manner by which it is being brought before this body. This House has a constitutional responsibility in the regulation of U.S. trade with foreign nations. That means providing comprehensive guidance to the administration as it embarks on a new round of world trade negotiations.

Fulfilling our constitutional responsibility requires more than considering a single negotiating objective as we are doing today. Rather, we should be considering a broader range of negotiating objectives. There is, for example, a resolution, I believe with over 200 signatures, relating to the vital importance of maintaining U.S. anti-dumping laws. Also, there is the important issue of the role of core labor standards in trade negotiations.

Here I want to express, because it has been mentioned by the chairman of the subcommittee, the need for us to face this issue of core labor standards in trade negotiations. I think they are vitally relevant to them.

At the end of the Seattle Round of world trade negotiations, this House will most likely be called upon to enact implementing legislation. We must not wait until the last minute to provide our input. Instead, we should be working with the administration now to develop and refine our agenda going into the new round. We must not defer this responsibility.

So I urge my colleagues, remembering, though, the need for a broader ring of consideration, to vote for H. Con. Res. 190. I urge all of us to participate in developing a set of objectives for the new round of world trade negotiations that covers the gamut of issues confronting American workers, farmers, and businesses in the global economy.

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

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN).

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, the Internet has brought countless improvements to the lives of many Americans in the past several years. One of the most promising uses of the Internet is its ability to connect countless people and businesses at little cost through E-commerce.

Doing business over the Internet allows people all over the world to search for the best deal on a wide range of goods and services, destroying the traditional barriers to free and open competition and comparison shopping. It empowers consumers, especially in rural and remote small communities, to easily reach the marketplaces of the world. These factors have contributed to making E-commerce increasingly popular. It is expected to account for $1.3 trillion in sales by 2003.

So far E-commerce has been allowed to flourish largely without the interference of unfair government regulation. Unfortunately, it is the way of governments the world over to tax and impede the growth of such a new source of prosperity.

Mr. Speaker, I want to strongly support the House Concurrent Resolution 190, which would urge the President to work to prevent discriminatory and harmful taxes on E-commerce in the United States and abroad. This resolution would show the world that the U.S. House of Representatives supports the continued growth of E-commerce free from destructive taxation.

Mr. Speaker, let us make another point very clearly. Let us never allow a tax or tariff on e-mail.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. COX), the Committee on Ways and Means, and my colleague from the Senate, Senator WYDEN, for helping bring this important measure to our attention and for their bringing this to the floor.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, it is now my privilege to yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN), who is highly versed in these matters.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I support this concurrent resolution. As my colleagues all may know, not one of the 130 members of the World Trade Organization presently imposes a tariff on the Internet. That is a good thing and may account for the Internet's success. I would like this ''no tariff'' policy to become the official policy of the WTO. I know there are some nations thinking of applying various taxes. I encourage the Members of this Congress to go on record against such taxes.

Electronic commerce is made possible by the bits and bytes of information that travel in packets within this country and around the world, across State and national boundaries. There are some who want to tax each bit of information that is transmitted.

Earlier this year, the UN suggested taxing the bits that make up the E-mails we have grown accustomed to sending each other. This may suggest to my colleagues the mischief that could be caused by doing such a thing.

Let us nip this bit tax idea in the bud and support this concurrent resolution that urges a worldwide ban on any bit tax.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support the concurrent resolution.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), who also has been immersed in issues relating to E-commerce.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of this resolution on keeping the Internet a global tax-free zone. We must achieve a global consensus on banning tariffs and discriminatory taxation on electronic commerce.

The gentleman from California (Mr. COX) has provided leadership last year in gaining approval of the Internet Tax Freedom Act. I joined with him then and I believe that all the reasons that we advanced for supporting that moratorium on taxes by 30,000 potential taxing jurisdictions here in America, all of those reasons apply around the globe to the need for a global free trade zone and limitation on taxation.

□ 1100

While currently none of the members of the World Trade Organization are imposing tariffs, it is very crucial that we prevent new barriers from arising.

Clearly, the imagination for new forms of taxation and new restrictions on trade seems unlimited. A bit tax, for example, which could be levied on every bit of digital data that is transmitted over the Internet, would significantly impair the expansion of electronic commerce.

The high-technology community that I represent in Austin, Texas, has been a driving force for growth throughout our State. Fortune Magazine calls Austin the best place in the country to do business. And in large measure this is the product of the environment we have created with high technology.

Meanwhile, the United States is the world leader in high-technology research and development. The actions that have already been taken by this Administration and the actions that this resolution urges will solidify our Nation's competitive edge in the world economy.

In 1995, I believe there were about 3 million people who were Internet users. Today, we are at about 200 million. And within 5 years we are expected to have a billion Internet users around the globe.

Clearly, an Internet Global Free Trade Zone will foster continued growth, and not only benefit one of the most important engines driving our strong economy, but it will also benefit consumers at home and abroad, who will be encouraged to get connected. And this also means more good high-paying jobs here in the United States, and it means more opportunity for the citizens of the world to share in this important new revolution in technology.

We need no tax on e-mail and no tariffs or other trade restrictions on the Net.

I applaud the Administration for what it has already done in placing this important agenda item on the list of top priorities when the World Trade Organization convenes in Seattle, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. COX) for his continued leadership to ensure that government does not impede continued expansion of electronic commerce.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in strong support of this resolution and to congratulate

my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. COX), for introducing it.

This important resolution would direct the U.S. representatives to the upcoming World Trade Organization summit in Seattle, Washington, to advocate making the moratorium on Internet taxation that was adopted at the 1998 WTO conference a permanent Internet tax moratorium.

Mr. Speaker, I worked closely with the gentleman from California to move legislation through the House in 1998 that placed a moratorium on new taxes on the Internet. This important legislation set the standard for other nations around the world to follow. As a result, the Internet remains relatively free from the burdens of special and new taxes, and we must continue to put pressure on our fellow nations that would seek to tap this booming economic resource and destroy much of its momentum.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot stand by and assume that the rest of the world holds the same distaste for taxing the Internet. That is why we must continue to work actively through measures such as this one to keep the Internet free from new taxes. This includes monitoring the ongoing deliberations of the commission set up by the Internet Tax Freedom Act passed by Congress in 1998. This commission, chaired by the governor of my home State of Virginia, Jim Gilmore, will hopefully return to Congress next year with recommendations to retain the no-new-tax policy that has made this medium so successful.

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, we must send a message to our fellow nations gathering in Seattle next month that to permit taxation of the Internet is to infect it with a virus that will slowly sap its strength, weakening and ultimately destroying the extraordinary growth that has revolutionized the way we live, work, and learn.

I urge my colleagues to support this important resolution.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I obviously have a bias on this issue. I represent a district that is the most wired in the country, which probably means it is the most wired in the world, with 59.9 percent of all the households in the northern Virginia area wired with the Internet. So, obviously, I do not want any taxation on Internet transactions.

We know that ''wired communities'' are going to be at the cutting edge of the enormous growth of this industry. The resolution itself says that electronic commerce between businesses is going to grow to $1.3 trillion in another 3 years and that, in fact, the electronic retail sales are going to amount to about $108 billion. With 200 different nationalities with their own different sovereign forms of government, I cannot imagine how we could implement a bit tax. We do not want it. It is going to impede the progress of spreading information technology throughout the world.

We do need to keep in mind, however, that this is still an open issue. Legislatively, it is still an open issue before us. There is only a moratorium on Internet taxation. There is a commission that we put together to address the long term issues surrounding internet taxation composed of businesses, States, localities and Federal officials, determining what we do about a couple of major problems. One of them is what do States and localities do when Internet, e-commerce, takes over from traditional retail commerce? What do they do with the loss of revenue? How do we make it up to our schools, our roads, our public safety, et cetera? They are currently dealing with that issue.

The other issue is what do we do with the retail centers of activities in our cities and towns? If e-commerce is going to be the way that we normally purchase a product, it has profound implications for the physical centers of our communities across the country. We have to deal with those issues.

Now, I am admitting a bias. I do not want taxation on any e-commerce, because that would be in the interest of my constituency. But we have also got to listen to the State and local officials who can see what is coming from places that, while they may be wired, are desperately in need of the tax revenue from retail transactions that will be made uncompetitive if our economy goes the way of e-commerce. It is far more convenient and it is less expensive. E-commerce, in fact, is always going to be less expensive compared to traditional sales if it is not taxed. It is not fair to have retail establishments taxed, yet people who are selling the same product on the internet are not taxed because we prohibit taxation of those products. That has got to be resolved.

If we go in this direction, which I think ultimately we will, how do we make up for the loss of revenue to our States and localities? We have to deal with this. We are the Nation's leaders, and it is incumbent on us to resolve these issues now before we make permanent such a profound change in our private retail and public revenue structures.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY).

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

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, as we send Ambassador Barshefsky to the WTO Ministerial in Seattle next month, the world is on the verge of a crucial decision for electronic commerce. Will it remain duty and tariff free?

We are here today to say, yes, it should. That is the consensus here in the United States about what is best for the growth and development of e-commerce. But other countries in the world are not so sure, and that is why we are backing Ambassador Barshefsky in her efforts that will be undertaken at the WTO Ministerial meeting in Seattle 5 weeks from now at a session that many of us will be attending.

This week, I am circulating a letter to Ambassador Barshefsky for Members' signatures that share the same spirit as the Cox resolution. We need strong congressional support to show the world that the United States stands firmly opposed to any taxation of e-commerce.

The imposition of tariffs and duties on electronic services or information will only mean that they will become less available to the world. Unless cyberspace is tax free, how will people in developing nations have consumer choice? In my view, the tariff moratorium should be made permanent. It should be as broad as possible to cover the wide array of what is available electronically.

This decision in Seattle is no doubt going to be a difficult choice for developing nations strapped for revenue while watching the Internet grow exponentially. It is the principled choice, however, and I believe the right conclusion will be reached in Seattle with the leadership of our delegation and others who agree with this policy.

The U.S. leads the world in the software industry. The fact is that we live in an age where the downloading of software is an export directly to a consumer. It has never touched the hands of a government agent at a post office, a shipping port, or an airport. That freedom of government intrusion is what we hope to protect.

Mr. Speaker, if the world fails here, we will see an immediate rash of tariffs, customs duties, and other trade barriers. The only possible result is the limitation of available information and services, and that cuts to the very heart of what the Internet does so well.

I ask strong support for the Cox resolution.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA).

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

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding me this time, and I compliment the gentleman from California (Mr. COX) for his steadfast efforts to keep everybody's paws off economic commerce, or e-commerce.

I think this is an essential resolution, and it is a signal to other folks around the world just to say no to imposing taxes on Internet sales. We have seen the development and unprecedented growth of the Internet and e-commerce and what it means to the American taxpayer, what it means to the person sitting at home who now has the luxury that several years ago

was only a dream. And what we are saying is we want to continue that growth; we want to continue the opportunities that occur daily. People sitting across this country and, indeed, across the world recognize the endless possibilities of what the Internet means to e-commerce.

So many governors across this country, so many people recognize when we tax something unnecessarily, we are hurting commerce, we hurt growth, and we destroy opportunity. What we want the WTO to do, and what we want our ambassador to do is to send a signal to everyone around the world to keep their paws off consumers' wallets.

There are those who say, well, if we do not tax e-commerce then we will affect sales tax revenues and miss out on the windfall. I have got some words for those folks. We are taxed too much. I see it every day in New York. People go across the bridge to New Jersey because there is no sales tax on clothing. That is the way people think. They go to where they can find the cheapest price. That is human nature.

So, if anything, we should build a wall here not to impose taxes on e-commerce and hope that other folks around this country will start lowering the tax burden on hard-working folks with families. But in spite of that, the last several years what we have seen and witnessed in this country, as e-commerce has grown, so too have sales tax revenues.

So I think those concerns are misplaced. And, if anything, we should be dedicating our efforts to reducing the tax burden on hard-working Americans while at the same time prohibiting new taxes on e-commerce.

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

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to conclude with one final observation, and that is, in response to the concerns expressed by our ranking minority member on the full Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), and the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Trade, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), about the failure to have held hearings on this issue.

We have been under tight constraints, but let me just remind everyone that this is not mandating anything. It is simply urging the U.S. to seek a global consensus on this issue. I am sorry that we did not have the hearings that the gentleman said he would have liked to have seen; but hopefully, as we go down the line, we will have increased opportunities for that. But right now I would urge all my colleagues to support this measure.

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

Mr. CRANE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RANGEL. I say this with all deference and respect to my dear friend from Illinois, Mr. Speaker. It is not just this one bill that we are talking about. We expect that another tax issue will be coming up on the suspension calendar. If I thought it was just a question of time, I would not resent it.

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Con. Res. 190, a bill to place a moratorium on electronic commerce taxation. It is crucial that Congress works to provide a tax-free environment for the Internet to grow.

Mr. Speaker, during this past decade, the United States has witnessed the longest peacetime economic expansion in recent memory. Indeed, e-commerce has contributed to much of this decade's economic growth. It is estimated that over 140 million people worldwide are now online. In the United States alone, the information technology industry accounted for more than one-third of the real growth in the gross domestic product over the past 3 years, employing more than 7 million workers.

In my home State of Oregon, ''the Silicon Forest,'' in communities like Portland, Beaverton, and Hillsboro—e-commerce has been responsible for a remarkable economic recovery, and boom, over the past decade. We in Oregon have benefited from the strong growth of the information technology industry. Oregon companies, large and small, have benefited from the growth of the Internet.

Although electronic commerce still constitutes a relatively minor part of global trade, technological advances and key trade policy decisions will surely facilitate the further growth of this important industry. In the upcoming years, electronic commerce is expected to grow by leaps and bounds. Congress must commit itself to work with the international community to pave the way for this important industry to grow.

Furthermore, like all other business transactions, it is crucial to achieve uniformity within the information technology industry, such as a universally accepted form of electronic signature. By encouraging and developing a system of standards, Congress can further assist the growth of e-commerce.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this important legislation. Let's continue to encourage the growth of the information technology industry and America's economy. I urge my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 190.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in favor of H. Con. Res. 190, a resolution which extends the work initiated by my colleague, Mr. COX, last year, on extending the moratorium on Internet taxation to the international arena. This important piece of legislation urges the United States to seek a global consensus now that supports a moratorium on tariffs and on special, multiple, and discriminatory taxation of electronic commerce. It does so by calling on the World Trade Organization to enact a permanent moratorium on e-commerce tariffs at its Seattle ministerial meeting next month. With none of the WTO's 130 members currently taxing Internet commerce, it is imperative that we implement a global strategy that ensures that the Internet remains tax free before such barriers are erected.

With Internet use and global electronic commerce growing at an astronomical pace, it is inarguable that the Internet is emerging as the most unique and the fastest-growing tool of communication known to mankind. The Internet facilitates not only economic growth but the easy dissemination of ideas and information from almost any spot in the world. We are at the tip of the iceberg in terms of the potential that the Internet can offer both cheaply and quickly. Yet an ever-present concern plagues many of us who—like my colleagues standing with me here today—understand the need to foster its continued growth by minimizing the amount of government regulation and taxes that will interfere with the transformation of the Internet into the repository of global communications for the 21st century. H. Con. Res. 190 is a critical component of ensuring that government does not inhibit the growth of the Internet, whether intentionally or unintentionally. Various schemes of taxation introduced by governments across the world will make the internet an unpredictable environment for even simple communications; much more so for conducting online business. Such a development would most certainly discourage the easy and efficient use that the Internet now provides for users worldwide.

Last year, we enacted the Internet Tax Freedom Act which codified a policy against special, multiple, discriminatory Internet taxation and urged the United States to seek international agreements that would concertize those same principles globally. With the July 1999 United Nations Report urging sovereign states to impose ''bit taxes'' on electronic transmissions, it is incumbent now more than ever for Congress and the United States to take the lead in opposing any taxation of electronic commerce globally that would inhibit the continued economic and social growth of the Internet. The resolution specifically urges the President to oppose a United Nations or any other international organization's proposal to establish a ''bit tax.''

It is also important that we utilize every available opportunity to press for an Internet tax moratorium and for this reason, H. Con. Res. 190 also calls on the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development to adopt the principle of ''no multiple, discriminatory, or special taxes'' on the Internet or on electronic commerce.

Each of the principles expressed in this crucial measure are equally important to the future of the Internet. I want to thank my colleagues, Mr. COX and Mr. SESSIONS, for introducing this resolution and for moving it forward quickly. I urge all Members to vote in favor of H. Con. Res. 190.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KOLBE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 190, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 1115

SENSE OF CONGRESS THERE BE NO INCREASE IN FEDERAL TAXES TO FUND ADDITIONAL GOVERNMENT SPENDING

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 208) expressing the sense of Congress that there should be no increase in Federal taxes in order to fund additional Government spending.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 208

Whereas Federal taxes are at their highest peacetime level in history, taking 20.6 percent of the gross domestic product;

Whereas the typical American family pays 36 percent of its income in Federal, State, and local taxes—more than it spends on food, housing, and clothing combined;

Whereas in 1999 governments at all levels will collect $10,298 for every man, woman, and child in the United States;

Whereas since 1989 the Federal per capita tax burden has increased 27 percent;

Whereas the Congressional Budget Office forecasts that the productivity of American workers—and controlled Federal spending—will create a non-Social Security surplus of $996,000,000,000 over the next 10 years;

Whereas the House of Representatives voted on May 26, 1999, to protect Social Security and Medicare by passing the Social Security lock box by a vote of 416 to 12; and

Whereas Congress must protect Social Security and Medicare by controlling Federal spending, rather than by increasing taxes on any Americans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of Congress that there should be no increase in Federal taxes in order to fund additional Government spending.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KOLBE). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Con. Res. 208.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be here today to speak in favor of House Concurrent Resolution 208.

I would like to commend my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) for introducing this important legislation that forces us to focus on the choices we need to make in order to maintain fiscal discipline.

As my colleagues know, House Concurrent Resolution 208 expresses the sense of this Congress that we should not raise taxes in order to fund additional Federal spending.

Indeed, as I understand it, Mr. Speaker, it is the sentiment of this commonsense, conservative majority in this House through another legislative vehicle later on our Calendar to propose that we work to realize a savings of 13 cents for every $10 of Federal spending, because we need to keep in mind the bigger picture here. Taxes are at their highest peacetime level in the history of our country. The average American family pays more in taxes than in food, shelter, and clothing combined.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot continue to burden working Americans with higher and higher and higher taxes. We must be willing to find savings by reducing wasteful Washington spending so that we can maintain fiscal discipline without asking the American people to hand over more of their hard-earned money to the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield the balance of my time to my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) and that he be permitted to yield further blocks of time.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, this is stupid. An issue like this should either be brought to the floor by leadership for discussion, or someone ought to take a course in Economics 101.

Now, I know the difficulty it is to count when they are trying to put together a budget. It is something like what is, is; and how many months in a year; and what is an emergency. I know the difficulty they are having. But it cannot be so bad that they are going to make a mockery out of the entire legislative process by asking this floor to feel good by saying that we are not going to raise Federal taxes in order to fund additional Government spending.

There are only three things to do if they are going to spend. If they are going to have additional spending, for whatever purpose, they have to go to the majority. Now, I know it does not feel comfortable being in the majority, but they are the majority. They are the leadership. And so, they have to find out what they want to spend. And I guess they would go to the Committee on Appropriations. But we do not spend here in the minority. Majority spends.

So what is the solution? The solution is that they either increase taxes, which the resolution they are dictating to the Speaker and to the Republican leadership that they cannot do that, they go into the Social Security Trust Fund. And then they put on commercials on TV that they are not doing that, even though the Congressional Budget Office says that they are.

Or the third thing that they do is come to the floor and say, I never put my hand in the cookie jar in the first place.

This is no way to deal with the problems that we face as a Nation. We do not come on the House of Representatives floor with a sense of Congress. We legislate in this House. We send these issues to the respective committees. We have hearings. And we do something about it.

If, on the other hand, they are in a continuous resolution mode and they are not involved anymore in legislation and they just want the President to be their partner so that the Government does not close down, then go to the White House and tell him what to put in the bill. Because clearly, the President is going to have issues in the omnibus bill that has never come out of the committees that have been set up in this Congress.

So I know maybe they want to have something to vote on. And who knows, maybe the public really thinks this is on the level. Maybe they really think that we are coming down here voting against Federal taxes. Normally they wait until April 15 to do something this stupid. But, no, now they are saying here on the brink of the Government about to close down because of the inability to pass the appropriations bills that they are going to take the Suspension Calendar, which says that it is noncontroversial, and then we are going to mandate and see who has the nerve to vote against something which says that we are not going to have an increase in Federal taxes.

Do my colleagues not know that, if we could do this, nobody in the United States would ever have to pay taxes? We should have 435 Members on the floor every day passing resolutions that we do not need any taxes. We can pull up the Code by its roots, just pass the resolution. We can stop spending tomorrow. Pass a resolution.

But one thing they will not do, they will not come up with any concrete ideas to cut back spending or any ideas how we can avoid having Social Security be a problem in the future.

So, Mr. Speaker, there are so many things that we should be doing, individual minimum tax, increases in minimum wage, even the extensions which are so important to the American people, questions of education, patients' bill of rights, a variety of things. But in lieu of a press release, we are now going to use the Suspension Calendar to say we do not want any further increases in Federal taxes to fund additional Government spending.

Mr. Speaker, I want other people to make some type of observations on this historic piece of legislation that has now come before the House of Representatives, even though I wish the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means was here so that we could have an exchange as to how we could deal with these tax issues. But I will deal with the Committee on Rules until we can find out how we are going to do this.

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

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) for adding to the civility of the discourse in the House.

But, Mr. Speaker, later this week, in all probability, we will pass the 13th and final appropriations bill for this year. And when we do so, we will have spent in those bills all the non-Social Security funds that the Federal Government will take in next year but not one dime of the Social Security funds themselves. We will have a balanced budget, and we will not have raised taxes.

Unfortunately, the President has already vetoed three of those bills and he may veto more because he thinks we are not spending enough money in them.

Mr. Speaker, if the President wants to spend more money, as he does, for instance, in the foreign aid bill, he has to show us where he is going to cut spending somewhere else. Because the only alternatives are to spend part of the Social Security fund or to raise taxes, and neither of those alternatives is acceptable. We have made it clear in this body that we will not tolerate spending Social Security money.

Today I believe we must send the President a clear message that we will not raise taxes to pay for his new additional spending, either.

Now, when we talk about Federal taxes, it is useful to consider the overall context of the Federal budget, the national economy, and just a little bit of history.

This first chart illustrates that Federal discretionary spending is higher than it has ever been; and, thus, the Federal Government is bigger than it has ever been.

The second chart shows that Federal taxes are higher than they have ever been in our Nation's peacetime history, consuming almost 21 percent of our Nation's entire economic output.

Now, even after we set aside all of the Social Security funds for Social Security and debt retirement, as this third chart will show, we still have unprecedented surpluses projected as far as the eye can see. The administration's budget forecasts that. The congressional budget forecasts that. Private budget forecasters show that.

Now, when taxpayers are paying more than it takes to fund the biggest Federal Government in history and, in addition to that, taxpayers are paying more than it takes to pay Social Security benefits over the next 10 years and another $2 trillion more and all of that surplus is going to reform Social Security or to pay down the national debt, when taxpayers in fact are paying an additional trillion dollars before and beyond that, it is obvious to me that taxes are too high.

For the President to propose adding to this record Federal tax burden is outrageous. We need to lower taxes and restore to working Americans their freedom to decide how they want to spend their money. And make no mistake about it, when the Federal Government takes money away from the people who earn it, it is taking part of that freedom away as well.

The money this Government takes from hard-working Americans is money those hard-working folks will never be free to spend for themselves as they see fit. The money this Government takes from working Americans takes time for these folks to earn that money. That is time people cannot devote to things they would rather be doing than working for the Federal Government, such as spending time with their children, caring for an elderly family member, volunteering in their community, or just enjoying some leisure time.

At a time of already record-high Government spending, record-high Federal taxes, unprecedented surpluses, it is just unconscionable to consider taking even more money away from the people who earn it. And that is all this resolution says, that there should be no increase in Federal taxes in order to fund additional Government spending.

Mr. Speaker, America's taxpayers are counting on this Congress to protect them from the President's very large appetite for their money. I urge my colleagues to send a clear message to the President: No tax increases, restrain Federal spending. Vote ''yes'' on House Concurrent Resolution 208.

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

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the tax writing committee.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I come out here today, I have never seen such a weighty piece of legislation in my entire 29 years in Government. In the State legislature, they do not even come up with things as stupid as this. But here we are. And there is a pattern. There is a pattern.

One week ago, the leadership sent a bunch of freshmen out here with a silly bill with the President's tax increases in it and nothing that it was going to be spent on; and, lo and behold, we slapped it down. And then they went down that afternoon to the White House, having insulted the President with that, and said, see, the House does not want to raise taxes. So today they are going down again to balance the budget this afternoon, and we come out and we find this kind of nonsense in front of us.

Now, I do not know who the brain trust is over there, but I know that the one that was put in House Concurrent Resolution 197 had a provision in it that had to do with the tobacco tax. And they were against that tobacco tax, by God. Boy, they were really against it.

Now in the one that is before us now, House Resolution 208, they have taken it out. And I think, I say to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), what they are doing is setting the stage to raise the tobacco tax. Because if they were against it yesterday when they filed it, what has changed? Why have they come up here without it?

I think they are going to use it. Yes, sir, they are getting ready to fix this budget. Does that make sense to my colleagues?

□ 1130

One of the fascinating things about this, you have always got to be careful when you put numbers in here. In paragraph 2, it says, ''Whereas Federal taxes are at their highest peacetime level in history, taking 20.5 percent of the gross domestic product.''

Do my colleagues know what the percentage was when the Republicans took over the House of Representatives? 18.6. Under their tutelage, under their great management, under all this great stuff they have done, including that tax break last year, people are now paying almost 2 percent more taxes than they paid when they started. Now, what they have done, of course, is they have shifted all the income to the people on the top and they are paying more taxes. So their proposals actually worked. They have shifted all the money in the country up, under their tax bills, and we are paying more taxes in this country because of Republican policies.

It is a wonderful thing to sit here and contemplate what the thinking must have been in the room. They said, well, we do not want to raise taxes to pay for programs. What other reason would there be to raise taxes? I mean, why else would a Congress come out here and raise taxes? Because they did not have anything else to do? No, that would not be it. Well, maybe, I know what it was. The only other reason would be to punish the rich, right, people who have got money. That is the only reason they would raise taxes, to take it away from them.

Now, this is the kind of thinking that has led us to this impasse. They came out here earlier in the session and had a $792 billion tax break. Thank God that died, because they cannot balance the budget. They were going to give away $729 billion, and they cannot balance the budget. They cannot get us out of here. We are here on our second continuing resolution, and by God I will bet my colleagues we will have a third continuing resolution because they cannot figure out how to bring this thing to a close. Yet 3 or 4 months ago, they were willing to give away $800 billion. It makes no sense. It makes about as much sense, I guess, as this one.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU).

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by making clear that no matter how strongly we feel about issues of substantive disagreement whether it is tax increases or tax relief or spending or cutting spending, I do not think that the rhetoric, the language using the

words like ''stupid'' or ''silly'' to characterize the behavior of other Members is ever appropriate to use on this House floor, whether you are a senior ranking member of a committee or whether you are a new Member of Congress like the principal sponsor of this legislation. I do not think I have heard so much hot air released at once since the Hindenburg went down.

I would like to get back to the substance, to the process that brought us here in the first place. At the beginning of this year, President Clinton in good faith brought forth a budget proposal. He said we are going to set aside 60 percent of the Social Security surplus and we are going to spend 40 percent. And he laid out his priorities in that budget and he said, ''We're going to increase taxes.'' His tax increase was approximately $240 billion over 10 years. It was a detailed budget, as the President submits every year to Congress.

The Republican Congress said, ''That's not right.'' And we put together a budget proposal that members of the minority did not support and that is their prerogative, but it was a budget proposal that said for the first time in 40 years we are going to set aside every penny of the Social Security surplus and we are going to do it while cutting taxes. And again the minority disagreed with that proposal, and the gentleman from Washington tried to describe some of the reasons they were against tax relief. Well, that is fine, too. But we advanced that tax relief proposal, to eliminate the marriage penalty, eliminate death taxes, give full health insurance deductibility for those that are buying health insurance and are self-employed, increase access to health insurance and the President vetoed that bill, as is his prerogative. But now we are at the end of the budget process and Republicans are holding firm to their commitment not to spend Social Security. We did it last year. We balanced the budget for the first time in 40 years without using Social Security. We can and we must do it again this year. That causes heartburn for a lot of members of the minority, feeling the pressure of having to control spending. We have talked about reducing spending across the board by 1 percent, allowing agency heads and department heads to root out waste and abuse, just 1 percent, one penny on every dollar, in order to balance the budget in 2000 without using Social Security. I believe we can do that. And the administration has indicated that they want to balance the budget without using Social Security, too. So we might have some common ground here. We will work with the administration to fund priorities if they can reduce spending elsewhere in the budget.

But what about taxes? The administration has waffled on tax increases. The President seems to have backed off his proposal to raise taxes by $240 billion over 10 years. We had a vote, a legislative vote in this House last week where his tax proposals received zero votes. I think that was an important statement for the House to make. But today we can go on record as saying no tax increases for new government spending, no spending the Social Security trust fund, no tax increases. It is a simple, clear message to the American people. We have been firm in our commitment as the majority party to protect Social Security since the very beginning of this budget process. With the passage of this resolution and the continued statement on a bipartisan basis from all Members of the House that we should not be increasing taxes, I think the fiscal responsibility this year and next year will continue to result in a growing economy and a better quality of life for hard-working Americans.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. If I have offended anybody, then I apologize. I just would want to say that it is extremely frustrating for a legislator to come to this floor and to believe that we can decrease, or not increase, Federal taxes or not have additional spending by putting a bill on the suspension calendar. It is frustrating to see that the tax writing committee is not dealing with taxes, the appropriating committee is not dealing with bills, but that the Committee on Rules is still pushing out bills under suspension.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), a member of the tax writing committee.

Mr. DOGGETT. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I believe one thing that is very obvious to anyone who has been observing this Congress is that we would not be here today debating this resolution or debating anything else if our Republican colleagues had done their job. They have not done their job. They are desperate for distraction. So I expect we will have more resolutions. This is not the last one. There will be more of these kind of resolutions to distract from the simple fact that they have failed utterly and completely to do their work during this past fiscal year. They are a competitive group. They are competing with themselves. We thought last year's Congress set the standard for doing little. It certainly was the least productive Congress since the days of Harry Truman. But they are competing with that record and I think they are winning. I believe they will have an even less productive and even more do-nothing Congress than they did during 1998.

That incredible record reminds us that today we are entering week four of the new fiscal year, and they still have not done last year's work. It is incredible that almost a month after the end of the Federal fiscal year, the bill that funds all of the Federal assistance to education, the bill that funds all of our health research in this country to try to cure dreadful diseases like Parkinson's, cancer, diabetes, that bill has never been presented on the floor of this House. That is what I mean by do-nothingism. It is the failure to do your work and to present for debate on the floor of the House that very fundamental bill. I know the Republicans, some of them still want to abolish the Department of Education, but at least they could bring that bill to the floor and let the House debate it.

Let me give my colleagues a second example since we are talking about taxes. On September 24, all the members of the Committee on Ways and Means were called into an emergency meeting directly across the hall from this Chamber in which we gather today. We were told that unless we rushed through a bill, the tax forms could not be prepared by the Internal Revenue Service. It had to be done by October 7 or the forms would not be ready. That bill was a very important one to people in central Texas, because it continued the research and development tax credit. That is a tax credit established by a Democratic Congress. It is true that under Speaker Gingrich it was allowed to expire and our technology companies were denied the benefit of that tax credit in 1995, but we saw an opportunity to extend it and continue it. Well, where is that bill? It has never been brought to the floor of the House. October 7 is past; we are approaching November 7, and they have never brought the research and development tax credit, the §127 and other so called ''extenders,'' employer provided education assistance, they have never brought these to the floor of the House to be considered. That is why a number of people are concerned that the Republican do-nothingism may jeopardize this tax credit and cause its loss for research and development. This credit expired on June 30, and we must not lose it again as happened under this Republican leadership with Newt Gingrich in 1995.

I do think it is important to note one important improvement in this resolution, and that is the deletion of the attack on a tax on tobacco. The only thing this Republican Congress ever did about tobacco usage and the fact that 3,000 of our young people get addicted each day to nicotine, the only thing they ever did was to provide a $50 billion tax credit to the tobacco lobby. When the public found out about it, Republicans got so scared about it that they withdrew that credit after it had been approved by the House. But it is at least worthy to note that while the sponsors of the pending resolution initially attacked the tobacco tax, they have removed that language from this resolution. And that happens to be the only significant tax increase the President has proposed. It is certainly better to tax tobacco than to take money from Social Security.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA).

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

Mr. FOSSELLA. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, let us bring it back into focus again. There are only three things you can really do with taxes. You can cut them and bring relief to hardworking taxpayers. That is what this Congress did, and the White House vetoed, so we deprived the opportunity of American hardworking taxpayers to keep a little more money in their paychecks or at the end of the year so they can put more food on the table or they can buy some clothes for the kids when they go to school or they could put a little money away for their child's college fund. That was deprived because of a veto from the White House and for those who chose to vote against that bill.

We can keep taxes exactly where they are, which hopefully is the worst we can do this year. Or we can do what the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) says, is not increase taxes, that is all, to pay for additional spending. What is so wrong about that? If you feel committed, if you do, fine. But if you feel committed that we need to raise taxes to pay for additional spending, then you should not have the problem, Mr. Speaker, of coming down here and voting for it.

I happen to believe that the people that I represent in Staten Island and Brooklyn are working too hard right now, sometimes two and three jobs, trying to put their kids through college, trying to just get enough money the buy that second car. They are working too hard for us to come down here and say, ''You know what, we don't think you're being taxed enough. We think we should be taking a little more out of your pocket.'' No, I would rather go home, Mr. Speaker, and look those folks in the eyes and tell them, you know what, we are doing all we can to provide more freedom and opportunity to you and your families and we are doing all we can in Washington to ensure that we are not going to take more money out of your pocket, we are not going to take more money out of your home because that is where we believe that money belongs.

If you feel so strongly that this government should be getting bigger and larger because the Federal Government should be taking more of the taxes, then come right down here and say it. But in the meantime, people like the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and I believe he speaks for the vast majority of Americans, are saying, you know what, we are taxed too much, do not do it. Spend the money appropriately and responsibly.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY MILLER).

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

Mr. GARY MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution. We are talking about the people of the United States. It is their money. It is not our money. I congratulate my freshman colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) for bringing this forward today.

The rhetoric today is incredible. One of my colleagues said we have not done our job, the Republicans have not done our job. It reminds me of the story of the farmer who hooked a horse up to one side of a wagon and a mule up to the back pulling in the opposite direction.

□ 1145

The reason we do not have a budget is because our colleagues will not do their job and vote for it.

We believe we can live within our means. Our colleagues are doing nothing to help us on this. They are laughing. That is the attitude we have from that side of the House. When we deal with a serious issue, we get laughter. As my colleagues know, actions speak louder than words.

We bring forward appropriations bills that spend within our means, and the Democrats vote no. Why? Because they say it does nothing for Social Security. Well, it has nothing to do with Social Security. They vote no because we will not spend more money, which means spending Social Security money.

With the President actions speak louder than words. All we heard last year is: We need to save Social Security. What did he do in his budget proposal? He spent $58 billion of Social Security, this money, this year on new programs, and he said we need to save Medicare and Medicaid in 5 years. He was proposing to cut $11.9 billion out of the programs. That does not save anything.

The President said: We need to save Social Security. We saved the first bill this year for the President to come forward with his reform for Social Security, and guess what that bill is doing? Doing nothing. He has not made a proposal to save Social Security.

I know when I was a young man I was raised with my grandparents. We were poor, and I started a business off in the construction industry, and I had an old van that used more oil than it did gas, and I was willing to sacrifice, and I built a company. I want my kids to have that opportunity, and I even want my colleagues' kids to have that opportunity. But they want to tax them to death. 20.5 percent of GDP is in taxes; they ought to be ashamed of themselves.

What we are trying to do here is make a statement: ''Put your actions where your words are.'' We have heard enough rhetoric. We have watched them vote no. We have watched the laughter and the childishness on the floor, and that is fine, Mr. Speaker. I respect these individuals. Some are trying to do what is right, some are trying to be political.

Let us protect the American people. Let us let people keep more of their hard-earned money, we do not need it. Government has grown to be a fatted calf and a fat hog. We do not need to spend our constituents' money. They earned it, they should keep it; we are trying to make that statement. If we are going to save Social Security, let us stop spending money. If we are going to help the American people better their lives, let us stop taxing them and spending their money.

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

Mr. Speaker, it would be very sad if the majority did not understand their responsibility. I am going to try to run this by just one time because the gentleman who just got finished speaking said the mule and the horse are working against each other.

The majority sets the agenda. The majority sets the budget. The majority sets the spending level. The majority sets the amount of taxes that are going to be made there. So I do not know why we need to have a resolution because would they be changing anything in their resolution that if they were going to say that expressing the sense of Congress that the Republican majority should not increase federal taxes? The Republican majority should not fund additional government spending. The congressional Republican majority for some reason omits now cigarette taxes or whatever they are going to do. Just put in there ''majority,'' and then we would know what we are voting for because everyone agrees with them. It is just that this is not the process that we control taxes and spending, by using the suspension calendar.

If they want to say, let the committees do it, then do it. My God, they did not ask for help on the Patients' Bill of Rights. We had to pull teeth to get some votes out of them where the minority provided the leadership. They did not ask for help in cutting back the number of teachers the President requested and the number of policemen. They sure did not ask for help when they decided they wanted to cut taxes by $792 billion, and they are asking for help by having a continuing resolution, and I assume they will be running down to the White House trying to get some help from the President of the United States.

All I am suggesting is: If they got the majority, they do not come to the floor and say it is a sense of Congress, they do it. They set the authorization, they set the spending and they set the taxes.

So, if it makes them feel better in coming here with sense of Congresses, we are going to help them. We are going to support it, and we are going to say we all do not want Federal increases in spending, and we do not want increases in taxes and we will have prescription drugs even if we, as the minority, have to provide the leadership for our aged and for our sick people, and we will pay for it, Mr. Speaker, but we believe in legislating

and not just bringing something up on the suspension calendar.

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

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

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say that I welcome the support of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle in resisting any increase at all in Federal taxes whatsoever, and I hope that they will pass that message on to the President, who has not apparently come to the same conclusion. He obviously does have a considerable say in this budget process as well as the Republican majority does, and I would simply remind my colleagues that at a time when there is already record high level of government spending, record high level of Federal taxes and unprecedented surpluses it would be unconscionable to consider taking even more income away from the American people who earn it, and that is what this resolution is all about. It is very simple. It simply says:

There should be no increase in Federal taxes in order to fund additional government spending.

I urge my colleagues to send this clear message to the President: No tax increases, restrain spending.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, this Congressional Resolution is stupid. It is a truly a type of ''con''—designed to make a political statement without any real thought for the future.

Between now and 2030, the number of Americans on Medicare will double, from 39 million to about 80 million. How will we pay for the retirement and health of the Baby Boomers.

We can cut benefits in half as the number of enrollees doubles, thus holding spending fairly steady. But that would mean just transferring costs to people in their old age and when they are sick.

We can cut what we pay doctors and hospitals in half, but who would then provide quality care to seniors?

Or we could consider some tax increases.

Actually, to save Medicare will take a combination of the three options I have just listed.

To pass a Resolution like this to take one of those options off the table. Do we really want to do that? Instead of having an intelligent debate on how to provide for our citizens in the future, this Congress is just passing solgans—solgans which if taken literally would destroy our ability to meet the future needs of the Nation.

That's why I'm voting ''no'' today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KOLBE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 208.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

REAUTHORIZATION OF JUNIOR DUCK STAMP CONSERVATION AND DESIGN PROGRAM ACT OF 1994

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2496) to reauthorize the Junior Duck Stamp Conservation and Design Program Act of 1994, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2496

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

SECTION 1. REAUTHORIZATION OF JUNIOR DUCK STAMP CONSERVATION AND DESIGN PROGRAM ACT OF 1994.

Section 5 of the Junior Duck Stamp Conservation and Design Program Act of 1994 (16 U.S.C. 719c) is amended by striking ''for each of the fiscal years 1995 through 2000'' and inserting ''for each of the fiscal years 2001 through 2005''.

SEC. 2. EXPANSION OF PROGRAM TO INSULAR AREAS.

The Junior Duck Stamp Conservation and Design Program Act of 1994 is amended—

(1) in section 2(c) (16 U.S.C. 719(c)) by striking ''50 States'' each place it appears and inserting ''States'';

(2) by redesignating section 5 (16 U.S.C. 719c), as amended by section 1 of this Act, as section 6; and

(3) by inserting after section 4 the following:

''SEC. 5. DEFINITION OF STATE.

''For the purposes of this Act, the term 'State' includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, American Samoa, Guam, the Virgin Islands, and any other territory or possession of the United States.''.

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).

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. 2496.

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

There was no objection.

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

I am pleased that we are considering H.R. 2496, a bill introduced by our friend and colleague from Texas (Mr. ORTIZ). This measure will reauthorize the very popular Junior Duck Stamp Conservation and Design Program Act. This innovative program allows thousands of children from kindergarten to high school to participate in a nationwide wildlife art contest. It also provides students with a broad exposure to migratory water fowl and encourages activities to motivate students to take an active role in conserving these species.

In 1998, 42,337 students participated in this nationwide art contest. The first place national winner received a $2,500 scholarship, and his winning design appeared in the Federal Junior Duck Stamp for that year. This legislation does not make any major changes to the underlying law. It simply extends the authorization of appropriations, which is $250,000 for an additional 5 years. By doing so the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service will continue to license and market junior duck stamps and use stamp proceeds to support conservation, education and hopefully to expand the junior duck stamp design competition to hundreds of additional students.

At our full committee markup the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) offered an amendment to expand the coverage of this program to include American Samoa, the District of Columbia, Guam and the Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. I strongly support his amendment and hope that thousands of additional students from places like Tom's River to Pago Pago will have an opportunity to win this art contest in the future.

I urge an aye vote.

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 am extremely pleased that this legislation has now been brought before the floor for consideration, and I certainly want to commend my good friend, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON), the chairman of our Subcommittee on Fisheries and Oceans, for his leadership and for bringing this legislation for the Members' consideration.

Mr. Speaker, the Junior Duck Stamp Program has matured over a relatively short period of time into a valued conservation and education program that is enjoyed by thousands of schoolchildren nationwide. Merging conservation education with the arts has proven to be an effective strategy to increase knowledge and appreciation of migratory bird and their habitat within our schools. The Junior Duck Stamp Program has enhanced public awareness of the critical need to protect and preserve our Nation's diverse waterfowl and their essential wetland habitats. Moreover, this innovative program has helped promote a conservation ethic among America's young people which will be absolutely critical to ensure healthy wildlife and a healthy environment in the future.

Mr. Speaker, an added benefit to the Junior Duck Stamp Program has been that it has also extended appreciation for wildlife and wetlands far beyond

the classroom to the public at large through literally hundreds of annual art contests and exhibitions of art work at State fairs, wildlife refuges, museums and educational conferences. From the southern bayous of Louisiana to the prairie potholes of North Dakota to the tidal marshes along the Pacific Coast such public exposure has attracted and informed thousands of people annually who might otherwise remain unenlightened about the need to protect and conserve the wildlife and wetlands we enjoy today.

Mr. Speaker, I do commend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ORTIZ) for his introduction of this legislation. I especially appreciate his support and again the support of our chairman the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) in working with us to expand the eligibility of this program to now include the insular areas as well as the District of Columbia.

This is a noncontroversial bill that deserves the support of this House, and I do strongly urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

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

Before I yield back the balance of my time I would like to just make note that our good friend is back in the reader's chair. Mr. Paul Hayes is back with us today for the first time, and I know that all of my colleagues will want to join with me saying how pleased we are to have him back and that he has recovered from a little bump that he had awhile back, and we are delighted that he is with us today.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. ORTIZ), the sponsor and the author of this legislation.

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON), my good friend the chairman of the subcommittee, and the ranking member of the committee for their leadership, for being able to pass this in the subcommittee, bringing it to the full committee and onto the floor, and today I rise in support of H.R. 2496, the Junior Duck Stamp Conservation and Design Program Act. This is a noncontroversial program that increases the capacity for schools, States and other institutions to conduct wildlife conservation and education programs.

□ 1200

I had the honor of sponsoring the Junior Duck Stamp Conservation and Design Program Act back in the 103rd Congress when I was a subcommittee chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. The purpose of the program, then and now, is to provide elementary and secondary school students with educational opportunities in the conservation and management of migratory birds. The program supplements our schools by offering an educational component to conduct conservation programs.

As economic and population growth continues and increasingly affects our environment and natural resources, we have to work harder to find ways to preserve both our world and our standard of living.

Solutions to this challenge, like any challenge, begin with knowledge and understanding, and that begins with education. This is why so many people have embraced educational methods, such as the Junior Duck Stamp Program. This program teaches grade school students appreciation for environmental science and habitat conservation, while rewarding their hard work and effort with support for continuing education.

This is a great tool to help educate students who have not had the opportunity many of us have had to spend time with nature and to develop appreciation of our resources and their management.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to tell my friends that over 400,000 students are involved in this program; and, again, I would like to thank the chairman and the ranking member, and I ask my friends to support this bill.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. 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 take one moment to congratulate the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ORTIZ) for his great effort in bringing this bill to the floor and for making it possible for us to reauthorize this program. It is certainly, as I said before, a very worthwhile program, and I congratulate the gentleman from Texas for his forethought in bringing it to us.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KOLBE). 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. 2496, 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.

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.

RONGELAP RESETTLEMENT ACT OF 1999

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2970) to prescribe certain terms for the resettlement of the people of Rongelap Atoll due to conditions created at Rongelap during United States administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2970

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 ''Rongelap Resettlement Act of 1999''.

SEC. 2. RONGELAP RESETTLEMENT AGREEMENT.

The ''Agreement Regarding United States Assistance in the Resettlement of Rongelap Concluded Between the United States Department of the Interior and Rongelap Atoll Local Government'', accepted by the Secretary of the Interior on behalf of the President on September 19, 1996, as amended, shall continue in effect: *Provided*, That the authority to make disbursements pursuant to section 3 of such Agreement is extended for a period of 10 years after the existing authority terminates and that all such disbursements are—

(1) subject to the percentum limitation set forth in the Agreement;

(2) used by the Rongelap Atoll local government to manage and support community reunification, recovery, and mobilization for resettlement, and other activities associated with and in support of resettlement for the dislocated populations at Majuro, Ebeye, Mejatto, and elsewhere in the Marshall Islands; and

(3) subject to the disapproval of the Secretary based upon a determination that a particular use of funds does not effectively contribute to resettlement or address conditions of dislocation.

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

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

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. 2970.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, Rongelap Atoll is one of four atolls which were contaminated by high-level radiation from nuclear testing during the time the islands were administered as a trust territory by the United States. The people of Rongelap were first forced to leave their home in 1954. Since that time, they have returned to reside in Rongelap based on incorrect assurances that the islands were safe.

Now, after independent, scientific studies confirmed by the Department of Energy and the National Academy of Science, a federally funded resettlement plan is being implemented with the full involvement and consent of the Rongelap community. In 1996, Congress provided trust funds for the implementation of this plan for the resettlement

of the 2,900 Rongelapese living in various parts of the Marshall Islands. Congress also required the administration to enter into an agreement with the Rongelap community to manage the resettlement process.

H.R. 2970, Mr. Speaker, approves this resettlement agreement, allows the distribution of funds already provided by Congress for this purpose and provides that the Secretary of Interior may disapprove expenditures that do not effectively advance resettlement.

This legislation, introduced by the gentleman from Alaska (Chairman YOUNG) and the ranking Democrat of the Committee on Resources, the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER), creates no cost to the Federal Government and is supported by the Rongelap community and the Marshall Islands. I urge all Members to support the 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, today I rise to support the passage of H.R. 2970, which provides for the continuance of the 1996 Rongelap Resettlement Agreement between the Department of Interior, the Rongelap Atoll local government and the Republic of the Marshall Islands. Without this legislation, the resettlement activities being carried out by Rongelap's local government would be jeopardized and the eventual return of the Rongelap people back to their Atoll could be delayed well into the next millennium.

As you may know, Rongelap, as has been pointed out by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON), is one of four atolls of the Marshall Islands which were contaminated due to nuclear testing during the time the islands were administered as part of the Trust Territory of the Pacific islands and as a U.N. trusteeship under the control of the United States.

In the post-World War II era, islands that were identified as nuclear test sites by the U.S. were evacuated and their people displaced from their homelands which they had known for centuries. The resulting contamination of their land and surrounding coral reef ecosystems have made it very difficult for their safe return to their islands.

In 1996 Congress authorized the implementation of a plan for the resettlement of the people of Rongelap, which now comprises a population of some 2,900 persons. Congress expressly required the President to establish an agreement to govern the resettlement process as intended by Public Law 104–134. In fulfilling that requirement, the Secretary of the Department of Interior entered into an agreement with the Rongelap Atoll local government for a resettlement program that includes radiological rehabilitation and reconstruction of the islands, as well as a community recovery and reunification program.

A trust fund established by Public Law 102–154 ensures that the local government is able to carry out the resettlement program. The principle of the trust fund requires that 50 percent of the annual income be dedicated to island rehabilitation. An amount not to exceed 50 percent of the income is made available to Rongelap's local government to manage and administer the resettlement program through their local government. This enables the government to carry out community recovery programs and address the needs of the Rongelap people through government services and support efforts.

This arrangement is set to expire next year unless Congress acts now to extend that authority. If the current arrangement is permitted to terminate, a resettlement administering authority that would essentially duplicate the local government would have to be established and funded in order to organize and mobilize the community for resettlement. This process could take many years to complete and would only serve to delay the return of the Rongelap people, which is our objective and which is their objective, and a legitimate one at that.

The success of the Rongelap local government, however, to carry out resettlement activities, has far exceeded the agreement and expectations of both the Congress and the Department of Interior. In recognition of their success and progress, it would be imprudent to abort the current approach.

This legislation is clearly bipartisan, supported by the Rongelap Atoll local government, cosponsored by the Committee on Resources chairman, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), and the committee's ranking member, the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER). I congratulate both of them for acting swiftly to ensure that the forward progress of the Rongelap government is continued.

I also recognize and congratulate my fellow island brothers. I represent an area that is closest to the Marshall Islands of all the districts represented in the House. I congratulate my fellow islands brothers and sisters for their effective management of the resettlement trust fund and their success in planning and discharging sound public policies to resettle their homelands.

I encourage my colleagues to support the passage of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a statement from His Excellency, Banny deBrum, the ambassador of the Marshall Islands to the United States.

EMBASSY OF THE REPUBLIC OF THE MARSHALL ISLANDS

To: Hon. Robert Underwood.
From: RMI Embassy.
Subject: House Committee Report.
Date: October 26, 1999.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN UNDERWOOD: The RMI agrees with the findings and recommendation set forth in House Report 106–404, adopted unanimously by the Resources Committee on October 20, 1999. As documented in Appendix B of the Committee's report, the Republic of the Marshall Islands (RMI) strongly supports the request of the Rongelap Atoll Local Government (RALGOV) for ratification by Congress of the resettlement program established by agreement between the Department of the Interior (DOI, RMI and Rongelap. The resettlement program fulfills the policy goals set forth by Congress in Section 118(d) of P.L. 104–134, and since all parties view the policy and the programs a success, Rongelap and the RMI do not want to leave continuation of the program to chance as the years pass, and as priorities at DOI change for reasons that have nothing to do with Rongelap or the resettlement program.

H.R. 2970 carries out the express intention of Congress as stated in P.L. 102–154 (105 Stat. 1009) that the Rongelap Resettlement Trust Fund be used by the local government to carry out a resettlement program based on a self-determination process for the community. Congress required Rongelap to enter into an agreement with the Executive Branch, and a 1996 agreement between DOI and Rongelap, with approval of the RMI, satisfies that requirement.

Under the 1996 DOI agreement, the Rongelapese are empowered to be in control of their own resettlement. This means that the scientist can investigate and recommend ways to mitigate radiological contamination, engineers and construction contractors can carry out radiological rehabilitation projects, and government officials can exercise oversight, but the decisions about resettlement are made by the people.

This is a significant improvement over past resettlement program in which the islanders were relocated again and again without meaningful participation in planning or decision-making. DOI is to be commended for agreeing to a program that gives the Rongelapese the final word on what measures to advance resettlement will be taken. This makes the people who must decide whether to go back to Rongelap or resettle elsewhere the ability to take control of their own destiny after decades of being controlled by federal officials with an agenda having little to do with the future well-being of the community.

H.R. 2970 preserves the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to disapprove of any expenditure which is determined not to be an effective use of funds to address the conditions of dislocation or to advance resettlement. This bill also preserves limits on the use of annual earnings of the resettlement trust fund by the local government, while recognizing the importance of local government operations and resettlement programs to the success of the overall effort. Thus, this bill confirms the policy DOI has adopted under Section 118(d) of P.L. 104–134, and extends the current program for 10 years instead of allowing it to expire in 2000.

If the resettlement program were not ahead of schedule, if the local government were not operating efficiently and effectively to achieve resettlement within the framework of law and policy DOI required under the resettlement agreement it approved in 1996, then we might want to modify or change the ground rules for the program. However, since the Rongelapese have met every requirement imposed by DOI and exceeded DOI's expectations for implementation of the resettlement program, it would be unwise and unfair to change the policy, the program or the ground rules now.

Given the unpredictability of U.S. actions and policies that resulted in exposure of the

Rongelapese to near lethal high level radiation during the U.S. nuclear testing program, given the fact that some of their people were used for epidemiological research and testing not related to medical treatment and without the knowledge or consent of the test subjects, given the fact that they were returned to their island in 1957 and told by the AEC that it was safe, and given the determination by the National Academy of Sciences in 1993 that they should not inhabit that island until it has been made safe through a scientifically monitored program of radiological rehabilitation, I think 10 years of predictability in U.S. policy regarding their radiological clean up of their islands and resettlement of the community if and when their homeland is safe is not too much to ask. DOI has a successful program, and this bill will make sure it continues.

Thank you for your continued support and allow this important opportunity to share the RMI Government's position on H.R. 2970.

Sincerely,

BANNY DEBRUM,
Ambassador.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from America 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 for yielding me such time to express my support for this legislation. I also want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from New Jersey (Chairman SAXTON) for his leadership in managing this bill before the Members of the chamber.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Rongelap Atoll, like those from Bikini Atoll in the Marshall Islands, have been suffering for decades because of the nuclear testing activities of the United States Government earlier.

Through the efforts of this committee, Congress passed legislation in 1996 which is assisting the people of Rongelap in establishing a resettlement plan. From the trust fund established in 1992, 50 percent of the annual income is dedicated to island rehabilitation, reconstruction and resettlement programs. The other half of the trust income is available to continue the resettlement program through the local government. This is working well, and I certainly hope that my colleagues will support the bill.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Rongelap Atoll were victims of the most powerful nuclear explosion ever known to man at that time, the first hydrogen bomb explosion in the Marshall Islands in the Pacific in 1954, a 15 megaton explosion that was approximately 1,000 times more powerful, 1,000 times more power than the atom bombs we dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki during World War II.

The people of Rongelap did not even know what had happened, other than the fact that they first observed a terrifying brilliant flash of light over 100 miles away, then the shifting winds that brought them a powder-like substance that they innocently washed themselves with, only to result in severe burns and rashes. The color of the ocean turned yellow. Severe vomiting and illnesses of all sorts soon followed; and as a result of this wrong our government had committed against the people of Rongelap, the health of these people has never been the same.

Mr. Speaker, the records indicate our government did commit a grave wrong against the people of Rongelap. The U.S. officials responsible for this hydrogen bomb explosion knew, knew, that the winds had shifted at least 3 to 4 hours before the nuclear hydrogen explosion would take place.

Mr. Speaker, our military officials knew that with the shifting winds, the nuclear fallout would be going directly towards the island of Rongelap and all the men, women, and children living in Rongelap were subjected to radioactive contamination. So now our government is making an effort to at least compensate in some fashion the residents of Rongelap Atoll.

Mr. Speaker, no amount of money will ever restore these people back to normal health, but I do submit that I want to thank sincerely the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of the Committee on Resources, and the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER), the ranking member, and thank again the gentleman from New Jersey (Chairman SAXTON) for their leadership and efforts which are bringing this legislation forward to, at least with some sense of conscience, make available some kind of assistance to these people that were subjected to this serious nuclear explosion that our government made in 1954.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

Mr. SAXTON. 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 New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2970.

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.

PERKINS COUNTY RURAL WATER SYSTEM ACT OF 1999

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 970) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide assistance to the Perkins County Rural Water System, Inc., for the construction of water supply facilities in Perkins County, South Dakota, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 970

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 ''Perkins County Rural Water System Act of 1999''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) in 1977, the North Dakota State Legislature authorized and directed the State Water Commission to conduct the Southwest Area Water Supply Study, which included water service to a portion of Perkins County, South Dakota;

(2) amendments made by the Garrison Diversion Unit Reformulation Act of 1986 (Public Law 101–294) authorized the Southwest Pipeline project as an eligible project for Federal cost share participation; and

(3) the Perkins County Rural Water System has continued to be recognized by the State of North Dakota, the Southwest Water Authority, the North Dakota Water Commission, the Department of the Interior, and Congress as a component of the Southwest Pipeline Project.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) CORPORATION.—The term ''Corporation'' means the Perkins County Rural Water System, Inc., a nonprofit corporation established and operated under the laws of the State of South Dakota substantially in accordance with the feasibility study.

(2) FEASIBILITY STUDY.—The term ''feasibility study'' means the study entitled ''Feasibility Study for Rural Water System for Perkins County Rural Water System, Inc.'', as amended in March 1995.

(3) PROJECT CONSTRUCTION BUDGET.—The term ''project construction budget'' means the description of the total amount of funds that are needed for the construction of the water supply system, as described in the feasibility study.

(4) PUMPING AND INCIDENTAL OPERATIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—The term ''pumping and incidental operational requirements'' means all power requirements that are incidental to the operation of the water supply system by the Corporation.

(5) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation.

(6) WATER SUPPLY SYSTEM.—The term ''water supply system'' means intake facilities, pumping stations, water treatment facilities, cooling facilities, reservoirs, and pipelines operated by the Perkins County Rural Water System, Inc., to the point of delivery of water to each entity that distributes water at retail to individual users.

SEC. 4. FEDERAL ASSISTANCE FOR WATER SUPPLY SYSTEM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall make grants to the Corporation for the Federal share of the costs of—

(1) the planning and construction of the water supply system; and

(2) repairs to existing public water distribution systems to ensure conservation of the resources and to make the systems functional under the new water supply system.

(b) LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF CONSTRUCTION FUNDS.—The Secretary shall not obligate funds for the construction of the water supply system until—

(1) the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) are met with respect to the water supply system; and

(2) a final engineering report and a plan for a water conservation program have been prepared and submitted to Congress for a period of not less than 90 days before the commencement of construction of the system.

SEC. 5. MITIGATION OF FISH AND WILDLIFE LOSSES.

Mitigation of fish and wildlife losses incurred as a result of the construction and operation of the water supply system shall be on an acre-for-acre basis, based on ecological equivalency, concurrent with project construction, as provided in the feasibility study.

SEC. 6. USE OF PICK-SLOAN POWER.

For operation during the period beginning May 1 and ending October 31 of each year, portions of the water supply system constructed

with assistance under this Act shall be eligible to utilize power from the Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Program established by section 9 of the Act of December 22, 1944 (Chapter 665; 58 Stat. 887), popularly known as the Flood Control Act of 1944.

SEC. 7. FEDERAL SHARE.

The Federal share under section 4 shall be 75 percent of—

(1) the amount allocated in the total project construction budget for the planning and construction of the water supply system under section 4; and

(2) such sums as are necessary to defray increases in development costs reflected in appropriate engineering cost indices after March 1, 1995.

SEC. 8. NON-FEDERAL SHARE.

The non-Federal share under section 4 shall be 25 percent of—

(1) the amount allocated in the total project construction budget for the planning and construction of the water supply system under section 4; and

(2) such sums as are necessary to defray increases in development costs reflected in appropriate engineering cost indices after March 1, 1995.

SEC. 9. CONSTRUCTION OVERSIGHT.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—At the request of the Corporation, the Secretary may provide to the Corporation assistance in overseeing matters relating to construction of the water supply system.

(b) PROJECT OVERSIGHT ADMINISTRATION.—The amount of funds used by the Secretary for planning and construction of the water supply system may not exceed an amount equal to 3 percent of the amount provided in the total project construction budget for the portion of the project to be constructed in Perkins County, South Dakota.

SEC. 10. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary—

(1) $15,000,000 for the planning and construction of the water supply system under section 4; and

(2) such sums as are necessary to defray increases in development costs reflected in appropriate engineering cost indices after March 1, 1995.

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

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

□ 1215

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

Mr. Speaker, Perkins County is located in northwest South Dakota on the border with North Dakota. Like many areas in the high plains, there are insufficient water supplies, and much of what is available does not meet minimum health and safety standards.

In the early 1930s, South Dakota and Perkins County funded a water supply feasibility study which was completed in 1994. The study concluded that obtaining water from the Southwest Water Authority, a nearby water system located in North Dakota, was the most feasible option, and that the necessary water supply system would cost approximately $20 million. This bill provides for a 75/25 Federal-local cost share, with a total authorization of $15 million for the water supply project costs.

A similar bill passed the House and Senate last year, but due to time constraints was never sent to the President for signature. This bill simplifies the Pick-Sloan power provision of the previous bill, and makes power available to the project at the firm power rate schedule of the Pick-Sloan Eastern Division, within the Western Power Administration, rather than at pumping power rates. This is more equitable to other power users, and consistent with other municipal and industrial water projects.

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, I rise in support of H.R. 970. Similar legislation was passed by both the House and Senate in the 105th Congress.

The committee has received extensive testimony regarding the poor quality of domestic water supplies in this area. Farmsteads in this part of South Dakota are often miles apart, and residents must depend on wells that produce water with high levels of sodium.

Engineering studies have shown that centralized treatment facilities using groundwater would not be cost-effective. It makes much more sense to assist Perkins County residents by allowing them to hook up to the Southwest Pipeline project, a rural water supply now under construction just over the border in North Dakota.

I congratulate the Chair and the ranking member, and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 970.

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

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE), the author of this legislation.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I stand to speak in favor of H.R. 970, the Perkins County Rural Water System Act of 1999.

Mr. Speaker, it has been a long and winding road that this important project has taken to get to this point today. I am extremely pleased that we are nearing the point of enactment.

I would like to thank the gentleman from California, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Water and Power, and the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of the full Committee on Resources, as well as the ranking members, the gentlemen from California, Mr. MILLER and Mr. DOOLEY, for their assistance and cooperation in helping advance this bill. Their leadership and cooperation throughout this process have been very instrumental and will continue to be instrumental as we work with the other body to see that this bill becomes law.

The reason I say H.R. 970 has been on a legislative journey of sorts is because this body in the last session of Congress passed a measure similar to H.R. 970, and in the waning days of the 105th Congress, a bill very similar to the one before us today met the approval of the full House.

However, when considered by the other body, the bill was amended and differences between the two bodies could not be settled. As a result, I reintroduced this legislation, and I hope the House will see fit to approve it today.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would provide the authorization that is necessary for the Perkins County rural water system to qualify for Federal assistance for construction. When completed, the system will provide water to over 3,500 people in an area covering 2,866 square miles.

In order to give my colleagues in the House some perspective of that area, that area is larger than either the State of Delaware or Rhode Island. But unlike either of these two States, this area of South Dakota lacks this very important lifeline resource of water.

Not unlike some other areas of South Dakota, Perkins County frequently experiences problems in terms of quality and quantity of water. The present water supply all too frequently fails to meet Environmental Protection Agency standards for total dissolved solids and sulfates. In addition, the sodium and fluoride levels have surpassed acceptable limits. While water clearly is a factor in the quality of life, it is also a factor of good health.

The people of Perkins County have waited for some time to address these concerns. In fact, the project's origins date back to 1982, when sponsors of the Southwest Pipeline project in North Dakota contacted a group of farmers and ranchers in Perkins County to gauge their interest in receiving water from a better, healthier source. While interest was there, the Southwest Pipeline project did not develop to the point that it could have been included in engineering design until 1992.

However, the Southwest Pipeline authorization does not explicitly authorize construction of the Perkins County rural water system. Despite this strong historical connection, there still was not the legal authority necessary for the system, which is why I am on the floor of the House today.

The legislation before us now would help address a vital need to any and every community: that is, water suitable for human consumption. Many areas of this Nation are blessed with vast quantities of quality drinking water. It is a resource that helps ensure growth and prosperity. Other areas, like Perkins County, South Dakota, however, suffer from lack of access to a dependable water supply.

Though this may be a sparsely populated area of this Nation, the communities in Perkins County such as Bison, Lemmon, and Prairie City, all are important to supporting the social fabric of the magnificent rangeland that surrounds. Likewise, there is potential for growth, but only if the basic resources are in place.

H.R. 970 would help this region continue to thrive into the next century. The bill also will allow us to move past simply examining the symptoms of poor drinking water and move forward with the cure to the deficiencies in the current water supply.

On behalf of the residents of Perkins County, South Dakota, I ask all the Members on both sides of the aisle to support this legislation today. Again, I thank the leadership of this committee for moving this bill forward.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time. I urge an aye vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONILLA). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 970, 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.

NATIONAL GEOLOGIC MAPPING REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1999

Mrs. CUBIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1528) to reauthorize and amend the National Geologic Mapping Act of 1992.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1528

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 ''National Geologic Mapping Reauthorization Act of 1999''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Section 2(a) of the National Geologic Mapping Act of 1992 (43 U.S.C. 31a(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (7), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (8) as paragraph (10);

(3) by inserting after paragraph (7) the following:

''(8) geologic map information is required for the sustainable and balanced development of natural resources of all types, including energy, minerals, land, water, and biological resources;

''(9) advances in digital technology and geographical information system science have made geologic map databases increasingly important as decision support tools for land and resource management; and''; and

(4) in paragraph (10) (as redesignated by paragraph (2)), by inserting ''of surficial and bedrock deposits'' after ''geologic mapping''.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

Section 3 of the National Geologic Mapping Act of 1992 (43 U.S.C. 31b) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (4), (5), (6), and (7) as paragraphs (6), (7), (8), and (10), respectively;

(2) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

''(4) EDUCATION COMPONENT.—The term 'education component' means the education component of the geologic mapping program described in section 6(d)(3).

''(5) FEDERAL COMPONENT.—The term 'Federal component' means the Federal component of the geologic mapping program described in section 6(d)(1).''; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (8) (as redesignated by paragraph (1)) the following:

''(9) STATE COMPONENT.—The term 'State component' means the State component of the geologic mapping program described in section 6(d)(2).''.

SEC. 4. GEOLOGIC MAPPING PROGRAM.

Section 4 of the National Geologic Mapping Act of 1992 (43 U.S.C. 31c) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1)—

(A) in the first sentence, by striking ''priorities'' and inserting ''national priorities and standards for'';

(B) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking ''develop a geologic mapping program implementation plan'' and inserting ''develop a 5-year strategic plan for the geologic mapping program''; and

(ii) by striking ''within 300 days after the date of enactment of the National Geologic Mapping Reauthorization Act of 1997'' and inserting ''not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the National Geologic Mapping Reauthorization Act of 1999'';

(C) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''within 90 days after the date of enactment of the National Geologic Mapping Reauthorization Act of 1997'' and inserting ''not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the National Geologic Mapping Reauthorization Act of 1999''; and

(D) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking ''within 210 days after the date of enactment of the National Geologic Mapping Reauthorization Act of 1997'' and inserting ''not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of the National Geologic Mapping Reauthorization Act of 1999, and biennially thereafter'';

(ii) in clause (i), by striking ''will coordinate'' and inserting ''are coordinating'';

(iii) in clause (ii), by striking ''will establish'' and inserting ''establish''; and

(iv) in clause (iii), by striking ''will lead to'' and inserting ''affect''; and

(2) by striking subsection (d) and inserting the following:

''(d) PROGRAM COMPONENTS.—

''(1) FEDERAL COMPONENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The geologic mapping program shall include a Federal geologic mapping component, the objective of which shall be to determine the geologic framework of areas determined to be vital to the economic, social, environmental, or scientific welfare of the United States.

''(B) MAPPING PRIORITIES.—For the Federal component, mapping priorities—

''(i) shall be described in the 5-year plan under section 6; and

''(ii) shall be based on—

''(I) national requirements for geologic map information in areas of multiple-issue need or areas of compelling single-issue need; and

''(II) national requirements for geologic map information in areas where mapping is required to solve critical earth science problems.

''(C) INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Federal component shall include interdisciplinary studies that add value to geologic mapping.

''(ii) REPRESENTATIVE CATEGORIES.—Interdisciplinary studies under clause (i) may include—

''(I) establishment of a national geologic map database under section 7;

''(II) studies that lead to the implementation of cost-effective digital methods for the acquisition, compilation, analysis, cartographic production, and dissemination of geologic map information;

''(III) paleontologic, geochrono-logic, and isotopic investigations that provide information critical to understanding the age and history of geologic map units;

''(IV) geophysical investigations that assist in delineating and mapping the physical characteristics and 3-dimensional distribution of geologic materials and geologic structures; and

''(V) geochemical investigations and analytical operations that characterize the composition of geologic map units.

''(iii) USE OF RESULTS.—The results of investigations under clause (ii) shall be contributed to national databases.

''(2) STATE COMPONENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The geologic mapping program shall include a State geologic mapping component, the objective of which shall be to establish the geologic framework of areas determined to be vital to the economic, social, environmental, or scientific welfare of individual States.

''(B) MAPPING PRIORITIES.—For the State component, mapping priorities—

''(i) shall be determined by State panels representing a broad range of users of geologic maps; and

''(ii) shall be based on—

''(I) State requirements for geologic map information in areas of multiple-issue need or areas of compelling single-issue need; and

''(II) State requirements for geologic map information in areas where mapping is required to solve critical earth science problems.

''(C) INTEGRATION OF FEDERAL AND STATE PRIORITIES.—A national panel including representatives of the Survey shall integrate the State mapping priorities under this paragraph with the Federal mapping priorities under paragraph (1).

''(D) USE OF FUNDS.—The Survey and recipients of grants under the State component shall not use more than 15.25 percent of the Federal funds made available under the State component for any fiscal year to pay indirect, servicing, or program management charges.

''(E) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of activities under the State component for any fiscal year shall not exceed 50 percent.

''(3) EDUCATION COMPONENT.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The geologic mapping program shall include a geologic mapping education component for the training of geologic mappers, the objectives of which shall be—

''(i) to provide for broad education in geologic mapping and field analysis through support of field studies; and

''(ii) to develop academic programs that teach students of earth science the fundamental principles of geologic mapping and field analysis.

''(B) INVESTIGATIONS.—The education component may include the conduct of investigations, which—

''(i) shall be integrated with the Federal component and the State component; and

''(ii) shall respond to mapping priorities identified for the Federal component and the State component.

''(C) USE OF FUNDS.—The Survey and recipients of grants under the education component shall not use more than 15.25 percent of the Federal funds made available under

the education component for any fiscal year to pay indirect, servicing, or program management charges.

''(D) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of the cost of activities under the education component for any fiscal year shall not exceed 50 percent.''.

SEC. 5. ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

Section 5 of the National Geologic Mapping Act of 1992 (43 U.S.C. 31d) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(3), by striking ''90 days after the date of enactment of the National Geologic Mapping Reauthorization Act of 1997'' and inserting ''1 year after the date of enactment of the National Geologic Mapping Reauthorization Act of 1999''; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''critique the draft implementation plan'' and inserting ''update the 5-year plan''; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking ''this Act'' and inserting ''sections 4 through 7''.

SEC. 6. GEOLOGIC MAPPING PROGRAM 5-YEAR PLAN.

The National Geologic Mapping Act of 1992 is amended by striking section 6 (43 U.S.C. 31e) and inserting the following:

''SEC. 6. GEOLOGIC MAPPING PROGRAM 5-YEAR PLAN.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting through the Director, shall, with the advice and review of the advisory committee, prepare a 5-year plan for the geologic mapping program.

''(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The 5-year plan shall identify—

''(1) overall priorities for the geologic mapping program; and

''(2) implementation of the overall management structure and operation of the geologic mapping program, including—

''(A) the role of the Survey in the capacity of overall management lead, including the responsibility for developing the national geologic mapping program that meets Federal needs while fostering State needs;

''(B) the responsibilities of the State geological surveys, with emphasis on mechanisms that incorporate the needs, missions, capabilities, and requirements of the State geological surveys, into the nationwide geologic mapping program;

''(C) mechanisms for identifying short- and long-term priorities for each component of the geologic mapping program, including—

''(i) for the Federal component, a priority-setting mechanism that responds to—

''(I) Federal mission requirements for geologic map information;

''(II) critical scientific problems that require geologic maps for their resolution; and

''(III) shared Federal and State needs for geologic maps, in which joint Federal-State geologic mapping projects are in the national interest;

''(ii) for the State component, a priority-setting mechanism that responds to—

''(I) specific intrastate needs for geologic map information; and

''(II) interstate needs shared by adjacent States that have common requirements; and

''(iii) for the education component, a priority-setting mechanism that responds to requirements for geologic map information that are dictated by Federal and State mission requirements;

''(D) a mechanism for adopting scientific and technical mapping standards for preparing and publishing general- and special-purpose geologic maps to—

''(i) ensure uniformity of cartographic and scientific conventions; and

''(ii) provide a basis for assessing the comparability and quality of map products; and

''(E) a mechanism for monitoring the inventory of published and current mapping investigations nationwide to facilitate planning and information exchange and to avoid redundancy.''.

SEC. 7. NATIONAL GEOLOGIC MAP DATABASE.

Section 7 of the National Geologic Mapping Act of 1992 (43 U.S.C. 31f) is amended by striking the section heading and all that follows through subsection (a) and inserting the following:

''SEC. 7. NATIONAL GEOLOGIC MAP DATABASE.

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Survey shall establish a national geologic map database.

''(2) FUNCTION.—The database shall serve as a national catalog and archive, distributed through links to Federal and State geologic map holdings, that includes—

''(A) all maps developed under the Federal component and the education component;

''(B) the databases developed in connection with investigations under subclauses (III), (IV), and (V) of section 4(d)(1)(C)(ii); and

''(C) other maps and data that the Survey and the Association consider appropriate.''.

SEC. 8. BIENNIAL REPORT.

The National Geologic Mapping Act of 1992 is amended by striking section 8 (43 U.S.C. 31g) and inserting the following:

''SEC. 8. BIENNIAL REPORT.

''Not later 3 years after the date of enactment of the National Geologic Mapping Reauthorization Act of 1999 and biennially thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report that—

''(1) describes the status of the national geologic mapping program;

''(2) describes and evaluates the progress achieved during the preceding 2 years in developing the national geologic map database; and

''(3) includes any recommendations that the Secretary may have for legislative or other action to achieve the purposes of sections 4 through 7.''.

SEC. 9. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

The National Geologic Mapping Act of 1992 is amended by striking section 9 (43 U.S.C. 31h) and inserting the following:

''SEC. 9. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act—

''(1) $28,000,000 for fiscal year 1999;

''(2) $30,000,000 for fiscal year 2000;

''(3) $37,000,000 for fiscal year 2001;

''(4) $43,000,000 for fiscal year 2002;

''(5) $50,000,000 for fiscal year 2003;

''(6) $57,000,000 for fiscal year 2004; and

''(7) $64,000,000 for fiscal year 2005.

''(b) ALLOCATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Of any amounts appropriated for any fiscal year in excess of the amount appropriated for fiscal year 2000—

''(1) 48 percent shall be available for the State component; and

''(2) 2 percent shall be available for the education component.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. CUBIN) and the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. CUBIN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. CUBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1528.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1528, a bill to reauthorize and amend the National Geologic Mapping Act of 1992. That law established a cooperative program between the United States Geologic Survey, the various State geologic surveys, and academia to prioritize geologic mapping needs for the Nation, and to ensure that a small cadre of trained mappers continues to flow from our universities.

This bill represents the second authorization, the second reauthorization of the initial program, which was enacted by the 102nd Congress.

Mr. Speaker, just in the last few months we have witnessed earthquakes in Turkey, Greece, and Taiwan, with devastating loss of life and quality of life. The planet we live on is a dynamic one. Having modern geologic maps of our country is a foundation of good Earth science application to natural hazards identification and abatement, as well as for broad planning efforts for resources utilization. Such mapping is also key to delineation and protection of sources of safe drinking water and sound land use planning.

The National Geologic Mapping Act has fostered a spirit of cooperation between the Federal Government's Earth scientists and those employed by the 50 States, as well as academia. No one agency or group has all the answers. Through the workings of the Cooperative Geologic Mapping Program, priorities based on real needs are advanced, and funding is made available to the States on a 50/50 matching basis from a small portion of the annual USGS appropriation.

Since the program was initiated, the States have demonstrated a greater ability to come up with the matching funds in their own State legislatures, a sign that the program is indeed successful.

Of course, we realize that geologic mapping will not stop earthquakes, landslides, and volcanic eruptions from happening, but it does provide new insights into the likelihood of their occurrence, so that the impacts to society may be ameliorated.

I would like to thank our colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL), a cosponsor of this bill and a sponsor of the original act in 1992, for joining with me in support of this new and improved act, and likewise for our colleague, the gentleman from the Second District of Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS), who is a geologist himself and a cosponsor of H.R. 1528.

Lastly, I would like to acknowledge the efforts of Dr. David Wunsch, who is a congressional science fellow who worked with the Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources during the last year. David has returned to the Kentucky Geologic Survey to do important research in the hydrogeology of coal-bearing terrains, but he was instrumental in seeing this bill come this far.

H.R. 1528 has the full support of the administration, and I urge its passage.

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 bill, the National Geologic Mapping Reauthorization Act of 1991, has the full support of the Committee on Resources. Democrats and Republicans alike have voted to favorably report this bill to the House, and the Clinton administration has also endorsed the bill.

We need geologic mapping in our society for many worthwhile purposes, including emergency preparedness, environmental protection, land use planning, and resource extraction.

Over the years, the need for geologic maps has grown steadily, but map production has not kept up. The Earth provides the physical foundation for our society. We live upon it and we use its resources. Therefore, we need to work toward a better understanding of the Earth's resources and potential dangers.

Geologic maps are one effective way to convey the Earth science foundation needed for better understanding and decision-making by all of us, Federal agencies, State, territorial, and local governments, private industry, and the general public alike.

The National Geologic Mapping Act of 1992, which this bill would extend, which was first authored by our colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) authorized a national program of geologic mapping to be accomplished through partnership with State geological surveys, academia, the private sector, and the USGS.

This partnership is essential if we are to developing the extensive amount of material needed for informed decision-making. Accordingly, it is my pleasure to support adoption of the bill. I urge all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in voting on H.R. 1528.

I would like to acknowledge the leadership of the subcommittee chairwoman, the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. CUBIN).

Mrs. CUBIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes, to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS).

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to begin by thanking the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. CUBIN) for her gracious yielding of time for me to speak, and her diligent work and commitment on this bill, as well as that of the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD), and for seeing to it that this bill reaches the House floor.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation becomes very important when we consider and address issues of safety in the environment. H.R. 1528 reauthorizes the geologic mapping Act of 1992, which was a legislative response to identified deficiencies in the National Academy of Sciences with their lack of basic geologic knowledge and structures in this country.

Being a geologist myself, I can personally attest to the great importance of geologic mapping and its resultant impact on many aspects of our society. Geologic maps benefit safety and planning regulations, telling us where natural disasters may occur. For example, they identify and map earthquake fault lines and water flow patterns which are important to identifying disaster potentials when building infrastructure for our communities and transportation routes.

□ 1230

Without a detailed geologic map of the United States, we will be forced to address issues such as safe drinking water and environmental systems, understanding in the same dangerous fashion that someone might drive a car at night without headlights.

It is imperative for us to explore and understand what resources we have in this country and how best to use them before we carelessly make unscientific decisions without the full knowledge of our underlying environment.

I also believe that detailed geologic maps provide the basic information for solving a broad range of regional and State problems. These include the protection of drinking water, the identification and mitigation of natural hazards such as earthquakes and volcanic eruptions, as well as many other land-use planning requirements.

This legislation will assist State and local communities with land and water decisions, aid farmers and ranchers with crop decisions, advance habitat protection for endangered species, and aid the mining industry with site determination for mineral resources.

Currently, Mr. Speaker, only about 20 percent or one-fifth of the Nation is adequately mapped. Congress, however, has finally begun to understand the importance and need of geologic mapping, and it is time that we use our dollars wisely to bring about the best science for this country.

Geologic maps are the primary database for virtually all applied and basic earth science investigations. It is because of this continued need for core science that I urge all Members to support H.R. 1528. I believe that passage of this bill is in the best interest of science and the Nation as well.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. CUBIN) for her leadership in bringing this important legislation before us today. I urge all my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONILLA). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. CUBIN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1528.

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.

GAS HYDRATE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1999

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1753) to promote the research, identification, assessment, exploration, and development of methane hydrate resources and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1753

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 ''Gas Hydrate Research and Development Act of 1999''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) CONTRACT.—The term ''contract'' means a procurement contract within the meaning of section 6303 of title 31, United States Code.

(2) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT.—The term ''cooperative agreement'' means a cooperative agreement within the meaning of section 6305 of title 31, United States Code.

(3) DIRECTOR.—The term ''Director'' means the Director of the National Science Foundation.

(4) GRANT.—The term ''grant'' means a grant awarded under a grant agreement, within the meaning of section 6304 of title 31, United States Code.

(5) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term ''institution of higher education'' means an institution of higher education, within the meaning of section 1201(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1141(a)).

(6) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Energy, acting through the Assistant Secretary for Fossil Energy.

(7) SECRETARY OF COMMERCE.—The term ''Secretary of Commerce'' means the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

(8) SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.—The term ''Secretary of Defense'' means the Secretary of Defense, acting through the Secretary of the Navy.

(9) SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.—The term ''Secretary of the Interior'' means the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the United States Geological Survey and the Director of the Minerals Management Service.

SEC. 3. GAS HYDRATE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) COMMENCEMENT OF PROGRAM.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Director, shall commence a program of gas hydrate research and development.

(2) DESIGNATIONS.—The Secretary, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Interior, and the

Director shall designate individuals to carry out this section.

(3) MEETINGS.—The individuals designated under paragraph (2) shall meet not later than 120 days after the date on which all such individuals are designated and not less frequently than every 120 days thereafter to—

(A) review the progress of the program under paragraph (1); and

(B) make recommendations on future activities to occur subsequent to the meeting.

(b) GRANTS, CONTRACTS, COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS, INTERAGENCY FUNDS TRANSFER AGREEMENTS, AND FIELD WORK PROPOSALS.—

(1) ASSISTANCE AND COORDINATION.—The Secretary may award grants or contracts to, or enter into cooperative agreements with, institutions of higher education and industrial enterprises to—

(A) conduct basic and applied research to identify, explore, assess, and develop gas hydrate as a source of energy;

(B) assist in developing technologies required for efficient and environmentally sound development of gas hydrate resources;

(C) undertake research programs to provide safe means of transport and storage of gas produced from gas hydrates;

(D) promote education and training in gas hydrate resource research and resource development;

(E) conduct basic and applied research to assess and mitigate the environmental impacts of hydrate degassing (including both natural degassing and degassing associated with commercial development); and

(F) develop technologies to reduce the risks of drilling through gas hydrates.

(2) COMPETITIVE MERIT-BASED REVIEW.—Funds made available under paragraph (1) shall be made available based on a competitive merit-based process.

(c) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary shall establish an advisory panel consisting of experts from industry, institutions of higher education, and Federal agencies to—

(1) advise the Secretary on potential applications of gas hydrate;

(2) assist in developing recommendations and priorities for the gas hydrate research and development program carried out under subsection (a)(1); and

(3) report to the Congress within 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, or at such later date as the Secretary considers advisable, on the impact on global climate change from gas hydrate extraction and consumption.

(d) LIMITATIONS.—

(1) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Not more than 5 percent of the amount made available to carry out this section for a fiscal year may be used by the Secretary for expenses associated with the administration of the program carried out under subsection (a)(1).

(2) CONSTRUCTION COSTS.—None of the funds made available to carry out this section may be used for the construction of a new building or the acquisition, expansion, remodeling, or alteration of an existing building (including site grading and improvement and architect fees).

(e) RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE SECRETARY.—In carrying out subsection (b)(1), the Secretary shall—

(1) facilitate and develop partnerships among government, industry, and institutions of higher education to research, identify, assess, and explore gas hydrate resources;

(2) undertake programs to develop basic information necessary for promoting long-term interest in gas hydrate resources as an energy source;

(3) ensure that the data and information developed through the program are accessible and widely disseminated as needed and appropriate;

(4) promote cooperation among agencies that are developing technologies that may hold promise for gas hydrate resource development; and

(5) report annually to Congress on accomplishments under this section.

SEC. 4. AMENDMENTS TO THE MINING AND MINERALS POLICY ACT OF 1970.

Section 201 of the Mining and Minerals Policy Act of 1970 (30 U.S.C. 1901) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (4) through (7) as paragraphs (5) through (8), respectively;

(2) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

''(4) The term 'gas hydrate' means a gas clathrate that—

''(A) is in the form of a gas-water ice-like crystalline material; and

''(B) is stable and occurs naturally in deep-ocean and permafrost areas.''; and

(3) in paragraph (7), as so redesignated by paragraph (1) of this section—

(A) in subparagraph (F), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (G) as subparagraph (H); and

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (F) the following:

''(G) for purposes of this section and sections 202 through 205 only, gas hydrate; and''.

SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Energy to carry out this Act—

(1) $5,000,000 for fiscal year 2000;

(2) $7,500,000 for fiscal year 2001;

(3) $11,000,000 for fiscal year 2002;

(4) $12,000,000 for fiscal year 2003; and

(5) $12,000,000 for fiscal year 2004.

Amounts authorized under this section shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 6. SUNSET.

Section 3 of this Act shall cease to be effective after the end of fiscal year 2004.

SEC. 7. REPORTS AND STUDIES.

The Secretary shall simultaneously provide to the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate copies of any report or study that the Department of Energy prepares at the direction of any committee of the Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1753.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, gas hydrates, which consist of a mixture of gas and water frozen into a solid crystalline state, have great energy potential. The most abundant form of gas hydrates, methane hydrates, are found in many areas throughout the world.

The U.S. Geological Survey's 1995 National Assessment of United States Oil and Gas Resources estimated the value of the U.S. in-place methane hydrate resource to be an astounding 320,000 trillion cubic feet of gas or 320 quadrillion cubic feet of gas.

By comparison, the United States annually consumes about 22 trillion cubic feet of methane as natural gas, and the world's current known gas reserves are about 5,000 trillion cubic feet of gas.

In addition, the occurrence and stability of gas hydrates at oceanic depths offers the possibility that excess greenhouse gases, especially carbon dioxide, may be disposed in the deep ocean as synthetic hydrates.

H.R. 1753 directs the Secretary of Energy, in consultation with the Secretaries of Commerce, Defense, and the Interior, and the Director of the National Science Foundation, to commence a program of gas hydrate R&D.

It authorizes the Secretary of Energy $5 million for fiscal year 2000, $7.5 million for fiscal year 2001, $11 million for fiscal year 2002, and $12 million for each of fiscal years 2003 and 2004 to carry out the program.

The bill also authorizes the Secretary of Energy to award grants or contracts to, or enter into cooperative agreements with institutions of higher education and industrial enterprises to conduct gas hydrate R&D; requires that all such awards be made available based on a competitive merit review process.

It limits administrative expenses to not more than 5 percent and prohibits any funds from being used for either the construction of a new building or alteration of an existing building, including site grading and improvement and architect fees.

It allows the Secretary of Interior to award gas hydrate R&D contracts in grants to, and to enter into cooperative agreements with, qualified entities under the Marine Mineral Resources Research Act of 1996.

It sunsets the gas hydrate R&D program after the end of fiscal year 2004.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the bill to the House for its adoption.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be here today to move one step closer to enactment of the Gas Hydrates Research and Development Act. I would like to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), chairman of the full Committee on Science, as well as the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), the ranking member of the full committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy and Environment, for all of their hard work on this bill.

In particular, I would like to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DOYLE), our colleague on the subcommittee and full committee, for all of his hard work on this legislation. He of course is the author of this bill.

Gas hydrates have the potential to provide a significant natural gas resource to this country if they are safely and economically extracted from the ocean floor where they are found.

This legislation establishes an interagency research and development program to examine many issues associated with the extraction of gas hydrates, including the possible economic, environmental, and energy benefits.

I strongly support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DOYLE), and I ask unanimous consent that he be allowed to control that time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be here this afternoon to speak in support of the Gas Hydrate Research and Development Act. As has been noted, this bill is a 5-year authorization measure that will promote the research, identification, assessment, exploration, and development of gas hydrate resources.

I want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Chairman SENSENBRENNER) for his interest in moving forward with this bill. I want to recognize his efforts in drawing greater attention to a diverse range of important and timely matters, including the need for heightened gas hydrate research, that have come before the Committee on Science during this session.

I also want to acknowledge the support that the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy and Environment, and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO), the ranking member, has given to the initiatives that are outlined in the legislation currently before us.

Mr. Speaker, the Gas Hydrate Research and Development Act provides the necessary framework, guidance, and authority to enable further examination in what could conceivably save consumers billions of dollars, make difficult national and environmental decisions easier, and strengthen our Nation's energy security.

I am proud of the fact that this effort has attracted bipartisan support in the House as well as in the Senate. Senator AKAKA's companion legislation S. 330, which is cosponsored by Senators LOTT, GRAHAM, CRAIG, and LANDRIEU, was passed by the Senate earlier this year. Here in the House, I am pleased to report that both the Committee on Science and the Committee on Resources reported the measure out by voice vote.

I am also particularly proud of the inclusive approach that this initiative embodies. It instructs the Secretary of Energy to work with other agencies, institutions of higher education, and the private sector in conducting future gas hydrate research and development. I have always favored a consortium approach to such efforts as they not only prove to be cost effective, but in many cases help to accelerate the rate of discovery.

There are many questions surrounding gas hydrates that must be answered, and to accomplish the necessary R&D activities will require a diverse set of engineering and scientific disciplines. I am confident that DOE's outreach efforts and the specific expertise in this area can be found at our Federal energy technology centers, in concert with the input from the other entities I have previously mentioned, that we can achieve our goal of producing the technology necessary for the commercial production of methane from oceanic and permafrost hydrate systems while at the same time meeting requirements for cleaner fuels and reduced emissions.

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. CUBIN).

Mrs. CUBIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1753, a bill to authorize a program of the Department of Energy fostering research and development of a peculiar form of energy minerals, natural gas hydrates.

This bill is a blended version of the legislation reported by the Committee on Science and the Committee on Resources. It reflects a role for the Department of Interior's Mineral Management Service, the agency which is charged with resources disposition from our continental shelves. That is where the lion's share of methane hydrate minerals occur, there and in the permafrost regions of the Earth.

This bill integrates the role which the scientists of the Marine Minerals Research Institute, an adjunct of the Minerals Management Service, may play in gas hydrates research. The Institute, which has three branches, one for continental shelf research, one for deep ocean basins and near island environments, and one for arctic and cold water regions, is well positioned to provide expertise in the quest to make what is now a drilling hazard for some OCS operations and turn it into an energy resource.

Mr. Speaker, without a doubt, if this Nation is to reach a sustained use of 30 trillion cubic feet of natural gas by the end of the next decade, which is a Clinton administration projection, then we will need to develop unconventional sources of natural gas as well as the traditional accumulations. Coalbed methane being developed in my home State of Wyoming is one of those unconventional sources. But methane hydrates in our Alaskan permafrost regions and our OCS also hold great promise to help our country meet this demand with domestic gas.

I would like to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Chairman SENSENBRENNER) for his willingness to incorporate several Committee on Resources' adopted provisions to strengthen this bill. I would also like to thank the committee staffs for their work to iron out the differences.

Lastly, I would like to acknowledge the efforts of our former congressional science fellow, Dr. David Wunsch. He was critical to the formulation of my subcommittee's hearings and amendments to this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill and to help us move toward the goal of energy self-sufficiency.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOLLOHAN), who has always been and continues to be a leading advocate for critical R&D efforts. I know I am not alone in counting the gentleman from West Virginia among the most distinguished Members of Congress who can always be counted on for his strong support and sound advice.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1753, the Gas Hydrate Research and Development Act of 1999. I want to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DOYLE) for his introduction of this legislation and for his leadership in the area of this Nation's research into the use of energy and the more efficient use of energy, creating an energy independence for this country.

The Department of Energy estimates that up to 200,000 trillion cubic feet of methane may exist in crystalline or hydrate form and in U.S. permafrost regions and surrounding waters. This potentially enormous resource is 100 times greater than the entire conventional natural gas supply in the United States.

However, we are still unsure how much methane we really have in hydrate form as well as how exactly to convert methane hydrates into a commercially feasible product.

In 1997, the President's Committee of Advisors on Science and Technology, P–CAST, identified the need for a comprehensive methane hydrates research and development program, recommending an initial investment of $44 million over 5 years.

□ 1245

H.R. 1753 will go a long way toward implementing the P–CAST recommendations and will continue the work already started by the Federal Energy Technology Center, FETC, which has sites in Morgantown, West Virginia, and in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

FETC has a long history in the methane hydrates field. In 1981, when the first hydrate ice core was retrieved, FETC was one of the six organizations chosen to analyze it. Continuing its leadership in this area, FETC has developed a strong methane hydrate

strategy designed to implement the P–CAST recommendations.

H.R. 1753 would allow DOE to move forward with the FETC hydrates program. Other nations, most notably Japan, already have begun intensive hydrate research efforts. The longer we wait to move ahead, the harder it will be to catch up.

I call on my colleagues to join me in voting for this important legislation, and I call on DOE to implement the FETC plan.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), the distinguished subcommittee chair.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin, the chairman of the Committee on Science, for yielding me this time.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy and Environment of the Committee on Science, I am pleased we are considering H.R. 1753, the Gas Hydrates Research and Development Act of 1999. My friend and colleague on the subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DOYLE), introduced H.R. 1753, which we marked up and passed by a voice vote on May 12. I am happy to report the final version was approved overwhelmingly by the full committee on September 9.

Mr. Speaker, I have the distinct pleasure of serving on both the House Committee on Science and the Committee on Resources, which shared jurisdiction on this bill, and I would like to thank my friends on the Committee on Resources for all their hard work in getting H.R. 1753 to the floor.

I especially would like to thank the chairman, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), and the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. CUBIN), who now ably chairs the subcommittee which I once chaired and whose willingness to work with me and the chairman of the Committee on Science on this important piece of legislation is much appreciated. I also again would like to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO), who worked hard to make sure that this bill moved forward.

Gas hydrates, as has been described here earlier, are an ice-like substance found in the undersea sediment in the Arctic permafrost and other locations throughout the world. These hydrates one day will provide an abundant supply of clean natural gas if we can only figure out a way to get it out. So that is what this is all about. Much more research is needed before we can attain that goal, and 1753 brings us closer to the day when we can safely and effectively begin to use this abundant new source of energy.

This legislation will make funds available to continue the research into extracting this clean and bountiful source of potential energy gas hydrates. It also seeks to better coordinate research between the Department of Energy, the U.S. Geological Survey, and the United States Navy.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation which will help secure our energy future.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD), who played an instrumental role in shepherding this legislation through the House Committee on Resources.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1753, the Methane Hydrate Research and Development Act of 1999, a piece of legislation which was introduced on May 11 by our friend and colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DOYLE), who has taken the lead on this. I also want to thank the chairman of the Committee on Science, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO), and the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. CUBIN) for their efforts in support of this.

The primary purpose of this bill is to promote the research, identification, assessment, exploration, and development of methane hydrate resources. This is important because one of our most important sources of clean, efficient energy is natural gas. Today, natural gas comes primarily from geological formations in which methane molecules exist in the form of gas.

They also exist in ice-like formations called hydrates. Hydrates trap methane molecules inside a cage of frozen water and hydrates are generally found on or under seabeds and under permafrost. While we do not know the extent or amount of methane trapped in hydrate, scientists believe today we are talking about an enormous resource.

According to the U.S. Geological Survey, worldwide estimates of the natural gas potential of methane hydrates approach 400 million trillion cubic feet, as compared to the mere 5,000 trillion cubic feet that make up the world's known gas reserves. This huge potential illustrates the interest in advanced technologies that may reliably and cost effectively detect and produce natural gas from methane hydrates.

I would like to add that the technology that is needed for this will involve some form of deep seabed mining, which is an area and a concern of interest to those of us in the Pacific.

On a cautionary note, we should be mindful that although methane is relatively clean burning, it is a fossil fuel. So removing it from its safe haven on the ocean floor and burning it will release carbon in the form of carbon dioxide into the atmosphere. Methane hydrates near offshore drilling rigs also may pose a threat through substances on the ocean floor. For instance, if a drilling rig were hit by shifting or deep pressurization of the methane hydrates underneath it, the impact on the rig and the workers aboard could be disastrous.

This is worthwhile legislation. It is something we need as a country to get going on, because I believe other countries are developing the technology to deal with this.

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

I too want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) for his words of support and express my appreciation for his good work not only on science issues but on veterans issues as well.

As I mentioned in my opening remarks, the potential for significant benefit to consumers, the environment, and business exist in methane hydrate research. I want my colleagues to listen to and consider the following: it has been projected that the U.S. gas consumption is expected to increase by 40 percent by the year 2020. Couple this with the fact that currently more than half of the present U.S. oil supply is imported and without natural gas production our oil import volume would be much larger. But if only 1 percent of the methane hydrate resource could be made removable, the United States could more than double its domestic natural gas resource base.

As numerous scientists, as well as the President's Committee of Advisors on Science and Technology have noted, natural gas will remain a principal energy source well into the next century. This is partly attributable to the increasing pressure for clean fuels. As methane from hydrates is essentially a pure methane, which is free of sulfur, nitrogen, and other contaminants, it is the cleanest burning of all fossil fuel resources. Subsequently, its utilization could be a key factor in mitigating global warming concerns.

Needless to say, when a new abundant resource is found that meets a growing demand with a greater level of efficiency, consumers will not only have a greater selection of options but more affordable costs as well. It is time we begin to avail ourselves of the potential resources brought to bear through intensive methane hydrate research, just as Japan, India, the United Kingdom, Germany, Brazil, and Norway are currently active in doing through their individual methane hydrate programs.

Mr. Speaker, as much as methane hydrate research is a matter of global proportions, it is of equal importance to almost every region of our country. While large deposits have been identified and studied in Alaska, the West Coast from California to Washington, the Blake Ridge offshore of the Carolinas, and in the Gulf of Mexico, activity and interest has been demonstrated in numerous other locations.

In the area of western Pennsylvania that I represent, Gerald Holder at the University of Pittsburgh, and the Pittsburgh Energy Technology Center, have a long history in hydrate research. Efforts are also underway at Penn State University, the Colorado School of Mines, the Georgia Institute of Technology, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Brookhaven National Lab, Texas A&M University, the

Monterey Bay Aquarium Research Institute, and the South Dakota School of Mines and Technology are just a few of the various other organizations that have a vested interest in methane hydrate research.

I also want to make particular mention of the work that is being done at the University of Hawaii and again recognize Senator AKAKA for his efforts in advancing similar legislation in the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1753 presents a thoughtful and common sense approach to expanding future energy choices. Through continued pursuit of progress in science and technology, we can assist in providing future generations with an abundant supply of a clean and reasonably priced energy source.

I urge my colleagues to support the Gas Hydrate Research and Development Act, and I thank my chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), for his support and his help.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the statement of Senator AKAKA in support of H.R. 1753 for the RECORD.

REMARKS OF SENATOR DANIEL K. AKAKA REGARDING METHANE HYDRATE LEGISLATION

I believe that H.R. 1753, and the Senate counterpart bill, S. 330, are important energy research bills that Congress should enact this session. Methane hydrate research has strong, bipartisan support. Senators Lott, Graham, Craig and Landrieu have cosponsored S. 330.

The discovery of methane hydrates presents a research and development opportunity with major energy security implications. The bill will serve the long-term goal of developing new energy supplies as well as the near-term goal of increased safety and recovery of conventional oil and gas.

Significant, widespread deposits of gas hydrates have been detected, but have not been characterized, all over the globe. The data on this resource may surprise you.

Worldwide, the amount of methane trapped in gas hydrate form is estimated to be 10,000 gigatons—twice the carbon found in all other fossil fuels and 3,000 times the amount of methane present in the atmosphere. Scientists at the U.S. Geological Survey estimate that 320,000 trillion cubic feet of natural gas exists in methane hydrate form in the U.S.—a staggering resource.

In the United States, on-shore deposits are found in the arctic regions of Alaska. However, deep sea methane hydrate deposits are the most abundant source of methane, occurring at depths greater than 300 meters. Marine geologists have identified large deposits off the coasts of Alaska, Louisiana, Texas, New Jersey, Oregon and North and South Carolina.

Research is needed to determine whether we can produce natural gas from these vast reserves. Natural gas from methane hydrates will never be realized unless we undertake a serious research and development program outlined in these bills.

The U.S. currently lags other countries in exploring this exciting new energy source. Japan and India have launched aggressive R&D programs to explore methane hydrates. Some believe that Japanese commercial production is only a decade away. Clearly we are falling behind in our efforts to understand this energy source. In the face of dwindling energy resources and increased reliance on energy imports, we can hardly afford to miss this important opportunity.

In addition to potential use as an energy source, methane hydrate deposits also represent a challenge to conventional oil and gas extraction. Hydrates influence physical properties of ocean sediments, particularly strength and stability. Characterizing hydrate formation and breakdown is important for the safety of deep offshore drilling and other deep sea operations.

Given these research, technology, and energy security considerations, it would be shortsighted not to invest in our future by assessing and developing gas hydrates. I urge you to pass H.R. 1753.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 1753, the Methane Hydrate Research and Development Act of 1999. This measure will promote the research, identification, assessment, exploration, and development of methane hydrate resources.

As a Member of the House Science Committee, I recognize the importance of our natural resources. And as a Houstonian and Texan, I have a vested interest in natural and fossil fuels.

Natural gas is an important source of clean efficient energy. Today, natural gas comes primarily from geological formations in which methane molecules—the primary component of natural gas—exist in the form of gas.

Methane also exists in ice-like formations called hydrates. Hydrates. Hydrates trap methane molecules inside a cage of frozen water. Hydrates are found on or under seabeds and under permafrost.

The amount of methane trapped in hydrates is largely unknown, but it is very large. A number of scientists believe that hydrates contain more than twice as much energy as all the world's coal, oil, and natural gas combined.

Currently, we do not know how to produce a meaningful amount of energy from hydrates. Scientists around the world are trying to discover cost effective production methods. They are also trying to assess the size of the resource base, to explore problems hydrates cause during the production of offshore natural gas, and to explore additional uses for hydrates.

If scientists can find a way to safely extract the gas, they will have tapped an enormous new clean-burning energy supply. This act direct the Secretary of Energy to commence a gas hydrate research and development program. In conjunction with the Secretaries of Defense and the Interior, along with the Director of the NSF, the Secretary of Energy is to commence this research. This measure will allow the Secretary to award grants or contracts or even enter into cooperative agreements with institutions of higher education and industrial enterprises to conduct basic and applied research, to identify, explore, assess, and develop gas hydrate as a source of energy.

Mr. Speaker, it is vital that we continue to search for new sources of energy that will reduce our dependence on foreign sources, further protecting our energy security, and that will protect the environment from further harm.

Mr. MASCARA. Mr. Speaker, in an era of increasingly volatile energy prices and dwindling energy resources, it is imperative that the U.S. fund research for alternative energy sources now so that we are not left out in the cold when the cost of or inaccessibility to traditional fossil fuels makes heating our homes and fueling our factories impossible. H.R. 1753, the Methane Hydrate Research and Development Act of 1999, attempts to stave off that threat by directing the Secretary of Energy to coordinate a research and development program with the Secretaries of Defense, Interior and the Director of the National Science Foundation to develop methane hydrate resources.

Methane hydrate, a frozen mixture of methane and water, is found in sea sediments of the outer continental regions under unstable, high pressure conditions and in arctic regions where permafrost conditions exist. Methane hydrate, once safely extracted from these regions promises to become a viable source of alternative energy. The most promising area of research seems to be in harvesting methane hydrates from the outer continental regions. A 1997 U.S. Geological Survey appraisal of natural gas hydrate resources in the U.S. estimated that about 200,000 trillion cubic feet exist. It has been estimated that one 50 by 150 kilometer area off the coast of North and South Carolina could supply the energy needs of the United States for over 70 years.

Unfortunately these estimates do us no good without investments to develop the technology to safely and economically harvest methane hydrates. Passage of H.R. 1753 is a crucial first step to developing economical and ecologically sensitive technology that allows the United States to meet our energy needs in the 21st century. I support passage of H.R. 1753 and urge my colleagues to support passage of this important legislation.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BONILLA). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1753, 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 promote the research, identification, assessment, exploration, and development of gas hydrate resources, and for other purposes.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that pursuant to Public Law 100–696, the Chair, on behalf of the Democratic Leader, announces the appointment of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) as a member of the United States Capitol Preservation

Commission, vice the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN).

CONCERNING ECONOMIC, HUMANITARIAN, AND OTHER ASSISTANCE TO NORTHERN SOMALIA

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 20) concerning economic, humanitarian, and other assistance to the northern part of Somalia.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 20

Whereas in the area in the northern part of Somalia, referred to as Somaliland by the elected representatives of the people living there, a significant level of economic and social stability has been achieved, promising likely success for international and United States sponsored economic development and humanitarian programs;

Whereas economic development, humanitarian, and other forms of assistance to the people of such area from international organizations, the United States, and other foreign nations, has been diminished, delayed, or canceled due to questions about the assertion of sovereignty by those people as a nation separate from Somalia;

Whereas provision of economic development and humanitarian assistance to the people of such area does not constitute recognition of any particular claim to sovereignty by any de facto government of the region; and

Whereas the fundamental purpose of economic development, humanitarian, and other aid is to relieve human suffering: Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) urges all international organizations, foreign countries, and agencies of the United States Government engaged in economic development, humanitarian, and other forms of bilateral or multilateral assistance to evaluate the ability of such assistance to achieve the amelioration of human suffering in each region of Somalia, including the northern part of Somalia referred to as Somaliland;

(2) urges the President not to delay, diminish, or cancel the amounts and kinds of assistance otherwise appropriate to the people of certain regions in Somalia because conditions may not be propitious for such assistance in other regions of Somalia;

(3) urges the President not to delay, diminish, or cancel the amounts and kinds of such assistance directed toward any region in Somalia waiting for a permanent resolution of the efforts now underway to forge a new government for Somalia;

(4) calls upon all Somali parties to continue to work toward a permanent end to the civil strife there and the adoption of a permanent governmental structure most conducive to the well-being and basic human rights of all Somali people; and

(5) calls on the President to—

(A) work with the international community to help bring an end to the suffering of the Somali people and work toward a negotiated settlement of the Somali conflict;

(B) increase the levels of humanitarian assistance provided to Somalia through local and international groups;

(C) provide funding for demobilization and demining efforts in Somalia;

(D) provide assistance in the health and education sectors of Somalia; and

(E) work with other donor groups to assist the people of Somalia in reconstruction and development.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Con. Res. 20, the concurrent resolution now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Horn of Africa is no longer as strategically important to our Nation as it once was. However, we cannot ignore it as an area of a region with past and continuing instability.

The hostility of the Islamic fundamentalist regime of Sudan toward our Nation, the regrettable ongoing war between Eritrea and Ethiopia, and the violent clashes between warlords in southern Somalia all bear watching. Because of these problems, it is in our national interest to identify those portions of the Horn which have demonstrated a degree of stability and governance and to encourage them. Northern Somalia, and particularly the area once defined as the British protectorate of Somaliland, is one such area.

Our distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), traveled to that remote region last year. We are grateful to them for their energetic diligent service on the Subcommittee on Africa. This resolution is a direct result of their eyewitness accounts of a people rebuilding their lives and economies after a long troubled period.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to fully support this measure, H. Con. Res. 20.

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

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

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution, H. Con. Res. 20.

□ 1300

Let me once again thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN); the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), chairman of the subcommittee; and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON) for bringing this resolution to the floor.

I would also like to thank the primary sponsor, the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL), who traveled on CODEL Campbell to Somaliland last year, where we had the opportunity to meet with President Egal.

This resolution expresses several points: Support for humanitarian and targeted development assistance for Somaliland. It encourages efforts at democratization and transparency. It recognizes the level of stability in the region. It encourages freedom of the press. It encourages dialogue with other regions in Somalia, and it also calls on the U.S. to provide funding for health and education.

When Somalia gained independence from Britain and Italy, Somalia was left with two distinct systems of governing by virtue of the fact that they were controlled by different colonial powers.

The governing body of Northern Somalia was colonized by the British. In the south it was colonized by the Italians. As we know, Djibouti, an independent country before their independence, was colonized by the French.

The various systems have something to do we believe with the relative stability and instability of these regions. Northern Somalia, which was colonized by the British, was sort of left intact by the colonial hierarchy. They continued to allow traditional leaders to function. They allowed local leaders to be able to project themselves, therefore creating a more stable environment when independence came.

Whereas, their Italian counterparts replaced the indigenous structures and they had their own Italian model for Southern Somalia around Mogadishu. And so, the lack of local leaders being recognized in the south by the form of colonization that the Italians had as contrasted with that of the north is one of the reasons to explain the differences in those two regions.

''The Great Conference of the Northern Peoples'' convened a meeting in May of 1991 and established the part of Somalia which the people in the north call Somaliland. It also promulgated a new Constitution for that region. President Egal was reelected to office in 1997 for another 5-year term by winning 223 votes in their 315-member national communities conference.

Egal's relationship with other clans in Somalia has improved over the past years due to his efforts of reaching out to other clan leaders and once again having had visibility before independence.

Somalia is one example of a collapsed system of government by the north, as we can see in the past. And so, the opportunity for us to visit there with CODEL Campbell to see the schools, the hospitals, the civil servants functioning and our recent visit by President Egal encourages us to continue to support the efforts that are happening there.

Also, as the war continues between Ethiopia and Eritrea, we see that sides in Somalia are being taken by leaders

between Isaias and Meles. And so, to have the stability in the north is very important.

Mr. Speaker, we urge support of this resolution.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. Royce), the distinguished chairman of our Subcommittee on Africa.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with the Members here that this resolution draws a much needed sense of attention by this Congress to Somalia, which has ceased to exist as a nation. And so, the nation's state, basically, has ended in a situation of near anarchy as a result of fighting between factions led by self-serving warlords there.

But this resolution authored by the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) recognizes that the northernmost part of Somalia has achieved a significant level of economic and social stability.

I would just like to share with the Members that November 1 in Newsweek Magazine they report: ''The people here in the north call their territory Somaliland and they want no part of the thuggery to the south. In the north, children in crisp, white shirts attend school and play cheerful games of soccer. Their parents busily rebuild broken homes, hammering new roofs or white-washing walls. And, astonishingly, not a gun is in sight.''

The article in Newsweek goes on to quote the Deputy Parliament Speaker, who says, ''We want a nod from Uncle Sam that we're going in the right direction. We've established a healthy haven in a very rough neighborhood.''

Well, this should be a given and this resolution does that. However, the resolution should not be construed as a call for diplomatic recognition of Somaliland per se. In fact, the resolution calls for all Somalia parties to work with the international community to achieve a permanent end to the civil strife there and the adoption of a permanent government structure most conducive to the well-being and basic human rights of all Somalia people.

I would like to commend again the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) for offering this resolution and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Africa. I would also like to recognize the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), our full committee chairman, for his work on this resolution.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL), who is one of the original sponsors of this measure.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the chairman of our full committee, but for whom we would not have this resolution on the floor today, for his generous support for this resolution and, more generally, for his support for matters of great importance to all of us in regard to Africa.

I wish to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), the subcommittee chairman, who has taken the time to learn the subject matter, to become an expert, and to lead our Congress on matters of importance to all of us regarding Africa.

I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), my cosponsor and the ranking Democrat on the subcommittee, with whom I have traveled to Africa, who has constantly shared with me his extensive knowledge about Africa, gleaned not only from his years in Congress but also from his remarkable public service prior thereto in connection with his work with the YMCA and humanitarian and refugee assistance. From all these sources I have learned a great deal.

The resolution has a very simple purpose. The United States and international assistance agencies ought to help where we can do the most good, and we should not hold back that help pending a final and perfect resolution of the difficulties in Mogadishu. That is the heart of this resolution.

We do not have to get into the issue of recognition of any country, or subcategories or any countries, contrary to the accepted standards of our State Department. All we have to do is recognize that if there is in place an instrument that can accept assistance from the World Bank, from the Africa Development Bank, from AID, that we then ought to go ahead and offer that assistance if we can help needy people.

What is happening today instead, Mr. Speaker, is that such assistance by the World Bank, by the Africa Development Bank, by United States AID, is held up because there is no recognized government in Mogadishu. That should not be a reason to hold back useful assistance to some remarkable people in the northern part of the former country of Somalia, who have achieved so much.

Secondly, the legal status is exactly as my good friend and colleague, the subcommittee chairman, has stated. However, bear in mind that Somaliland was an independent sovereign state, admittedly for a short period, for 6 days; but as they came out of colonial status from Britain, they were an independent country. They voluntarily gave up that independence to join with formerly Italian colony of Somalia to form the State of Somalia.

Now, under the tremendous strain of a civil war, that union broke apart. I emphasize this because the people of the land that was Somaliland have aspirations. I do not speak against those aspirations. I note, as the subcommittee chair did, that today we do not speak on the subject of those aspirations for statehood. We leave that neutral and unsaid in this resolution.

However, so many of our colleagues remember the horror that befell American troops trying to do good in Mogadishu, and specifically, the American Rangers. That was not the fault of the good people of Somaliland. They had nothing to do with it. They had no control over Mogadishu. They were not part of the government, such as it was there. They were not part of the warring factions in Mogadishu.

Instead, what we see is a stable area capable of accepting aid and using it for needy people. And today, by this resolution, we put on record the House of Representatives and, hopefully, the other body as well in support of assisting people in ways that can be accepted and utilized.

In conclusion, I want to return to the note of thanks with which I began. We would not be here but for the chairman and the subcommittee chairman who have given priority to this resolution. It speaks volumes for their compassion and concern that they wanted to put this forward today. I thank them for doing so.

I conclude with a final word of thanks again to my good friend, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), whose leadership in this area has been exemplary to us all.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude by saying I agree with the chairman of the subcommittee that this should not be construed as recognition. But I must certainly associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) that this is a unique situation and, in the future, perhaps it is something that we need to look at. But I agree that this does not connote any type of recognition.

I do, though, in conclusion urge all independent national organizations, foreign countries, and agencies of the United States Government to engage in economic development and humanitarian and other forms of foreign assistance to evaluate the ability of such assistance to achieve the amelioration of human suffering in each region of Somalia, including the northern part of Somalia known as Somaliland.

We urge our President not to delay, diminish, or cancel the amount of assistance otherwise necessary to the people of certain regions of Somalia because the conditions in the other parts, as has been mentioned, are not stable and peaceful; and we encourage the President not to delay or diminish aid to certain areas of Somalia that are awaiting a peaceful resolution of the conflict.

We also call on all Somalia parties to continue to work towards a permanent end to the civil strife there and to adopt the permanent government structure conducive to the well-being and the basic human rights of all Somalis.

This resolution is just presented as a catalyst to deliver humanitarian assistance to Somalia and to create a dialogue that will end the suffering and confusion within Somalia.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 20, the resolution ''Concerning Economic, Humanitarian And Other Assistance To Northern Somalia.'' To understand the importance of this resolution, we must look to the recent history of politically, economically and war torn Somalia.

Cities in Somalia have traditionally been centers of trade, administration and education. Now they lie shattered. In Hargeisa, for example, 80 percent of the buildings have been destroyed, supply infrastructures like electricity and water have been smashed, the schools left roofless and ruined, the hospitals devastated and the citizens have suffered without the most basic facilities. Anti-personnel mines and unexploded shells lie buried in the rubble of the city, still deadly, forbidding the clearance of much of the debris. Such terrifying conditions in what had been stable and well-established cities symbolize the legacy of Siad Barre's disastrous years of power.

As the Africa Watch Committee set down in its 1990 report on the region, ''It is difficult to overstate the Somali government's brutality towards its own people, or to measure the impact of its murderous policies.'' Two decades of the presidency of President Siad Barre have resulted in human rights violations on an unprecedented scale, which have devastated the country. Even before the current wars, the human rights of Somali citizens were violated systematically, violently and with absolute impunity. The most bloody conflict, and the longest lasting, has been the war in the North against the Isaak clan, the largest in the region.'' Recounts given by the people who have and continue to be exposed to physical violence and verbal abuse in Somalia paints a picture of dead, wounded, displaced people and impoverished and demolished cities.

Mrs. Fozia Mohamed Awad, speaking of the problems in Northern Somalia recants ''I personally lived through the 1985 massacre, when fifty to sixty men were driven out of prison and shot by government soldiers. This happened in the city of Burao, and there were no trials or court appearances, they were just shot down. After these killings, the government confiscated our property, established control posts at the entrances of our towns and along the highways and nothing could happen without them being bribed.''

One morning the government army arrived at, Fozia Awad's village, approaching from a dried-up riverbed. They opened fire, killing all they could see—people and animals. They killed her mother and two other women relatives. In all, sixty people were killed on that occasion at the water point. Then they went to the nearby village and killed everybody there, except a few who fled into the bush.

Mr. Speaker, dear colleagues, H. Con. Res. 46 is extremely important in that it expresses the sense of Congress deploring the escalation of the conflict between Ethiopia and Eritrea which has resulted in the massive and senseless loss of life, as well as substantial economic hardship to the peoples of both nations. This measure strongly urges both Eritrea and Ethiopia to bring an immediate end to the violence between the two countries and strongly affirms U.S. support for the Organization of African Unity (OAU) Framework Agreement. In addition, H. Con. Res. 20 calls on the United Nations Human Rights Commission and all human rights organizations to investigate human rights abuses in connection with the forced detentions, deportations, and displacements of populations caused by this conflict.

I would like to thank my colleagues, Congressman CAMPBELL and Congressman PAYNE for introducing this important resolution. This resolution presents a commitment by the United States to the people of Somalia. It is for the spirits of the thousands of people who have died in Somalia and 60,000 more who have been detained or forced from their homes who are crying out for world intervention. This resolution is a first step.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 20.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.J. RES. 2

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of House Joint Resolution 2, of which I am not particularly fond, and to which my name was added without my knowledge in error.

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

There was no objection.

CELEBRATING 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF GENEVA CONVENTIONS

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 102) celebrating the 50th anniversary of the Geneva Conventions of 1949 and recognizing the humanitarian safeguards these treaties provide in times of armed conflict.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 102

Whereas the Geneva Conventions of 1949 set basic humane standards of behavior during armed conflict, and are the major written source of international humanitarian law;

Whereas these Conventions prescribe humane treatment for civilian populations, wounded, sick and shipwrecked military personnel, and prisoners of war during armed conflict;

Whereas these Conventions recognize the International Committee of the Red Cross as an independent and neutral organization whose humanitarian mission is to protect and assist civilians, prisoners of war, and other victims of armed conflict;

Whereas ''the red cross in a field of white'' is not an ordinary organizational symbol, but one to which the international community has granted the ability to impose restraint during war and to protect human life;

Whereas the American Red Cross and its sister national societies are members of a world-wide organization rooted in the provisions of international humanitarian law and dedicated to the promulgation of its principles, among which are the Geneva Conventions of 1949;

Whereas the international programs of the American Red Cross bring relief from natural and manmade disasters abroad, contribute to the development of nonprofit relief organizations abroad, and include the teaching of international humanitarian law throughout the United States;

Whereas many domestic programs of the Red Cross in health and safety, disaster, blood, youth, and service to the members of the Armed Forces of the United States grew out of a response to armed conflict;

Whereas, thanks to the efforts of Clara Barton and Frederick Douglass, the United States ratified in 1882 the first convention for the amelioration of the condition of wounded and sick members of the armed forces in the field;

Whereas in 1955 the United States ratified the Geneva Conventions of 1949; and

Whereas the Geneva Conventions of 1949 are among the most universally ratified treaties in the world: Now, therefore, be it

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

SECTION 1. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

The Congress—

(1) recognizes the historic and humanitarian significance of the Geneva Conventions of 1949, and celebrates the 50th anniversary of the signing of these treaties;

(2) exhorts combatants everywhere to respect the red cross emblem in order to protect innocent and vulnerable populations on every side of conflicts;

(3) commends the International Committee of the Red Cross and the more than 175 national Red Cross and Red Crescent societies, including the American Red Cross, on their continuing work in providing relief and assistance to the victims of war as prescribed by these Conventions;

(4) applauds the Promise of Humanity gathering organized by the American Red Cross in 1999 in Washington, D.C., as an important reminder of our responsibilities to educate future generations about the principles of international humanitarian law;

(5) commends the efforts of the International Committee of the Red Cross and the more than 175 national Red Cross and Red Crescent societies, including the American Red Cross, for their work in educating the world's citizens about the humanitarian principles of international humanitarian law as embodied in the Geneva Conventions of 1949;

(6) invites the American Red Cross during this anniversary year to assist Congress in educating its Members and staff about the Geneva Conventions of 1949;

(7) supports the anniversary theme of the International Committee of the Red Cross that ''Even War Has Limits''; and

(8) calls upon the President to issue a proclamation recognizing the anniversary of the Geneva Conventions of 1949 and recognizing the Conventions themselves as critically important instruments for protecting human dignity in times of armed conflict and limiting the savagery of war.

SEC. 2. GENEVA CONVENTIONS OF 1949 DEFINED.

In this concurrent resolution, the term ''Geneva Conventions of 1949'' means the following conventions, done at Geneva in 1949:

(1) Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of the Wounded and Sick in Armed Forces in the Field (6 UST 3114).

(2) Convention for the Amelioration of the Condition of Wounded, Sick and Shipwrecked Members of the Armed Forces at Sea (6 UST 3217).

(3) Convention Relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War (6 UST 3316).

(4) Convention Relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War (6 UST 3516).

□ 1315

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this measure.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON), the sponsor of this resolution.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 50th anniversary of the Geneva Conventions. In 1949, the Geneva Conventions were formally adopted which set the rules for safeguarding members of the armed forces who are wounded, sick, shipwrecked, prisoners of war and civilian workers of the military. At the same time, the dream of Henry Dunant was realized. Henry was the founder of the Red Cross movement, and in 1859 he originally proposed the establishment of a civilian volunteer relief corps to care for the wounded.

It was in 1949, nearly 100 years later, that the Geneva Conventions were formally ratified. In the old days, they did not take prisoners. They killed them. As it evolved through the years, beginning in 1859 when Henry Dunant started the program, we began to be more humane in our treatment of war. So in 1949, nearly 100 years later, the Geneva Conventions were formally ratified, and the Red Cross was recognized as the world's humanitarian organization.

Through his vision and determination, an organization was built that has educated, protected, given hope, provided comfort and relief to millions of people all over the world. Today virtually every country in the world is part of the Geneva Conventions. It was because of Mr. Dunant and these conventions that I and my family had hope during my 7 years of captivity as a prisoner of war in Vietnam. After I was shot down over Vietnam, a Vietnamese officer came up to me with a Red Cross on his lapel and said I could write a letter. Seeing the cross, I assumed he was working for the Red Cross and was visiting me to ensure that I would be treated humanely as the Geneva Conventions dictated. As Members know, our wars with both Korea and Vietnam, those two countries did not formally adopt the Geneva Conventions. They signed them but they did not adhere to them.

After we spoke, he asked me if I wanted to write a letter. I wrote the letter and later learned it was never sent. I found out later that in Communist countries, there are not many left nowadays, the military runs the Red Cross and they do it the way they want to and not the way a humanitarian Red Cross that we know our Red Cross in America by and in other nations, the international one, does. They are not volunteers with humanitarian goals in mind.

Later on during my captivity, a real Red Cross representative finally visited me and some of my letters made it home, through the Red Cross, and my family was able to send some that way as well. Those letters were some of the only comfort my family and friends here in America received during my nearly 7 years in captivity, and they were possible because the American Red Cross was there to make sure that the Geneva Conventions were followed.

I tell that story simply to illustrate the power and respect that the symbol of the Red Cross holds throughout the world. The Red Cross and its affiliates are the organizations that are there in time of need, whether it be to ensure the human rights of political prisoners or to help reconstruct the homes and lives of victims of national disasters. The Red Cross is always there.

In my case they were there to uphold the most powerful of human rights treaties, the Geneva Conventions. That is why today I congratulate and say ''thank you'' to the Red Cross, the American Red Cross and the International Red Cross on the 50th anniversary of the Geneva Conventions. I know that my family and I are very grateful to the Red Cross, to the volunteers who selflessly continue to serve so that human dignity is not compromised and human suffering is eliminated. I congratulate the Red Cross and the international movement, and again commemorate the anniversary of these important international treaties.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON) for bringing this important measure before this body at this time.

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

Let me first pay public tribute to my good friend and distinguished colleague the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON) for bringing this matter to the body and for his heroic service to our Nation. We are deeply in his debt. I also want to commend the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the chairman of the Committee on International Relations, for sponsoring this legislation.

I am, of course, delighted to ask all of my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 102. The Geneva Conventions, Mr. Speaker, were concluded in 1949, 50 years ago, to address the terrible practices that occurred during the Second World War. They established a comprehensive framework for dealing with treatment of combatants and civilians alike. The conventions include a wide range of protections. Persons who are not or are no longer taking part in hostilities according to the conventions need to be respected, protected and treated humanely. They must be given appropriate care, without discrimination of any kind. Captured combatants and other persons whose freedom has been restricted must be treated humanely. They need to be protected against all acts of violence, particularly against torture. If they are put on trial, they must enjoy the fundamental guarantees of proper judicial procedures. The right of parties to an armed conflict to choose methods of warfare are not unlimited. There must be no unnecessary or superfluous injury or suffering inflicted. In order to spare the civilian population, armed forces at all times must distinguish between civilian populations and civilian objectives on the one hand and military objectives on the other hand.

I think it is extremely important for us to state with pride that the American armed forces have gone out of their way to minimize or to eliminate what is typically called collateral damage, damage to civilian populations.

Since 1949, these and other protections have been critical in stopping at least some of the violence and abuse of both combatants and civilians. Through the good offices of the International Committee of the Red Cross, large numbers of American soldiers and citizens have been assisted in the invocation of these conventions.

In this connection, I want to pay tribute to Elizabeth Dole, who led the American Red Cross with such distinction over a long period of time. I urge all of my colleagues to vote for this 50th commemorative celebration of the Geneva Conventions.

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

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

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, this resolution celebrating the 50th anniversary of the Geneva Conventions of 1949 recognizes the important contributions the Geneva Conventions of 1949 made to international humanitarian law. Last August we observed the 50th anniversary of these treaties. During this century, we have seen the scope and devastation of conflict and warfare reach hitherto unimaginable bounds. In order to ameliorate the far reaching, devastating consequences of battle and conflict, the states parties to the Geneva Conventions have undertaken to recognize certain limitations and to humanize the laws of war. I commend the author of the measure the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON)

who through his own heroic experience as a POW during the Vietnam War has firsthand knowledge of the significance of these conventions. His North Vietnamese captors attempted to derogate from their obligations under the Geneva Conventions by injecting political issues into whether or not they had to be applied to U.S. airmen and other servicemen taken prisoner. Condemnation in the U.N. and elsewhere of its position forced Hanoi to apply these nonpolitical and humanitarian instruments regardless of any other political considerations.

Other provisions of the Geneva Conventions concerning the treatment of civilians during war or internal conflict have been shown by the events we have witnessed in this decade in the former Yugoslavia, in Central Africa and now in East Timor to be highly relevant. It is the Geneva Conventions that have by and large provided the basis for the indictment of numerous suspected war criminals by the Hague Tribunal. When these vital pieces of international humanitarian law are respected, the Geneva Conventions can and do temper the devastation of modern conflict. And when they are not, those violators who breach their provisions risk being considered as beyond the bounds of humanity, and the civilized world.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in the House to approve H. Con. Res. 102, calling for appropriate recognition of the 50th anniversary of the Geneva Conventions of 1949.

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

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EVANS).

Mr. EVANS. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON). As the ranking member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and a member of the Committee on Armed Services, the issues I deal with on a daily basis address the human costs exacted by war. Whether it be the millions of disabled veterans who still seek care from the VA or the innocent men, women and children who have been maimed by land mines, the scope of the carnage caused by war is breathtaking. We have come to take for granted that it is a barbaric enterprise, a part of the human condition that will always remain with us. However, the Geneva Conventions have helped bring some measure of sanity to the insanity we call war. It has helped to act as a safety net for the innocents of the world as well as foster respect for the basic human rights of combatants. While it has never by any stretch of the imagination been a perfect instrument, it is hard to imagine the pain and suffering that would have happened in our world without its existence.

If the Geneva Convention is to remain a living and important document, we must do all we can to ensure its relevance to the nations of the world and to all combatants. Today's resolution honoring the 50th anniversary of their creation will send an important message to the world that the United States believes in and embodies the humanitarian principles inherent in these accords.

I urge my colleagues to support this important resolution.

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

Mr. EVANS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SKELTON. I think the gentleman hit it right on the head when he used the phrase ''some measure of sanity.'' This, of course, is the very best in a very difficult world. But I wholeheartedly support this resolution and I compliment the gentleman on his comments. I thank the ranking member and the chairman for bringing this resolution to the floor. I certainly hope that it will pass, not only pass but do so unanimously.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me this time and want to say what a privilege it is to be in this Congress with him, he being one of the foremost champions of human rights not only in this Congress but throughout the world. I am very grateful for the commitment that he has made because if there are Members who exemplify what the Geneva Convention stands for in its unfolding of principles of humanity, it is the gentleman from California. I think we could also say that the esteemed chairman of the Committee on International Relations also is someone who celebrates these high principles.

I am certainly here in support of this resolution which celebrates the 50th anniversary of the Geneva Conventions.

□ 1330

It is important that we understand that the Geneva Conventions embody an agreement to try to bring principles of humanity into one of the most inhumane of circumstances in human conduct, the conduct of war, and Geneva Conventions brought together leaders from around the world 50 years ago with the express purpose of trying to find a way where, as we see a world slip into war, we could still say that there are some things that even in war are not going to be tolerated.

I have to say that in reflecting back in the last year in events which have been well publicized around the world I think it is important, when we speak of the Geneva Conventions, to also review the military objectives of NATO and Kosovo just 5 months ago which would seem to violate the very prohibition which the Geneva Convention has for deliberate attacks on civilians, and I cite from the Geneva Conventions here, Schedule 5, Article 52.1, which states that civilians shall not be the subject of an attack, while Schedule 6, Article 13.3, states, and I quote, civilians shall enjoy protection unless they take direct part in hostilities, end of quote.

Now the Conventions, in order for them to be effective must be applied to everyone whether we happen to like a given nation or not, and they would seem, if my colleagues read them, to apply to everyone in the world, including those Serbian civilians in Yugoslavia. For instance, Convention 4, Part 2, Article 13, states the provision of Part 2 covers the whole population of the countries in conflict without any adverse distinction based in particular on race, nationality, religion or political opinion and are intended to alleviate the sufferings caused by war, end of quote.

Well, we know for a fact that NATO targeted Serb civilians and civilian infrastructures. There is no one who would contest this now. For instance, the attack on the Serbian TV station caused the death of 20 civilians. NATO planes and missiles deliberately targeted the electric power infrastructure of Serbia. One State Department official has been quoted as saying that the attack on a TV station was intended to send a message to the Serbian populace, and this is a quote, to put pressure on the leadership to end this, unquote.

Now did NATO's aerial bombardment violate international humanitarian law as set forth in the Geneva Conventions of 1949? Did the bombing also violate the first additional protocol of 1977, which many of the NATO countries have ratified? The basic rule in Article 48 of Protocol 1 is that civilian populations and objects are to be distinguished from military objectives and that only military objectives are to be bombed. In addition, bombings which are intended to spread terror, and I will read that again, bombings which are intended to spread terror or attack civilian morale are expressly prohibited by Article 51. When NATO admittedly targeted the infrastructure of Yugoslavia, including water works, electricity plants, bridges, factories, television and radio locations in efforts to harm the morale of the people and to get them to overthrow their leadership, I wonder if NATO considered Article 51 which prohibited such actions.

NATO also targeted civilians when it attacked the Serbian TV station killing 20 civilians. Rules 51 and 57 also prohibit attacks on military targets that will cause excessive civilian deaths and prohibit disproportionate indiscriminate attacks. NATO bombing caused excessive loss of life and injury to civilians and possibly killed thousands.

Now we should celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Geneva Conventions and pass this legislation, but our words will ring hollow when our actions contradict them. Let us follow up this resolution with a study that honestly and

independently determines how, if at all, recent military action in Kosovo contravened the Geneva Conventions.

I urge passage of the resolution.

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

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

I would like to make a comment concerning my good friend's observations concerning NATO's participation in the recent hostilities in the former Yugoslavia.

Mr. Speaker, probably at no time in military history has there been such a deliberate attempt to minimize civilian casualties as was the case on the part of NATO. As a matter of fact, the NATO command went out of its way, even jeopardizing its own pilots, to minimize to the maximum possible extent civilian casualties. But I think it is self-evident that in a society where civilian and military facilities and infrastructure are intertwined and adjacent and contiguous the notion that warfare can be conducted without any civilian casualties is simply not realistic. The Geneva Convention makes a very clear distinction between tragic civilian casualties, unintended, inadvertent, and the deliberate punishment, maiming, killing of civilians. Let the record show that at no time did NATO do anything to deliberately injure civilians.

Now I think a special comment needs to be made with respect to Milosevic's television facilities. As any dictator, Milosevic has used the propaganda apparatus of the Serbian television network to spread falsehood, rumors, disinformation, thereby prolonging this tragic war. It would have been unthinkable for NATO not to take out Serbian television, and the post mortems following the conclusion of military activities has concluded as one of the main criticisms of NATO's action that the television facilities were not taken out earlier. I think we need to draw a very sharp line of demarcation between the deliberate injuring of civilians and the inevitable civilian losses which are entailed in military activities.

NATO must indeed be proud of its extraordinary efforts to protect all civilians and all civilian facilities. Railroad stations, bridges, radio stations, television stations are part and parcel of today's war, and to attempt to conduct a war where military and civilian facilities are so inextricably intertwined, as they are in all modern industrialized societies, is simply absurd. I think it is incumbent upon all of us not to misread or misinterpret the Geneva Conventions. The Geneva Conventions deal with deliberate injury, maiming and killing of civilians. The Geneva Conventions realistically understand that in the tragic event of war there will be civilian casualties, and that is what happened in the case of the Kosovo encounter.

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

Mr. LANTOS. I yield to my good friend from Ohio.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that one of the great celebrations that NATO had in this conflict was its ability to precisely target certain facilities, notwithstanding the unfortunate episode at the Chinese embassy, and that being the case, NATO together with the intelligence it was receiving absolutely understood that there were civilians in that TV station.

Now I respectfully submit that Rules 51 and 57 in this Convention, which the gentleman and I both agree ought to be honored, prohibits attacks on military targets which would cause excessive civilian deaths, and while we could engage in a debate on, I suppose, what would constitute excessive civilian deaths, I humbly submit the possibility that NATO may have gone along the line of challenging this very provision which is in the Geneva Convention, and I think that the gentleman and I both agree in our service in this Congress that we want to see the highest principles of humanity upheld, and we both understand how terribly difficult it is for all of us to have to grapple with the decisions that are made during a war because I think we would both agree that war is something that needs to be avoided at all cost, and when it is finally something that is enacted, that we observe the Geneva Conventions.

My statement here on this floor is to point out that while we can all admire the ideals that are expressed in the Geneva Conventions that it is important, I think, to review a recent history which may suggest that the Geneva Conventions could be fully exemplified in the conduct of combatants.

I would agree with the gentleman from California that Mr. Milosevic is not someone who at any point ought to be regarded for his role in this. He has certainly done everything he can to undermine democracy and freedom and Serbia, and I think we would all agree that he ought to be ousted. But the people who are Serbian civilians who had no role in supporting the Milosevic regime and in some cases tried to overturn him ought to be accorded the full privileges of that same Convention which we would accord to all other nations in the world, and I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for his indulgence and his kindness.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague and friend for his comments, and let me just conclude by saying that the Chairman of our Joint Chiefs, General Shelton, General Wesley Clark, the head of NATO, are no less committed to fully observing the Geneva Conventions than are all the Members of this body, and with that, Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to stand in support of H. Con. Res. 102, introduced by my friend, the Vietnam War hero from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON), celebrating the 50th anniversary of the Geneva Conventions.

This is not a theoretical matter for me. I know this is not a theoretical or abstract matter for the sponsor of this resolution. This resolution is about saving and honoring the lives of men and women who risk their lives in service to their country, and their families, and the innocent civilian victims of warfare.

I came precariously close to needing the protections of the Geneva Conventions myself.

On May 10, 1972, I flew my 300th air mission over Vietnam. I downed three North Vietnamese MiGs that day; together with the two I had previously shot down, I had just become the first U.S. Navy Ace of the Vietnam War. I was making the turn back home when forty miles inland, my F–4 Phantom was severely damaged by an enemy surface-to-air missile. I barrel-rolled that airplane until we reached the mouth of the Red River. My RIO, Willie Driscoll, and I ejected just as the Phantom exploded.

As we floated down to the water, there was no bravado, no silk scarf, no Benson and Hedges. I was scared to death. I saw the Viet Cong approaching my landing place from the beach. But I was blessed to be rescued by Americans. The Viet Cong did not capture me. I was spared the fate of my colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON), of being a prisoner of war. We are all in his debt.

These individual stories, of people whose lives were risked in war, and of people who were taken prisoner in war, point to the justification for the Geneva Conventions. It is that war is between nations, not between individual men and women; and that the men and women who risk their lives in war should be honored and treated with respect and dignity by the combatant nations involved.

Two miles west of the floor of this House lies ''the wall,'' the Vietnam Veterans Memorial. On its surface are the names of the men and women who gave their last full measure of devotion to their country during the war in Indochina. Each of them had parents and loved ones. Many had siblings and families of their own. The names of these family members and loved ones are not inscribed on the Wall, but in their grief, they are also casualties of the Vietnam War.

For them, and for the men and women serving America's armed forces today, the Geneva Conventions are very real. They mean the difference between life and death. They define the difference between a civilized world, and barbarism.

The Geneva Conventions, and the international organization that helps implement them, the Red Cross, deserve the honor of Congress today.

I am grateful to my friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON) for sponsoring this resolution, and I urge all Members to support it.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 102.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

COMMENDING GREECE AND TURKEY FOR PROVIDING EACH OTHER HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE AND RESCUE RELIEF AFTER RECENT EARTHQUAKES

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 188) commending Greece and Turkey for their mutual and swift response to the recent earthquakes in both countries by providing to each other humanitarian assistance and rescue relief.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 188

Whereas Greece and Turkey, two longstanding allies of the United States and North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) partners, have each recently suffered devastating earthquakes;

Whereas Greece and Turkey have unresolved issues that have led to tensions in the past;

Whereas Greece and Turkey, in an unprecedented fashion, were the first to respond to these tragedies by providing their neighboring country with humanitarian assistance and rescue relief that ultimately reduced the number of casualties;

Whereas Greece and Turkey were successful in putting aside their differences in order to respond swiftly to these crises; and

Whereas Greece and Turkey have held successful talks to begin to resolve their issues of disagreement: Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) commends Greece and Turkey for their mutual and swift response to the recent earthquakes in both countries by providing to each other humanitarian assistance and rescue relief;

(2) encourages the United States to continue its efforts in aiding both countries as they seek to rebuild after these tragedies;

(3) recognizes the renewed spirit of cooperation and the importance of the talks between Greece and Turkey; and

(4) encourages Greece and Turkey to persevere in resolving outstanding issues between the two countries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this measure.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GILMAN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The earthquake which devastated Turkey last August, Mr. Speaker, produced a swift reaction in neighboring Greece. Putting aside their bitter and longstanding political differences, the people and government of Greece responded to their neighbor's plight with generous humanitarian assistance and support.

□ 1345

The significance of this response by Greece did not go unnoticed or unwelcomed in Turkey, as the Turkish government as well as media commented very positively about Greece's quick response to this tragedy. In September, a strong but fortunately less destructive earthquake struck Athens, and Turkey was the first nation to respond in assistance in the form of search and rescue teams to locate survivors.

In the aftermath of those two natural disasters, the Greek and Turkish foreign ministers have been meeting and agreed to continue discussions building on the new-found good will between the Greek and Turkish people aimed at resolving the issues that have produced tensions between these two NATO allies of our Nation.

I commend the cochairs of our Hellenic Issues Caucus, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), for recognizing the significance of this thaw in relations between our two important allies in the Eastern Mediterranean and for their initiative which puts the Congress on record in support of continuing the dialogue between Greece and Turkey so that all outstanding differences can be resolved. I also thank the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), a senior member of our committee and chairman of the Committee on Government Reform, also an original cosponsor of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, we are now entering a critical stage for ensuring a peaceful future in that region of the Eastern Mediterranean. Next month, President Clinton will be visiting this region, and we hope he is going to use that occasion to make very clear to the government of Turkey our desire to see a settlement of a dispute in Cyprus on which Turkey needs to demonstrate a greater degree of flexibility.

We also hope that the President will make clear our interests in seeing that Turkey becomes accepted fully into the European Union when it meets the requirements of membership. There should be no discrimination against Turkey in that regard. In the interim, Mr. Speaker, our government should do everything we can to assist and encourage the process of reconciliation between Greece and Turkey.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support the new spirit of reconciliation between Greece and Turkey and to unanimously adopt H. Con. Res. 188.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge all of my colleagues to give their strong support H. Con. Res. 188. It rarely happens in the course of human events that two historic enemies, through misfortune and tragedy such as an earthquake, suddenly find themselves looking at each other with a different set of eyes. This is what is happening with respect to Greece and Turkey.

We have grown accustomed over decades and generations to view Greece and Turkey as irreconcilable opponents and even enemies, this despite the fact that they both are members of NATO; this despite the fact that both have excellent relations with the United States. The tragic earthquake has brought together these two historic opponents.

I want to pay strong tribute to the leadership in both countries and express the hope on behalf of all of my colleagues that the beginnings of a more benign dialogue between Greece and Turkey might just be a harbinger of a new era to come. This will require a great deal of understanding, a great deal of acceptance on both sides; but for the first time in modern history, we see responsible Greek officials like the foreign minister making kind statements about Turkey and vice-versa.

Such a development, Mr. Speaker, would not only be in the interests of these two countries and the stability of Europe and the cohesion of NATO, but it would be of tremendous value to United States national interests. It is our earnest hope that this tragic set of events, acts of nature, might have brought together these two formerly opposed countries, and I strongly urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

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

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, in the place of the chairman of the committee, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), the cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time and for the cooperation of the gentleman and his committee and his staff on this piece of legislation. As a sponsor of the bill, I rise to urge my colleagues, as others have done, to support H. Con. Res. 188.

Mr. Speaker, this bill commends Greece and Turkey for their mutual and swift humanitarian assistance to one another following two devastating earthquakes which rattled these two neighbors. Tensions between these two countries have always been high, and they have come to the brink of war on more than a few occasions. Although they share a history strong with conflicts, devastation and war, they revealed to the world that, in time of need, all human lives carry the same weight.

In this devastating time, Greece and Turkey were successful in putting aside their differences in order to provide assistance for all those people who were injured, buried under the rubble,

or left homeless by the earthquakes. Each country sent rescue workers, doctors, life saving equipment, blankets, and other forms of humanitarian aid to their neighbor. Greeks donated blood and provided schooling to Turkish students, all in the name of saving lives and building bonds of friendship, squashing previous animosity.

The acts of humanity that these countries have shown towards one another have generated a new favorable world sentiment. They prove once again that we can achieve a more peaceful future for our people, our world, and our planet, through good will, communications, and cooperation.

In recent months, government leaders and private businessmen from both countries have been meeting in the hopes of focusing on the similarities, rather than their differences, in order to forge a new positive relationship. They are presently holding their third round of talks on issues that affect both countries. These negotiations have created a feeling of optimism that these two nations will finally be able to resolve their differences.

Mr. Speaker, we need to send a message to Greece and Turkey that we recognize this renewed spirit of cooperation and the importance of the talks between them. We should encourage Greece and Turkey to persevere in resolving their outstanding issues.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud the actions of these two governments and these two peoples. I ask my colleagues to join me in commending Greece and Turkey for their heroic and achievements by supporting H. Con. Res. 188. Let this be a lesson to us all.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, before yielding to my good friend from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), I would like to pay tribute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), and my good friend, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), for their leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), one of the most distinguished Members of this body and a strong leader on the Committee on International Relations.

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, let me also commend the gentleman from California for the outstanding work he has done in being the conscience and the historian to this body. On many questions that come up, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) is always there with a historical and accurate display of what happened; and as long as we remember the past, then we can perhaps avoid problems in the future.

I stand to add my support to H. Con. Res. 188, commending Greece and Turkey for their mutual and swift response to the recent earthquakes in both countries by providing each other with humanitarian assistance and relief. I think that it shows that there are more similarities in people than differences, and sometimes leaders create differences that should not be there.

For Greece to respond immediately to the terrible earthquake in Turkey, to go there to help people in need and then having a similar situation, not quite the magnitude, but Turkey responding very quickly to Greece, I think hopefully could set the framework. Sometimes out of tragedy comes positive things, and perhaps this may well may be a welcoming situation so that leaders of both countries can see they have so much in common.

They are both supporters of NATO; they both are against extremist elements in the region. They both are supportive of a strong European Union, so people not only in Western Europe but Eastern Europe and throughout that region will be able to prosper.

I think both countries have a lot in common because they both have been so prominent in the growth and development of the world. The great Greek Empire that gave us philosophers like Aristide and Socrates, and the whole foundation of democracy which was started by the Greek society, and then another great empire, taken, of course, by force, but also showed great leadership with the Ottoman Empire that lasted for many, many years. So two great nations, two nations that have had so much to do with the growth and development of the world as we know it today should not be at each other's throats.

We know of the unfortunate situation, and there was enough blame to go around in the 1970s when the problem in Cyprus occurred, and neither side's hands were totally clean. But 25 years later we should come to some resolution to that problem. We should admit that perhaps there were problems created by both sides; but we should no longer, as we move into a new millennium, talk about an issue that happened 25 years ago.

Cypriots, whether they are Greek or Turkish, are basically the same. They really do not even see differences in one another. So if we could get the original Cyprus people together and they talk together as Cypriots, not as Greeks or Turkish, I think we would see perhaps a resolution of this problem.

So I am in strong support and commend those who are active in the Helenic Caucus, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), and my good friend, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), and also once again say that I think that it is possible for us to come up with a resolution.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), the chairman of the Committee on Government Reform.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), with whom I have had some differences on the Turkish-Greek issue over the years, for being a primary sponsor on this bill, along with the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), who came to me and we sat down and talked about it, and the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) for her contribution. I also want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), with whom I have become quite a good friend over the last couple weeks and months.

So maybe the millennium is coming, and even my good friend, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), we are all becoming closer. I guess the millennium is getting closer by the day. I do not think they are quite as bad as I thought they once were, and hopefully they do not think I am quite as bad as they once thought I was.

But this resolution I think is extremely important because it sends a signal from the Congress of the United States to both Greek and Turkish governmental leaders about how we feel about their spirit of cooperation.

Sometimes out of bad comes good, and the terrible tragedy that occurred in Turkey showed that Greek citizens and Greek governmental leaders were concerned about their fellow human beings in Turkey who were suffering. Two or three weeks later there was a terrible earthquake in Greece, and the Turkish government and the Turkish people reciprocated in kind. So an era of good feeling has evolved out of this.

It is the kind of thing that sparks warmth in the human heart, when you see enemies who have come close to being at war with one another three times in the last 25 years working together because people are hurting.

□ 1400

Since that time, there have been three steps, four steps that have been taken by the two governments which are very positive. The two countries decided to form a joint emergency response team to deal with natural disasters. The Greek and Turkish diplomats have held a series of meetings over the past 2 months on issues such as cooperation in culture, tourism, environment, and combatting crime.

During a meeting of the EU foreign ministers that was held in September, Greece expressed its support for Turkey's membership in the European Union. These are great steps in the right direction.

This resolution will not gloss over the fact that there are still strong differences on the issue of Cyprus, and those issues long-term are going to have to be resolved. Both sides are going to have to sit down and work out their differences.

But make no mistake about it, steps in the right direction have been taken

by both Greece and Turkey. We applaud that in the Congress. We would like to see it continue. We want to work with both countries to make sure it continues. We want to congratulate them today for their efforts on behalf of each other in times of great crisis for their two countries.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, it rarely happens that a freshman Member of this body makes as powerful an impact on our work as my good friend, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for not only his leadership but his humanity, and for being a mentor to me on international and human rights issues in the short time that I have been a Member of Congress.

I am honored and pleased to join my colleagues today in commending in this resolution Greece and Turkey in their mutual and prompt responses to earthquakes in both countries.

On August 17, in the middle of the night, Turkey experienced an earthquake that claimed thousands of lives and destroyed thousands of buildings. For a country of any size, a tragic event like this one requires the help of the international community. Rescue workers from Greece were the first to respond to Turkey's urgent situation.

On September 7, an earthquake occurred in Greece. The earthquake in Greece also caused numerous deaths and damage to property, and despite the strains of rebuilding after its own catastrophe, Turkey was the first country to react by sending rescue personnel and other resources.

Both of these countries showed a real commitment to humanitarian values and to each other. When individuals were in need and the lives of millions of human beings were at stake, these two countries put aside their differences and without hesitation did their best to help each other through a difficult time. The prompt and generous support exchanged between these two longtime allies of the United States and NATO members led to a welcomed warming of relations that serves as a valuable lesson to the global community.

It is important for the United States and the world to remain committed to helping Greece and Turkey through this difficult time of rebuilding. I look forward to doing so, and to witnessing continuing discussions between the Turkish and Greek governments to work out their remaining differences on other issues.

Again, I commend our allies, Greece and Turkey, and I look forward to working with them in the years to come. I would also like to commend and offer thanks to my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), the sponsor of this legislation, and the chairman and ranking Democratic Member of the Committee on International Relations for helping to bring this bill to the floor, and the other cosponsors of this legislation, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON).

Finally, I wish to extend my sincere condolences to the families of the victims of these two tragic events. I urge all Members to support this measure.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific of the Committee on International Relations.

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this resolution, and thank the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I had an opportunity to speak on this resolution when it was before the Committee on International Relations, and I also would like to convey the fact that I speak as the chairman of the House delegation to the NATO Parliamentary Assembly.

Greece and Turkey are two valuable and highly valued members of the NATO alliance as far as the United States is concerned. We have been concerned for some time about the obvious friction that has existed between these two NATO allies. We also have been very concerned about the fact that the European Union slammed the door in the face of Turkey when they provided their initial interest, expression of interest, in becoming a member, eventually, of the European Union, in part, allegedly because of Greek opposition to such membership.

Out of the adversity, out of the tragedy of the earthquake that occurred in Turkey, Greece responded in a wonderful neighborly fashion. It was well received by the Turkish people and the Turkish government. It has provided an opportunity for improved relationships between these two valuable countries, and I want to commend both the government of Greece and the government of Turkey for the way in which they have reacted to the adversity.

As mentioned perhaps a few minutes ago, when later a less severe earthquake took place in Greece, Turkey was quick to respond. Indeed, Turkey sent earthquake teams to Taiwan when they had their recent earthquake.

I do hope, as the gentleman from New York (Chairman GILMAN) said, that this will lead us to an opportunity for further cooperation and for reaching a peaceful settlement of the long-standing dispute related to Cyprus between Greece and Turkey, and that it in general will provide an opportunity for increased cooperation and friendships between those two countries.

So at a time when we often come to the House floor to lament things that are happening, it is good to commend our friends in Greece and Turkey for the extraordinary conduct that they have displayed in the wake of the recent tragedy.

I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), who has brought to this body potent powers of persuasion and the commitment to decency and human rights across the globe.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding time to me, and for his leadership in this body on so many important issues, both humanitarian, international, and just plain good policies for the United States of America.

As co-chair of the Congressional Caucus for Hellenic Issues and as an original sponsor of this legislation, I rise in strong support of resolution 188.

I would first like to thank the other co-chair of the Hellenic Caucus, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), for his support on this legislation and his continued good work on behalf of the people in Greece and Cyprus.

I would also like to thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) for his leadership on this issue and many others, and my colleague, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), for working with us to develop this legislation; and of course my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), for bringing this bill quickly to the floor, along with the assistance and support of the ranking member, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON).

This resolution commends Greece and Turkey for their quick and measured response to each other in their time of great need. When the terrible earthquake struck Turkey in August, Greece was the first country, the absolute first country to send in planes and their very best military unit to provide aid. Just weeks later, Turkey returned the gesture of caring, humanitarian feelings, and friendship by immediately responding to the earthquake in Greece with aid in tow.

I have also heard accounts and read in the papers that during this terrible aftermath of the earthquake, that Turkish papers printed for the first time Greek headlines thanking their friends in Greece for coming to help them in their great time of need. This was especially important because there has been great animosity between the two countries, great conflicts. Yet, in the hands of tragedy, these two countries reached across their often turbulent past with humanitarian aid and as helping friends.

While this is a great step forward, we must continue to reach out to our allies, Greece and Turkey, to help them to build their relationship together.

The recently witnessed good will between the two countries will not continue if they do not continue to build a dialogue and foundation between the two countries.

After the earthquakes, there were meetings that took place between the foreign ministers, foreign minister George Papandreou and the Greek foreign minister, Mr. Cem, on the disputes in the Aegean, in the disputes over Cyprus. They have been trying to work together for some just resolution. We really want to applaud their work, and hope that they will build a better foundation for future relations.

The international community has seen the signs of these two countries working together, and we need to encourage them to continue this good will in resolving their ongoing differences in the ongoing talks they are having. We urge them to continue to resolve the conflicts between them. Once the dust settles from the earthquake, the problems of yesterday will still be there unless they build a lasting relationship.

I really feel very strongly about the possibility of reaching a solution based on the foundation that they are building. Both Greece and Turkey are important U.S. allies. It is important also because the President hopes to visit these two countries, and hopefully he can be part of an ongoing effort to resolve some of the disputes between them.

At this point I rise to applaud the two countries, and really to applaud my colleagues for bringing this issue to the floor.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 188.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

URGING AN END OF THE WAR BETWEEN ERITREA AND ETHIOPIA

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 46) urging an end of the war between Eritrea and Ethiopia and calling on the United Nations Human Rights Commission and other human rights organizations to investigate human rights abuses in connection with the Eritrean and Ethiopian conflict.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 46

Whereas peace and stability existed between Eritrea and Ethiopia following the 1991 ouster of the Mengistu dictatorship and the independence of Eritrea in 1993;

Whereas on May 6, 1998, a military confrontation erupted between Eritrea and Ethiopia, resulting in the deaths of thousands of civilians and the reported forced detention or deportation of over 60,000 people;

Whereas hundreds of thousands of Eritreans and Ethiopians have been displaced from their homes as a result of this conflict;

Whereas the governments of the United States and Rwanda, the Organization of African Unity (OAU), as well as countries in the region, immediately put forth proposals for resolving the conflict;

Whereas on September 9, 1998, Congress passed H. Con. Res. 292 commending efforts by the United States facilitation team to resolve the crisis, including its success in brokering a moratorium on air raids, and calling on Eritrea and Ethiopia to end the conflict peacefully before it escalated into a full-scale war;

Whereas on December 17, 1998, the Central Organ Summit of the OAU approved a Framework Agreement in furtherance of its efforts to mediate the dispute between the 2 parties and provide an avenue for peace;

Whereas on January 29, 1999, the United Nations Security Council adopted Resolution 1226 expressing its strong support for the OAU Framework Agreement, and calling on both parties to work for a reduction in tensions by adopting policies leading to the restoration of confidence between the governments and peoples of Eritrea and Ethiopia, including urgent measures to improve the humanitarian situation and respect for human rights;

Whereas the Government of the United States, the OAU, and countries in the region have been engaged in an intensive effort to identify a peaceful solution to the conflict;

Whereas on February 6, 1999, while sustained diplomatic efforts by the international community were ongoing, the moratorium on air strikes was violated and war once again erupted between Eritrea and Ethiopia;

Whereas on February 10, 1999, the United Nations Security Council passed Resolution 1227 condemning the use of force by Eritrea and Ethiopia, stressing that the OAU Framework Agreement remains a viable and sound basis for peaceful resolution of the conflict, and calling once again on both countries to ensure the safety of the civilian population and respect for human rights and international humanitarian law;

Whereas the governments of Eritrea and Ethiopia have enjoyed warm relations with the United States and have stated their commitment to a peaceful resolution of the conflict based on the OAU Framework Agreement; and

Whereas the peoples of Eritrea and Ethiopia have suffered for decades due to war and manmade famines and do not deserve once again to suffer due to armed conflict, which could destabilize the entire subregion of Africa: Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) deplores the escalation of the conflict between Eritrea and Ethiopia which has resulted in the massive and senseless loss of life, as well as substantial economic hardship to the peoples of Eritrea and Ethiopia;

(2) strongly urges both Eritrea and Ethiopia immediately to bring an end to the violence between the 2 countries;

(3) commends the efforts of the Organization of African Unity (OAU) and former United States National Security Adviser Anthony Lake to mediate peace between Eritrea and Ethiopia;

(4) strongly affirms United States support for the OAU Framework Agreement; and

(5) calls on the United Nations Human Rights Commission and all human rights organizations to investigate human rights abuses in connection with the forced detentions, deportations, and displacements of populations caused by this conflict.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) each will control 20 minutes.

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

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this measure.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, this resolution was authored by my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL). It urges an end to the 17-month-long war between Eritrea and Ethiopia. That war has resulted in the loss of more than 70,000 lives. This resolution calls for an investigation of human rights abuses in connection with that conflict.

I want to share with the Members here today that both Ethiopia and Eritrea continue to obtain arms. They continue to train troops, they continue to mobilize, and they continue to engage in a furious propaganda war. Frankly, the conflict is spreading. It is spreading into Somalia. The international community, including those calling for debt relief, have to say at this point, enough. That is what the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) attempts to do with this resolution.

□ 1415

Hopefully, this resolution will help to bring home to both sides in that conflict that Congress has lost patience with Eritrea and Congress has lost patience with Ethiopia. We have lost patience with the intransigence that keeps a war going that neither side can afford.

This resolution recognizes the OAU framework. It provides an equitable basis to end the devastating conflict.

I would like to commend not only the author, the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL), but the other members of the Subcommittee on Africa as well that worked on this resolution, and specifically the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), the ranking member.

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

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

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 46 and would like to commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the chairman of the committee, and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON), the ranking member on the Committee on International Relations, for bringing this resolution swiftly to the floor of the House.

Let me also thank the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), chairman of the committee, and the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL), the prime sponsor of this resolution, for their tireless work on behalf of the continent of Africa.

H. Con. Res. 46 says briefly that the Nations of Eritrea and Ethiopia should end their border war and that the United Nations Human Rights Commission and other human rights groups should investigate human rights abuses that have been perpetrated on the people of those two countries.

It also deplores the escalation of conflict between Ethiopia and Eritrea, which has resulted in massive loss of lives and substantial economic hardship. The resolution urges both countries immediately to bring an end to violence.

The resolution goes on to commend the Organization for African Unity and former U.S. National Security Advisor, Mr. Anthony Lake, and our Assistant Secretary for African affairs, Dr. Susan Rice, for their efforts to mediate this conflict along with the OAU and other world leaders.

This resolution strongly affirms the United States support of the OAU framework for peace and calls upon the UN Human Rights Commission and all human rights organizations to investigate human rights abuses in connection with the tensions, deportations, and displacement of the population.

This war has been going on for 1½ years and has gone on too long. I have known and do know both President Isaias of Eritrea and Prime Minister Meles of Ethiopia for some time. I have visited both of them in their countries on several occasions. They both are outstanding, bright leaders. So it makes no sense that two persons who have known each other, distantly related, can continue on with a war of this nature.

I had the privilege first to visit Ethiopia back under the rule of the former emperor of Ethiopia, His Excellency, Mr. Haile Selassie. It was the people like the Mengistu who took Ethiopia down the wrong path, but people like Meles and Isaias fought against the brutal dictator and dispelled him from the country. After successfully ousting Mengistu, Ethiopia gave Eritrea an opportunity to vote for its independence in 1993, following an internationally monitored referendum.

As my colleagues may know, the original vote was supposed to occur in 1962, but was never called. But we give credit to Prime Minister Meles for allowing the vote to go forward, and Eritrea voted to separate itself.

So I would just hope that this war would end. I would like to encourage the Algerian government to continue its efforts as a mediator in the conflict. The former Prime Minister of Algeria is convening a meeting this week to once again attempt to bring both sides together.

Last week, I had an opportunity to speak with the Honorable Dawit Yohannes, Speaker of the House of the People's Republic of Ethiopia, and I encouraged his government to review again the OAU document, outlining a ceasefire and urged them to accept it.

Both Ethiopia and Eritrea have undermined their respective economic development gains by engaging in a war that has cost both sides over $100 million, and some estimates claim that as many as 70,000 lives have been lost in this World War I type trench warfare. Civilian casualties are also very high, but the numbers are unknown.

The Ethiopian and Eritrean conflict has hindered the United States' effort and curtailed our efforts to try to work against the Islamic fundamentalist government in Sudan that have been dealing with terrorists from Yemen and has been destabilizing northern Kenya.

The IGAD peace process, chaired by Mr. Moi, has, as its members, both Ethiopia and Eritrea and Uganda, all embroiled in wars. So therefore peace cannot be negotiated in Sudan when these are conflicted themselves.

So this war must end. It has put an end to our ACRI, the African Crisis Response Initiative, which was being trained in Ethiopia, which will once again set back peacekeeping on the continent.

This war has taken a heavy toll on both sides of the conflict. It threatens to induce famine in Ethiopia and Eritrea and Sudan. Last year, the lack of adequate food put 2.6 million people in harm's way because of that.

In conclusion, let me say that I am pleased by the swift, quick, and decisive action taken, once again, by Tony Lake and Dr. Rice, and I encourage them to continue to promote a political settlement.

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL), who has invested so much personal time and energy in attempting to resolve this conflict.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa, for yielding me this time and for his complimentary words.

Mr. Speaker, I also recognize that, but for the subcommittee chair, we would not have this on the floor today. I once again recognize his depth of compassion and commitment to Africa as he has shown throughout this Congress.

I also begin with my recognition of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) in all that he has done to educate me and our other colleagues in the Congress on this very important issue.

Two years ago, my wife and I, with the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) spent Thanksgiving in Asmara, Eritrea. We traveled to Keren, to Masawa. We traveled as widely as we could in Eritrea.

We stayed, then, for an additional week in Ethiopia. We visited, of course, the capital of Addis Ababa, but also Lalibela, Axum, Mekele, and went to the banks of Lake Tana.

We learned of a people that are remarkable, who have achieved so much, the people in Ethiopia who were never colonized, a people who were Christian from the time of the apostles, who have a patriarch, whose Orthodox Church is a powerful force within a country for compassion and respect for human rights.

Yet, these two countries have chosen to go to war, to spend what precious little treasure and human resources they have to kill each other. That is what war is, and that is what they have chosen to do.

I cannot fully express the sadness that comes to my heart and that of my wife as we reflect on the people that we met throughout Eritrea and Ethiopia. We were met at the remote airports by little children bringing flowers because a visit by a Member of the United States Congress is a rare occasion there. I wonder, were any of them killed? Did the bomb that fell on Mekele kill any of those little school children?

Then I think of the people in Ethiopia of Eritrean extraction who were herded together and put forcibly on buses and transported up to the border with Eritrea, where they had no means to take care of themselves. I wonder about the human rights conditions of those forcibly deported.

Then I hear of expressions on the radio that will sow the seeds of resentment for years to come, that will inflict wounds, that will prevent rapprochement following the end of this war.

To my colleagues in Congress, I can only offer my own sadness, my own words of severe disappointment. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) and I know how hard it is to draw the attention of our colleagues in Congress to the sufferings of the people in Africa.

When something like this happens, it only plays into the hands of those who would look away, those who would say, well, that is just one African group going after another African group.

Would we ever say that about Europe, by the way? Would we ever describe World War I or World War II as

just one European tribe going after another European tribe? Of course we would not. Yet there are those who might say so about Africa and turn their back. We do not turn our back, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) and I and the other members of the Committee on International Relations who bring this to the floor. I know that our colleagues taking part in this debate do not turn their back.

So that is the most important purpose of this resolution, to say that we do not turn our back. We are deeply troubled at the continuation of the war. We tell both countries, Mr. Speaker, that, as this war continues, the ability of those of goodwill who wish to see American help go to those most in need in Africa is compromised, is severely compromised by reason of this war.

I warn those whose interests are with those two countries that we will not be successful in the near term in augmenting interest and assistance because of the recollection of the war.

Second, this resolution calls for international human rights organizations to investigate the human rights abuses. By this, let me be specific. I was not heretofore, but today on the floor I wish to be specific. It is a human rights abuse for Ethiopia to round up Eritreans on the grossest use of stereotype that, because they are of Eritrean birth, they cannot be trusted, even though the two countries were one at the time of the birth of almost all of those individuals. These human rights abuses must be inspected.

This resolution calls upon the United Nations Human Rights Commission and all human rights organizations to investigate these human rights abuses. That is what Ethiopia has to account for because they have continued this war. My condemnation for that is serious.

I, of course, also mention Eritrea for having its role in the start of this war. I do not try to decide in these few moments who is most at fault. I simply observe with great sadness the difficulty that we have because of this war.

I conclude, Mr. Speaker, with a word of thanks again to the gentleman from New York (Chairman GILMAN), to the gentleman from California (Chairman ROYCE), to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), and to the administration.

There have been occasions when I have had to express my opposition to the administration. This is not one. I have nothing but admiration for their work, particularly of Assistant Secretary of State Susan Rice.

I urge an end to this war so that, when my wife and I return to Asmara and Addis Ababa, we might see those children grown up, knowing something other than war.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS).

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I will just take a minute of the body's time to express my strong support for the resolution as the Democratic cochair of the Congressional Human Rights Caucus. I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL).

I also want to take this occasion to pay tribute to both of these gentlemen for having devoted such an extraordinary portion of their personal and congressional time and energy to improving conditions in Africa. Both of them have been leaders in this field, and they deserve our highest commendation.

I know that the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) and his wife have devoted untold numbers of days to dealing with problems of Africa, and they fully deserve our thanks and our commendation, as does the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE).

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

Mr. Speaker, this is an important resolution. My colleagues have spoken eloquently about this tragic conflict. I can ensure them that what the U.S. Congress says about this conflict matters.

□ 1430

Eritrea and Ethiopia are listening to our expression of enough is enough. Compromise is needed. And as my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL), stated this conflict severely undermines U.S. support for these countries. With that in mind, I urge support of the resolution.

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. SNYDER).

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege back in July to visit Africa, to visit both Eritrea and Ethiopia. This is an interest of mine that began back in 1985 when I worked as a doctor in a refugee camp on the Ethiopian, Eritrean, Sudanese border during the great drought and war that was going on at that time.

I am very much aware, Mr. Speaker, that there is nothing more dangerous than a Member of Congress who has read a book or made a trip; but if I might, let me make a few comments following that visit. First of all, this is a country of 65 million people. It is not a tiny nation. It is a very significant portion of the continent of Africa.

These two nations are in one of the poorest areas of the world, in the Horn of Africa, but there has been remarkable efforts made since 1991, the end of the civil war against the Marxist military dictatorship that ruled both Eritrea and Ethiopia, and I saw evidence of this development. New schools, new industry, new colleges, community organizations working very hard on both sides on what they know to be their number one enemy, which is poverty. This has continued through 1993, and after 1993, when the peaceful separation of Eritrea from Ethiopia occurred and Eritrea achieved independence.

But then May of 1998 came along, and we had this horrific war. And let me repeat it is a horrific war that involves over 65 million people. It is entrenched warfare that has involved infantry assaults against fixed positions at a level not seen on this Earth in decades. There has been very, very high death rates among the wounded and there has been a high rate of wounded.

I visited the front one time, on one day for about an hour, on the Badime Plain. It was quiet then, as it has been now for several months. We could see remnants of burned-out tanks and were told that there were still corpses down below. But the problem will be what happens now that the rains are ending and the terrain is drying out. And that is the fear in those countries, but also the fear in Africa that this war will again renew itself.

I have visited with both Prime Minister Meles of Ethiopia and President Isaias in Eritrea. Both are patriots who care deeply about their countries, but so far they have been unsuccessful in their abilities to end this war together.

But it is interesting the amount of agreement on both sides. Both sides agree that this has been a horrific war with heavy losses on both sides. Both sides agree that this war has delayed development and delayed the fight against the ultimate enemy of the Horn of Africa, which is poverty. Both sides agree that eventually there will be an agreement, and both sides will work together once again on development together. Both sides agree that they want the world community to assist them in ending this war.

Now, that seems to me to be a lot of agreement and a lot of fertile ground for ending a war. But, unfortunately, to this date, it has not occurred.

This Congress does not have the specific answer on how to end this war. We are not diplomats. But this Congress and the American people do have great interest in seeing this terrible war end. I was optimistic at the end of July and August, and even into September, that progress was being made. Now I am not so optimistic, and I fear, as the rains have ended, that we may be seeing the signs of war renewing itself once again.

I hope the peacemakers will keep making peace. I hope the war fighters will hold off, even as the terrain dries. I support this resolution. One part of it I do disagree with, and perhaps it is an editing error, the resolution refers to thousands of civilian deaths. Personally, myself, I did not see evidence of thousands of civilian deaths. I saw evidence of thousands of internally displaced persons. But perhaps the resolution meant to say the deaths of thousands of soldiers.

But I support the underlying intent of this resolution, which is to encourage an end to this terrible war between Eritrea and Ethiopia and appreciate the interest of my colleagues in bringing the resolution here today.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS), who has lent his voice in a very short and rapid time.

And let me once again thank the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. SNYDER) for the outstanding work he has done, being there on the line.

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Speaker, let me first thank the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL). In the short period of time that I have been privileged to be a Member of this House, I have seen his sincere commitment on the Committee on International Relations and particularly in reference to Africa. He has always been outspoken and always has had some concerns with reference to rectifying some of the human tragedies that have taken place, and I want to thank the gentleman for bringing this bill forward.

Let me also thank the Chair of the Subcommittee on Africa, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), for his diligence in bringing forth these issues of concern to the African continent.

And, finally, let me thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), who is one whom I admired long before I entered the halls of Congress. I admired him and his wisdom and his knowledge of not only Africa but the entire globe, but in particular Africa. He is one that I have learned to respect and hold on to the hem of his garments with reference to the knowledge that he has, and I value him as a Member and as a friend.

Mr. Speaker, this war that is now raging on, I do not understand. For the life of me, I scratch my head perplexed. Generally, when there are sides that want to separate from each other or something of that nature, war takes place at that point. Here, we have two nations who separated peacefully, and yet once the separation took place, without any real articulated reasons, they are at war.

I have had the opportunity to speak with both the ambassadors from Eritrea and Ethiopia and, as said by my colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. SNYDER) before, it seemed to me they both wanted the same thing, yet war and tragedy continues. I ask, why do brothers and sisters fight one another? And for the life of me, I do not know.

But I say this, H. Con. Res. 46 gives us an opportunity to say to both nations, who want a decent relationship with this great Nation, that if they want to do so, we must have peace. And simply what it does is it reaffirms the OAU and the framework for peace which the OAU has set up. And it calls upon all of the human rights commissions and all human rights organizations to investigate human rights abuses in connection with the detentions, deportations, and displacements of their citizens.

If we do not urge these countries to end this war, it will continue to set both back to 10, 15 years ago, and affect their financial standing within the international community. This resolution sends a strong message that they can work cooperatively with the United States of America if they talk peace, and I urge my Members to support the passing of H. Con. Resolution 46.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT).

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding me this time.

Like the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS), it is hard for me to understand why this war continues. I have both Ethiopian and Eritrean residents who live in my congressional district; and when I talk to them, it is uncle against uncle, brother against brother, sister against sister, and yet the fighting continues. And superficially it seems like just a family feud, but the devastation and the deaths and the tragedy goes on and on.

So I want to rise in support of this resolution and applaud the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) for bringing the resolution to the floor in hopes that this could be some added incentive for these two nations to resolve their differences.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I urge support of H. Con. Res. 46.

I would also like to say that this conflict is starting to be felt here even in our Nation's capital between Ethiopians and Eritreans. I ask the Ethiopians and Eritreans here in our country to urge their governments to put down the weapons of war.

Ethiopia and Eritrea do not have the oil of Angola or Nigeria, nor the diamonds of the Congo or Sierra Leone, or the gold of South Africa or Botswana, and so the fight is really, unfortunately, a dispute that we believe can come to a solution.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 46, the resolution that urges Eritrea and Ethiopia to end the war between the both countries. H. Con. Res. 46 expresses the sense of Congress deploring the escalation of the conflict between Ethiopia and Eritrea which has resulted in the massive and senseless loss of life, as well as substantial economic hardship to the peoples of both nations. In addition, this resolution strongly urges both Eritrea and Ethiopia to immediately bring an end to the violence between the two countries and strongly affirms U.S. support for the Organization of African Unity (OAU) Framework Agreement. The resolution also calls on the UN Human Rights Commission and all human rights organizations to investigate human rights abuses in connection with the forced detentions, deportations, and displacements of populations caused by this conflict.

In 1952, former Italian colony Eritrea federated into Ethiopia and became one of its provinces. Forty years later, in 1993, Eritrea gained independence from Ethiopia peacefully, but no borders were clearly defined. Relations between the two countries remained peaceful and Ethiopian Prime Minister Meles Zenawi and Eritrean President Isaias Afwerki were deemed leaders who would help bring an African renaissance. However, the introduction of a new currency in Eritrea in 1997 spurred tension between the two nations as Eritrea started to distance itself from Ethiopia.

In May 1998 an area known as the Badme Triangle, administered by Ethiopia, became the first region to break out in fighting when Eritrean troops invaded the area, claiming it as their own. Fighting continued in the area, with both sides participating in bombings and forced detention of prisoners. The provocative act of aggression by Eritrea has attracted wide public attention since the Council of Ministers of the FDRE issued a statement on May 13 urging the Eritrean government to pull out its invading forces from the occupied territories of Ethiopia. It thus, seems, pertinent to give an overall view of the crises. The areas that have been occupied by the invading Eritrean force are the whole of Badme Woreda and part of Shiraro Woreda which are both located in Tigrai State. These areas have never been part of Eritrea when Eritrea was under the occupation of Italian colonialists, the British protectorate and later under the Haile-Sellassie imperial administration. During the Derg regime, the residents of the two Woredas fought the military junta gallantly under the vanguard of the Tigrai People's Liberation Front (TPLF).

Despite the indisputable historical records on the disputed areas, the Eritrean government has for long raised territorial claims. It should also be clear that the Ethiopian government has territorial claims on some areas which have been unfairly incorporated into today's Eritrea. As a matter of fact, there may be nothing wrong in raising territorial claims. Taking that fact into account, the two countries had established a joint committee to resolve territorial disputes peacefully. Both governments had reached a common understanding:

(1) to resolve territorial claims through peaceful negotiations; and

(2) to respect their respective boundaries which both occupied at the time of the fall of the Derg. It was on this bases that the joint committee was active until recently.

While this was the case, however, an unexpected thing took place. The issue was that while the joint committee set up by the two governments had been working to peacefully settle the dispute based on the aforementioned understanding and while they had agreed to hold a meeting on Friday, 8, May 1998, the Eritrean forces touched off a clash in the north-western part of Ethiopia on Wednesday, 6 May 1998. In this regard, it seems that action was initially taken by the Ethiopian side; but this claim would not be sustainable for the simple fact that the locality where the clash broke out belonged to Ethiopia.

In November 1998, the OAU Central Organ for Conflict Resolution presented a peace proposal to the countries and although both countries verbally accepted the proposal, fighting continued throughout the Horn of Africa.

Mr. Speaker, we must speak out against this war and the human rights abuses associated with it. This is a war that has taken the

lives of thousands of civilians and destroyed the economy of two growing countries. On Monday, October 11, of this year Eritrea accused Ethiopia of destroying six Eritrean villages in a border area which Ethiopia occupied during fighting between the two countries in February.

Administrators in the zone now report that forces from both countries have destroyed houses and villages and, in some cases, burned entire villages to the ground. Tens of thousands of soldiers have died during a vicious border war between the two Horn of Africa states in the last 17 months, and efforts by the Organization of African Unity (OAU) to resolve the dispute have so far failed.

In February the Ethiopian army forced Eritrea out of the disputed Badme area along the western end of their border after heavy fighting, and pushed into land which Eritrea says is unquestionably part of its country. Eritrea says around 4,000 Eritrean residents of the Gash Barka zone have since fled to displacement camps in the area.

Mr. Speaker, dear colleagues, I offer my full support for this resolution and urge that Eritria and Ethiopia end the war between them.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 46.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING INVESTIGATION INTO DISAPPEARANCE OF ZACHARY BAUMEL

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 1175) to locate and secure the return of Zachary Baumel, a United States citizen, and other Israeli soldiers missing in action.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendments:

Page 3, strike out all after line 12, down to and including line 22 and insert:

(b) PROVISION OF ASSISTANCE TO CERTAIN GOVERNMENTS.—In deciding whether or not to provide United States assistance to any government or authority which the Secretary of State believes has information concerning the whereabouts of the soldiers described in subsection (a), and in formulating United States Policy towards such government or authority, the President should take into consideration the willingness of the government or authority to assist in locating and securing the return of such soldiers.

Page 4, line 8, after ''additional'' insert: ''credible''.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CAMPBELL. 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, H.R. 1175, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), has taken a personal interest in this resolution. He cannot be here at this moment due to a prior commitment. I would, accordingly, read his remarks. They are more eloquent than my own, and I would say that his words fully reflect my own views on the subject as well.

''The measure before us today, H.R. 1175, is one which the House adopted overwhelmingly earlier this year but which was slightly amended by the other body last summer. Hence our renewed consideration.

''I remind my colleagues this important humanitarian measure is on behalf of three Israeli MIAs, one of whom, Zachary Baumel, is a dual American-Israeli national.

''It has been 17 long years since these Israeli soldiers faced Syrian forces in Lebanon's Bekaa Valley on June 11, 1982. The men have been missing since that day, and all efforts since then, which have spanned the globe, have not brought them back to their families. These families deserve answers.

''H.R. 1175 will require the Department of State to raise the matter of Zachary Baumel, Yehuda Katz, and Avi Feldman with appropriate government officials of Syria, Lebanon, and the Palestinian authority.

''This measure also requires the United States to raise the issue with other governments which may be helpful in locating and securing the return of these soldiers and to report to Congress on all efforts.

''The other body made two minor technical changes after consulting with us, the sponsors, the State Department, and the Baumel family, and everyone concerned has agreed to these changes.

''Accordingly, I wish to thank again our committee colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), for his continuing interest and commitment to this issue, and also urge our colleagues once again to express their strong support for H.R. 1175, as amended.''

Mr. Speaker, that ends the prepared remarks of our chairman, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), and I would add only my very own few words.

This has been of great importance to our committee and to me, as well as to the chairman. I observe what this resolution does. It not only calls on the State Department to continue raising this issue persistently, particularly with Syria, because it was in territory under Syria's actual control that these three individuals were taken prisoner—one of whom I emphasize is an American citizen as well as an Israeli citizen—but it also requests the State Department, in deciding which entities receive our aid, our taxpayers' money, that we take into account whether that entity or sovereign in question has assisted, has done all that it can, if it has basis for helping, to help with the resolution of these MIAs.

□ 1445

I think that is exactly the right message to send. I applaud the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), our chairman, for his leadership in this. And I note the extraordinary work of my good friend and my colleague from California (Mr. LANTOS), the co-chair of the Human Rights Caucus, a champion for individuals against the abuse of their human rights wherever they may be and of what nationality they may be.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as my very good friend and colleague has pointed out, we approved this resolution in a slightly different form sometime back and we are now adopting it again because the Senate made some very useful, minor modifications.

My good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL), outlined the issue. I can only add one footnote.

At a time when the peace process is moving in the area, it is incumbent upon Yassir Arafat and the Syrian leadership and all those who have any influence over the government that holds these unfortunate prisoners of war for the last 17 years to exert every effort to have them finally released. This action is long overdue.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, today, for the second time this year, the House is considering H.R. 1175. This legislation, introduced by my distinguished colleague from California, Mr. LANTOS, would help to locate Zachary Baumel, an American citizen and other Israeli soldiers missing in action since 1982.

On June 22, 1999 the House sent a strong message by passing H.R. 1175 with 415 votes in support of the bill. Today, the House has a chance to pass this legislation—as amended by the Senate—and send it to the President for his signature.

I believe that the Administration is concerned about the fate of these brave soldiers. However, it has been five years since the Gaza-Jericho agreement, and Zachary Baumel, Zvi Feldman, Yehuda Katz and others are still missing. Passage of this legislation will ensure that the Department of State raises this case on an urgent basis with all appropriate governments and authorities.

Whenever American citizens or allies of the United States are taken during conflict, we

must do everything possible to obtain their release or information as to their fate. My constituents agree. Over the past several months, I have received many letters and phone calls from individuals who are concerned about this issue, requesting that I do everything possible to ensure passage of this legislation. I urge all members to vote in support of this important measure.

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this time to voice my support for H.R. 1175, which would authorize an investigation into the disappearance of an American citizen, Zachary Baumel. It has been seventeen years since this young man, serving in the Israeli army, was captured along with the four other members of his tank battalion, in a battle with Palestinian and Syrian forces near the Lebanese town of Sultan Yaqub.

H.R. 1175 directs the Department of State to investigate the cases of Mr. Baumel, and two other soldiers, Yehuda Katz, and Zvi Feldman. The last known whereabouts of these soldiers was in Syrian-controlled territory, under the care of a Palestinian faction splintered from the PLO. As diplomatic efforts to secure the release of these men have been periodically unsuccessful to date, this legislation directs the State Department to discuss this matter on an urgent basis with officials of Syria, Lebanon, the Palestinian Authority, and other appropriate governments.

The bill makes a simple request of the President, that when he is considering whether or not to provide economic assistance to these countries, that he weigh and measure the willingness of these governments and authorities to assist in locating and securing the release of these men.

Mr. Speaker, the family of Zachary Baumel has been through incredible pain and uncertainty for these last seventeen years. Their hopes have been lifted in key times of negotiation, such as the Oslo Accords—yet to no avail.

It is time that our country take another real and substantive step in requesting action on behalf of these middle eastern governments. These young men and their families deserve no less.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GILLMOR). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the bill, H.R. 1175.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

STATISTICAL EFFICIENCY ACT OF 1999

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2885) to provide uniform safeguards for the confidentiality of information acquired for exclusively statistical purposes, and to improve the efficiency and quality of the Federal statistics and Federal statistical programs by permitting limited sharing of records among designated agencies for statistical purposes under strong safeguards, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2885

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 ''Statistical Efficiency Act of 1999''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act:

(1) The term ''agency'' means any entity that falls within the definition of the term ''executive agency'' as defined in section 102 of title 31, United States Code, or ''agency'', as defined in section 3502 of title 44, United States Code.

(2) The term ''agent'' means a person who—

(A) is designated by a Statistical Data Center (as designated in section 3) to perform exclusively statistical activities authorized by law under the supervision or control of an officer or employee of that Statistical Data Center; and

(B) has agreed in writing to comply with all provisions of law that affect information acquired by that Statistical Data Center.

(3) The term ''identifiable form'' means any representation of information that permits information concerning individual subjects to be reasonably inferred by either direct or indirect means.

(4) The term ''nonstatistical purpose'' means any purpose that is not a statistical purpose, and includes any administrative, regulatory, law enforcement, adjudicatory, or other purpose that affects the rights, privileges, or benefits of a particular identifiable respondent.

(5) The term ''respondent'' means a person who, or organization that, is requested or required to supply information to an agency, is the subject of information requested or required to be supplied to an agency, or who provides that information to an agency.

(6) The term ''statistical activities''—

(A) means the collection, compilation, processing, or analysis of data for the purpose of describing or making estimates concerning the whole, or relevant groups or components within, the economy, society, or natural environment; and

(B) includes the development of methods or resources that support those activities, such as measurement methods, models, statistical classifications, or sampling frames.

(7) The term ''statistical purpose''—

(A) means the description, estimation, or analysis of the characteristics of groups without regard to the identities of individuals or organizations that comprise such groups; and

(B) includes the development, implementation, or maintenance of methods, technical or administrative procedures, or information resources that support such purposes.

SEC. 3. DESIGNATION OF STATISTICAL DATA CENTERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Each of the following is hereby designated as a Statistical Data Center:

(1) The Bureau of Economic Analysis in the Department of Commerce.

(2) The Bureau of the Census in the Department of Commerce.

(3) The Bureau of Labor Statistics in the Department of Labor.

(4) The National Agricultural Statistics Service in the Department of Agriculture.

(5) The National Center for Education Statistics in the Department of Education.

(6) The National Center for Health Statistics in the Department of Health and Human Services.

(7) The Energy Consumption Division of the Energy Information Administration in the Department of Energy.

(8) The Division of Science Resources Studies in the National Science Foundation.

(b) DESIGNATION.—In the case of a reorganization that eliminates, or substantially alters the mission or functions of, an agency or agency component listed in subsection (a), the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, after consultation with the head of the agency proposing the reorganization, may designate an agency or agency component that shall serve as a successor Statistical Data Center under the terms of this Act, if the Director determines that—

(1) the primary activities of the proposed Statistical Data Center are statistical activities specifically authorized by law;

(2) the proposed Statistical Data Center would participate in data sharing activities that significantly improve Federal statistical programs or products;

(3) the proposed Statistical Data Center has demonstrated its capability to protect the individual confidentiality of any shared data; and

(4) the laws that apply to the proposed Statistical Data Center are not inconsistent with this Act.

(c) NOTICE AND COMMENT.—The head of an agency seeking designation as a successor Statistical Data Center under this section shall, after consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, provide public notice and an opportunity to comment on the consequences of such designation and on those determinations upon which the designation is proposed to be based.

(d) PROHIBITION AGAINST INCREASE IN NUMBER OF CENTERS.—No action taken under this section shall increase the number of Statistical Data Centers authorized by this Act.

SEC. 4. STATISTICAL DATA CENTER RESPONSIBILITIES.

The Statistical Data Centers designated in section 3 shall—

(1) identify opportunities to eliminate duplication and otherwise reduce reporting burden and cost imposed on the public by sharing information for exclusively statistical purposes;

(2) enter into joint statistical projects to improve the quality and reduce the cost of statistical programs;

(3) safeguard the confidentiality of individually identifiable information acquired for statistical purposes by assuring its physical security and by controlling access to, and uses made of, such information; and

(4) respect the rights and privileges of the public by observing and promoting fair information practices.

SEC. 5. LIMITATIONS ON USE AND DISCLOSURE OF DATA AND INFORMATION BY STATISTICAL DATA CENTERS.

(a) USE OF STATISTICAL DATA OR INFORMATION.—Data or information acquired by a Statistical Data Center for exclusively statistical purposes shall be used by the Center only for statistical purposes.

(b) DISCLOSURE OF STATISTICAL DATA OR INFORMATION.—Data or information acquired for exclusively statistical purposes shall not be disclosed in identifiable form, for any purpose other than a statistical purpose, without the informed consent of the respondent.

(c) RULE FOR USE OF DATA OR INFORMATION FOR NONSTATISTICAL PURPOSES.—A Statistical Data Center shall clearly distinguish any data or information collected for nonstatistical purposes (as authorized by law) by the Statistical Data Center by a rule that provides that the respondent supplying the data or information is fully informed, before the data or information is collected, that the data or information will be used for nonstatistical purposes.

SEC. 6. DISCLOSURE OF DATA OR INFORMATION BY AGENCIES TO STATISTICAL DATA CENTERS.

(a) AGENCIES THAT MAY DISCLOSE DATA OR INFORMATION TO A STATISTICAL DATA CENTER.—Subject to subsection (b), any Federal agency may disclose data or information to one or more Statistical Data Centers for exclusively statistical purposes.

(b) LIMITATIONS ON DISCLOSURE.—Data or information may be disclosed by an agency to one or more Statistical Data Centers under subsection (a) only if—

(1) the data or information are to be used exclusively for statistical purposes by the Statistical Data Center or Centers;

(2) the disclosure of, and proposed use of, the data or information by the Statistical Data Center is not inconsistent with any provisions of law or Executive order that explicitly limit the statistical purposes for which such data or information may be used;

(3) the disclosure is not prohibited by law or Executive order in the interest of national security;

(4) the disclosure is made under the terms of a written agreement between the Statistical Data Center or Centers and the agency supplying the data or information that specifies—

(A) the data or information to be disclosed;

(B) the purposes for which the data or information are to be used; and

(C) appropriate security procedures to safeguard the confidentiality of the data or information; and

(5) the data or information is not disclosed by that Center in identifiable form (except in a case in which the data or information was collected directly by a party to the agreement referred to in subsection (b)(4), and the agreement specifies that the data or information may be so disclosed to another party to the agreement for exclusively statistical purposes).

(c) NOTICE.—Whenever a written agreement authorized under subsection (b)(4) concerns data that respondents were required by law to report and the agreement contains terms that could not reasonably have been anticipated by respondents who provided the data that will be disclosed, or upon the initiative of any party to such an agreement, or whenever ordered by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, the terms of such agreement shall be described in a public notice issued by the agency that intends to disclose the data. Such notice shall allow a minimum of 60 days for public comment before such agreement shall take effect. The Director shall be fully apprised of any issues raised by the public and may suspend the effect of such an agreement to permit modifications responsive to public comments.

(d) APPLICABILITY OF OTHER LAWS.—(1) The disclosure of data or information by an agency to a Statistical Data Center under this section shall in no way alter the responsibility of that agency under other statutes (including the Freedom of Information Act and the Privacy Act) with respect to the disclosure or withholding of such information by that agency.

(2) If data or information obtained by an agency is disclosed to another agency pursuant to this section, all provisions of law (including penalties) that relate to the unlawful disclosure of the data or information apply to the officers, employees, or agents of the agency to which the data or information is disclosed to the same extent and in the same manner as the provisions apply to the officers and employees of the agency which originally obtained the information.

(3) The officers, employees, and agents of the agency to which the data or information is disclosed, in addition, shall be subject to the same provisions of law, including penalties, relating to the unlawful disclosure of information that would apply to officers and employees of that agency, if the information had been collected directly by that agency.

SEC. 7. COORDINATION AND OVERSIGHT BY OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall coordinate and oversee the confidentiality and disclosure policies established by this Act.

(b) REPORT OF DISCLOSURE AGREEMENTS.—(1) The head of a Statistical Data Center shall report to the Office of Management and Budget—

(A) each disclosure agreement entered into pursuant to section 6(b)(4);

(B) the results of any review of information security undertaken at the request of the Office of Management and Budget; and

(C) the results of any similar review undertaken on the initiative of the Statistical Data Center or an agency disclosing data or information to a Statistical Data Center.

(2) The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall include a summary of all reports submitted to the Director under this subsection and any actions taken by the Director to advance the purposes of this Act in the annual report to the Congress on statistical programs submitted in accordance with section 3504(e)(2) of title 44, United States Code.

(c) REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF RULES.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall review and approve any rules proposed pursuant to this Act for consistency with this Act and chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code.

SEC. 8. IMPLEMENTING REGULATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsections (b) and (c), the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, or the head of a Statistical Data Center or of an agency providing information to a Center, may promulgate such rules as may be necessary to implement this Act.

(b) CONSISTENCY.—The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall promulgate rules or provide such other guidance as may be needed to ensure consistent interpretation of this Act by the affected agencies.

(c) AGENCY RULES.—Rules governing disclosures of information authorized by this Act shall be promulgated by the agency that originally collected the information, subject to the review and approval required under this Act.

SEC. 9. EFFECT ON OTHER LAWS.

(a) TITLE 44 U.S.C.—This Act, including the amendments made by this Act, does not diminish the authority under section 3510 of title 44, United States Code, of the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to direct, and of an agency to make, disclosures that are not inconsistent with any applicable law.

(b) EXEMPTION FROM FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT.—Data or information acquired for exclusively statistical purposes as provided in section 5 is exempt from mandatory disclosure under section 552 of title 5, United States Code, pursuant to section 552(b)(3) of such title.

(c) PREEMPTION OF STATE LAW.—Nothing in this Act shall preempt applicable State law regarding the confidentiality of data collected by the States.

SEC. 10. CONFORMING AND PROPOSED CHANGES IN LAW.

(a) DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE.—(1) Section 1 of the Act of January 27, 1938 (15 U.S.C 176a) is amended by striking ''The'' and inserting ''Except as provided in the Statistical Efficiency Act of 1999, the''.

(2)(A) Chapter 10 of title 13, United States Code, is amended by adding after section 401 the following:

''§402. Exchange of census information with Statistical Data Centers

''The Bureau of the Census is authorized to provide data collected under this title to Statistical Data Centers named in the Statistical Efficiency Act of 1999, or their successors designated under the terms of that Act.''.

(B) The table of sections for chapter 10 of title 13, United States Code, is amended by adding after the item relating to section 401 the following:

''402. Exchange of census information with Statistical Data Centers.''.

(b) DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY.—(1) Section 205 of the Department of Energy Organization Act (Public Law 95–91; 42 U.S.C. 7135) is amended by adding after subsection (l) the following new subsection:

''(m)(1)(A) The Administrator shall designate an organizational unit to conduct statistical activities pertaining to energy end use consumption information. Using procedures authorized by the Statistical Efficiency Act of 1999, the Administrator shall ensure the security, integrity, and confidentiality of the information that has been submitted in identifiable form and supplied exclusively for statistical purposes either directly to the Energy Information Administration or by other Government agencies.

''(B) To carry out this section, the Administrator shall establish procedures for the disclosure of these data to Statistical Data Centers for statistical purposes only consistent with chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code (commonly referred to as the 'Paperwork Reduction Act'), and the Statistical Efficiency Act of 1999.

''(2)(A) A person may not publish, cause to be published, or otherwise communicate, statistical information designated in paragraph (1) in a manner that identifies any respondent.

''(B) A person may not use statistical information designated in paragraph (1) for a nonstatistical purpose.

''(C) The identity of a respondent who supplies, or is the subject of, information collected for statistical purposes—

''(i) may not be disclosed through any process, including disclosure through legal process, unless the respondent consents in writing;

''(ii) may not be disclosed to the public, unless information has been transformed into a statistical or aggregate form that does not allow the identification of the respondent who supplied the information or who is the subject of that information; and

''(iii) may not, without the written consent of the respondent, be admitted as evidence or used for any purpose in an action, suit, or other judicial or administrative proceeding.

''(D) Any person who violates subparagraphs (A), (B), or (C), upon conviction, shall be fined under title 18, United States Code, imprisoned not more than 1 year, or both.

''(E) For purposes of this subsection:

''(i) The term 'person' has the meaning given the term in section 1 of title 1, United States Code, but also includes a local, State, or Federal entity or officer or employee of a local, State, or Federal entity.

''(ii) The terms 'statistical activities', 'identifiable form', 'statistical purpose', 'nonstatistical purpose', and 'respondent' have the meaning given those terms in section 2 of the Statistical Efficiency Act of 1999.

''(3) Statistical information designated in paragraph (1) is exempt from disclosure under sections 205(f) and 407 of this Act and sections 12, 20, and 59 of the Federal Energy Administration Act of 1974, or any other law which requires disclosure of that information.''.

(2) Section 205(f) of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7135) is amended by inserting '', excluding information designated solely for statistical purposes under subsection (m)(1),'' after ''analysis''.

(3) Section 407(a) of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7177(a)) is amended by inserting '', excluding information designated solely for statistical purposes under section 205(m)(1),'' after ''information''.

(4) The Federal Energy Administration Act of 1974 (Public Law 93–275) is amended—

(A) in section 12 (15 U.S.C. 771), by adding after subsection (f) the following new subsection:

''(g) This section does not apply to information designated solely for statistical purposes

under section 205(m)(1) of the Department of Energy Organization Act (Public Law 95–91).'';

(B) in section 20(a)(3) (15 U.S.C. 779(a)(3)), by inserting '', excluding information designated solely for statistical purposes under section 205(m)(1) of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7135)'' after ''information''; and

(C) in the first sentence of section 59 (15 U.S.C. 790h), by inserting '', excluding information designated solely for statistical purposes under section 205(m)(1) of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C 7135)'' after ''information''.

(c) DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES.—Section 306 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 242k) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(o) SHARING OF IDENTIFYING INFORMATION FOR STATISTICAL PURPOSES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director may, subject to the provisions of paragraph (2), designate as an agent of the Center (within the meaning of section 2 of the Statistical Efficiency Act of 1999) an individual—

''(A) who is not otherwise an employee, official, or agent of the Center; and

''(B) who enters into a written agreement with the Director specifying terms and conditions for sharing of statistical information.

''(2) EFFECT OF DESIGNATION.—An individual designated as an agent of the Center pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be subject to all restrictions on the use and disclosure of statistical information obtained by the individual under the agreement specified in paragraph (1)(B), and to all civil and criminal penalties applicable to violations of such restrictions, including penalties under section 1905 of title 18, United States Code, that would apply to the individual if an employee of the Center.''.

(d) DEPARTMENT OF LABOR.—The Commissioner of Labor Statistics is authorized to designate agents, as defined in section 2.

(e) NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION.—Section 14 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 (42 U.S.C. 1873) is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (i) to read as follows:

''(i) Information supplied to the Foundation or its contractor in survey forms, questionnaires, or similar instruments for purposes of section 3(a)(5) or (6) by an individual, by an industrial or commercial organization, or by an educational or academic institution that has received a pledge of confidentiality from the Foundation, may not be disclosed to the public unless the information has been transformed into statistical or abstract formats that do not allow the identification of the supplier. Such information shall be used in identifiable form only for statistical purposes as defined in the Statistical Efficiency Act of 1999. The names of individuals and organizations supplying such information may not be disclosed to the public.'';

(2) by adding the following new subsection after subsection (i):

''(j) In support of functions authorized by section 3(a)(5) or (6), the Foundation may designate, at its discretion, authorized persons, including employees of Federal, State, or local agencies (including local educational agencies) and employees of private organizations who may have access, for exclusively statistical purposes as defined in the Statistical Efficiency Act of 1999, to identifiable information collected pursuant to section 3(a)(5) or (6). No such person may—

''(1) publish information collected under section 3(a)(5) or (6) in such a manner that either an individual, an industrial or commercial organization, or an educational or academic institution that has received a pledge of confidentiality from the Foundation, can be specifically identified;

''(2) permit anyone other than individuals authorized by the Foundation to examine in identifiable form data relating to an individual, to an industrial or commercial organization, or to an educational or academic institution that has received a pledge of confidentiality from the Foundation; or

''(3) knowingly and willfully request or obtain any confidential information described in subsection (i) from the Foundation under false pretenses.

Any person who violates these restrictions shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.''.

(f) DISCLOSURE PENALTIES.—Section 1905 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting '', or agent of a Statistical Data Center as defined in the Statistical Efficiency Act of 1999'' after ''thereof'' in the first two places such term appears.

(g) PROPOSED CHANGES IN LAW.—Not later than the date that is 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to Congress a description of any additional conforming changes in law necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2885.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Federal statistical structure is currently an assortment of 70 different entities located within 12 cabinet departments within the executive branch of the Federal Government. This fragmented structure compromises the quality of statistical data and wastes limited government resources. It also imposes undue burdens on those who supply information to the Federal Government for statistical purposes.

Federal statistical agencies currently operate under a patchwork of laws and regulations that prevent them from sharing the statistical information they collect. The Bureau of the Census, for example, compiles a list of business establishments. The Bureau of Labor Statistics must compile a similar list because the two agencies cannot share this information.

Similarly, the Department of Agriculture must compile its own list of farms because it does not have access to the list of farms compiled by the Bureau of the Census.

H.R. 2885, the ''Statistical Efficiency Act of 1999,'' would permit these agencies to share statistical data and, at the same time, would establish a uniform standard to protect the confidentiality of information acquired for statistical purposes.

The bill designates eight Federal agencies as statistical data centers. These agencies were selected because their primary mission is to collect, produce, and disseminate statistical information. Federal agencies would be allowed to disclose data or information to these centers exclusively for statistical purposes.

The bill contains a number of provisions designed to protect the confidentiality of the information collected. Currently, Federal statistical agencies operate under a variety of confidentiality laws ranging from highly restrictive to virtually nonexistent. This bill would create a uniform set of confidentiality protections designed to safeguard statistical information from unauthorized disclosure. Under the bill, data or information acquired for statistical purposes could only be used for statistical purposes.

The disclosure of information to a statistical data center must be consistent with existing laws and must be made under the terms of a written agreement between the agencies supplying the information and the statistical data center. The agreement must identify the data to be disclosed, the purpose for disclosure, and the procedures to be taken to safeguard the confidentiality of the information.

The bill prohibits the disclosure of data in identifiable form for nonstatistical purposes without the informed consent of the entity or individual who supplied the information. The bill also establishes criminal penalties for unlawful disclosure of this information.

Over the past two Congresses, the Subcommittee on Government Management, Information, and Technology has held three hearings focusing on proposals to improve the efficiency of the Federal statistical system, including the proposal before the House today.

Witnesses at these hearings included representatives from the administration, current and former heads of Federal statistical agencies, representatives of the General Accounting Office, and members from the academic and research communities. All of these witnesses agreed that both the quality and efficiency of the Federal statistical system would be improved by authorizing designated agencies to share statistical information under uniform confidentiality protections.

This legislation, which is similar to legislation proposed by the administration, has broad bipartisan support. Its benefits are equally broad.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this important bipartisan measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation and I urge its adoption.

First I want to commend the gentleman from California (Chairman HORN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the ranking member, whose joint work has allowed us to bring this bill to the floor.

We all understand that our Government collects all kind of information.

Some would say our government collects too much information. But the truth is much of this information that is collected is used to make very important policy decisions both in the agencies and on the floor of this House. It is important that this information be accurate and that it be readily available.

Yet, today we have no uniform system for the collection of Federal statistics. Eleven major agencies and between 50 and 60 minor agencies spend over $2 billion every year collecting data with no uniform standards to assure either the accuracy or to protect the privacy and confidentiality of that information.

Some agencies, like the Bureau of the Census, collect information and they hold that information in confidence and that is mandated by current legislative authority. But other agencies, like the Bureau of Labor Statistics, have a strong tradition of protecting the confidentiality of data but they have no legislative authority to support that practice.

The ''Statistical Efficiency Act of 1999'' accomplishes two objectives. First of all, it establishes a uniform legislative authority for the protection of information collected for statistical purposes. Second, the legislation establishes a procedure to allow agencies to share information one with the other.

This legislation will improve the efficiency of data collection and it will reduce the burden on individuals and businesses of responding to the mandates of various agencies for essentially the same information.

The first step this bill takes in facilitating data sharing among agencies is to assure the privacy and confidentiality of the information collected. This is accomplished by establishing the basic principle that all data collected for statistical purposes cannot be used for any other purpose.

For example, information collected for statistical purposes cannot be used for the enforcement of regulations or laws. This firewall between statistical purposes and regulatory enforcement is essential in obtaining the cooperation of businesses in reporting financial information.

The second step in the process laid out in this bill is to designate eight agencies involved in the collection of statistics as statistical data centers to facilitate data sharing. Under the terms of the bills, these agencies can establish written agreements for passing individually identifiable information between one another to improve the efficiency of the statistical activities. In addition, these eight agencies can facilitate data sharing among other agencies, again through written agreement.

I would like to note at this point that it is the intent of Congress in defining the term ''agent'' in this bill to give agencies the authority to swear in individuals who are not employees of the Federal Government as agents to facilitate data sharing. This will allow agencies like the Bureau of Labor Statistics to continue their long-standing relationship with State government for the collection of labor market statistics.

In addition, it will allow agencies to draw on expertise in the private sector for specific projects. These agents will, of course, be subject to the same requirements to protect the confidentiality of data as Federal employees of the agencies involved.

This bill also requires statistical data centers to identify ways to reduce costs and improve efficiency and quality in the Federal statistical system. The bill charges the Director of the Office of Management and Budget with the responsibility for overseeing the confidentiality and data sharing policies of the act.

□ 1500

Finally, the bill establishes penalties for improper disclosure of information collected for statistical purposes.

H.R. 2885 is strongly supported, as the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) stated, by the administration, and this legislation represents an important step forward in improving the efficiency and quality of data collection. I urge its adoption by this House.

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

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

Since my colleague who has been so helpful on this legislation mentioned the administration's statement of policy, I would like to file that Statement of Administration Policy at this point in the RECORD.

Briefly it says, ''The Administration strongly supports House passage of H.R. 2885. The bill will enhance the confidential treatment of information provided to Federal statistical agencies and facilitate the sharing of information among those agencies for statistical purposes.''

I would also like to submit for the RECORD the estimate of the Congressional Budget Office on H.R. 2885 that, in essence, sums up: it is not a problem. CBO ''estimates that neither the receipts nor the spending would exceed $500,000 in any one year.''

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 2885—STATISTICAL EFFICIENCY ACT—(HORN (R) CALIFORNIA AND 6 COSPONSORS)

The Administration strongly supports House passage of H.R. 2885. The bill will enhance the confidential treatment of information provided to Federal statistical agencies and facilitate the sharing of information among those agencies for statistical purposes.

* * * * *

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, October 22, 1999.

Hon. DAN BURTON,
Chairman, Committee on Government Reform, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimates for H.R. 2885, the Statistical Efficiency Act of 1999.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is John R. Righter.

Sincerely,

BARRY B. ANDERSON
(For Dan L. Crippen).

H.R. 2885—Statistical Efficiency Act of 1999

H.R. 2885 would designate eight bureaus and offices as statistical data centers: the Bureau of Economic Analysis, the Bureau of the Census, the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), the National Agricultural Statistics Service, the National Center for Education Statistics, the National Health Center for Health Statistics, the Energy Consumption Division in the Department of Energy, and the Division of Science Resources Studies in the National Science Foundation. Together, these agencies received appropriations of about $2.1 billion in 1999. Subject to certain confidentiality procedures, the bill would allow the centers to share statistical data, eliminate duplicate reporting requirements, and enter into joint projects to improve the quality and lower the cost of statistical programs. In addition, the bill would allow other federal agencies to share data with the eight centers for purely statistical purposes. In general, under current law, an agency that collects data is not allowed to share the information with another agency.

H.R. 2885 could lower the government's costs to collect statistical data if its results in the eight centers pooling resources and eliminating duplicate efforts. Although it is uncertain how much agencies would share resources and data under H.R. 2885, based on information from the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs in the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), CBO estimates that implementing the bill would reduce information collection costs by about $2 million a year. Any such savings would depend on the amounts provided to these agencies in appropriations acts. In addition, by allowing agencies to share and compare data, the bill also could improve the quality of federal statistics, but CBO has no basis for estimating the budgetary impact of such improvements. Finally, subject to the availability of appropriated funds, CBO estimates that the bill would cost CBO less than $500,000 annually to write regulations and oversee the bill's implementation.

Enacting H.R. 2885 would result in the collection of additional criminal fines, which affect both governmental receipts and direct spending, pay-as-you-go procedures would apply. CBO estimates that neither the receipts nor the spending would exceed $500,000 in any one year. H.R. 2885 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act and would not affect the budgets of state, local, or tribal governments.

The CBO staff contact is John R. Righter. This estimate was approved by Peter H. Fontaine, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

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

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

Mr. HORN. I urge the adoption, Mr. Speaker, of this measure and hope everybody will support it.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2885, 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.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER EXECUTIVE OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 1652) to designate the Old Executive Office Building located at 17th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, in Washington, District of Columbia, as the Dwight D. Eisenhower Executive Office Building.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 1652

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

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION OF DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER EXECUTIVE OFFICE BUILDING.

The Old Executive Office Building located at 17th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, in Washington, District of Columbia, shall be known and designated as the ''Dwight D. Eisenhower Executive Office Building''.

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the building referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the Dwight D. Eisenhower Executive Office Building.

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

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

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The bill before us today was introduced by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, John Chafee, who passed away on Sunday. I first would like to express my deepest sympathies and send condolences both to the Senator's family as well as to the people of Rhode Island. John Chafee will be sorely missed.

We are here today to complete one of the legislative initiatives begun by Senator Chafee, something that he felt in fact very strongly about. Senate bill 1652 designates the Old Executive Office Building in Washington as the Dwight D. Eisenhower Executive Office Building. President Eisenhower distinguished himself in the military before being elected the 34th President of the United States. After graduating from the United States Military Academy at West Point, Dwight Eisenhower was promoted to captain and assigned to command tank training at Camp Colt in Gettysburg, Pennsylvania. For his efforts during World War I, he was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal.

In 1919, President Eisenhower continued his tank training command, this time in Camp Meade, Maryland, where he met Colonel George Patton, who would become a lifelong friend. Before World War II, President Eisenhower spent time in the Panama Canal Zone, France and in the Philippines as chief of staff to General Douglas MacArthur. Eisenhower graduated at the top of his class from the military's command and general staff school at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas. Before going to the Philippines, Eisenhower's office was located in the Old Executive Office Building.

In 1939, President Eisenhower was 49 years old and held the rank of lieutenant colonel. By 1941, Eisenhower was promoted to brigadier general and after the bombing at Pearl Harbor, General George C. Marshall placed Eisenhower in charge of the war plans division. As chief American war planner, Eisenhower strongly supported the ''Europe first'' strategy. Eisenhower's second major campaign during World War II occurred in North Africa where he headed the operations division before General Marshall placed him in command of the U.S. Army's European theater of operations.

In 1944, Eisenhower was named Supreme Commander of the Allied expeditionary forces. The successful Normandy invasion launched on D-Day was the ultimate thrust which led to the German defeat. On December 15, 1944, Eisenhower was promoted to the Army's highest rank, General of the Army.

In 1952, after serving as president of Columbia University and commander of NATO forces, Eisenhower sought and won the Republican nomination for President. President Eisenhower was overwhelmingly elected to serve two terms as our Nation's President. His accomplishments as President span from the peaceful resolution of the Korean War to the implementation of desegregation, to fighting communism, to implementation of the interstate highway system. He presided over a remarkable time of peace and prosperity in this country. President Eisenhower became an elder statesman following his two terms as President. His worldly accomplishments and direct involvement with the Old Executive Office Building make this a most deserving honor.

I have given only the briefest sketch of Eisenhower's accomplishments, but when we think about it, when we speak of Eisenhower, we use the term Supreme Commander, General of the Army, and we associate with him men like Patton, MacArthur and Marshall. These men changed the world and for the better. We too often lose sight of the accomplishments of men like Dwight Eisenhower due to the press of our day-to-day responsibilities.

I support this bill and encourage my colleagues to support it as well.

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I rise in support of S. 1652, a bill to designate the Executive Office Building at 17th and Pennsylvania Avenue here in Washington, D.C. as the Dwight D. Eisenhower Executive Office Building.

President Eisenhower was born October 14, 1890 in Denison, Texas. He graduated from West Point in June 1915 and shortly after graduation married Marie Doud in Denver, Colorado, a marriage that lasted 52 years. After a series of assignments, including service in the Panama Canal Zone, Washington, D.C., and the Philippine Islands, in 1942 he was promoted to first chief of operations division, War Department general staff. On December 24, 1943, President Roosevelt designated him as Supreme Commander, Allied expeditionary forces, from which he led the D-Day invasion of Europe.

In 1950, President Truman appointed him as Supreme Commander of the NATO forces, thus making him the first man to command a large peacetime multinational force.

Eisenhower was elected President in November 1952 with the support of the moderate, eastern wing of the Republican Party and again in 1956. Eisenhower had a sharp, orderly mind, could analyze problems, develop alternatives, and choose from among them. He reflected mainstream beliefs and his personality was that of an outgoing, affable American. The American people loved him.

President Eisenhower served his country with great distinction, diligence, and devotion for over 60 years. Mr. Speaker, I support S. 1652 and posthumously may I extend my gratitude to Senator Chafee for introducing this bill.

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

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

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to encourage my colleagues to support S. 1652. This legislation, as we have heard, will designate the current facility at 17th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, in Washington, D.C., now known as the Old Executive Office Building, to be known as the Dwight D. Eisenhower Executive Office Building. The House version of this legislation was introduced earlier this year by me and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL). In the Senate, S. 1652 was introduced by Senator Chafee and because of his untimely death became one of his last legislative accomplishments. I thank the Senator for his leadership on this matter and express my condolences to his family and to the citizens of Rhode Island. Kansans wish to claim Dwight D. Eisenhower as our own, but Senator Chafee has reminded us that no State has ownership of this great American.

It is my honor to recognize a fellow Kansan and this great American,

Dwight David Eisenhower. The life of President Eisenhower serves as an inspiration to all Americans to work to make this country and this world a better place. Born in Denison, Texas, and raised in Abilene, Kansas, Ike came from humble beginnings and grew to be one of the most influential figures in our Nation's history. Ike is an American hero and few would disagree that his accomplishments warrant the numerous monuments that pay tribute to him across our great land. This is an appropriate time to bring the life of Dwight D. Eisenhower to the attention of Members of Congress and the American people. Last week we celebrated the anniversary of the President's birth. This week C-SPAN is highlighting the life that we honor here today.

Abilene, Kansas, which I have the privilege of representing in Congress, is the home of the Eisenhower Center, featuring the Dwight D. Eisenhower Museum, the presidential library, the Eisenhower family home and the Place of Meditation where the President and his wife Mamie Doud are buried. In the gentleman from Texas' district, visitors can view the Eisenhower Birthplace Historical State Park.

We all represent districts that contain schools or streets named for President Eisenhower. While many tributes have been paid to this great man, nothing of significance exists here in our Nation's capital to honor and remember President Eisenhower.

It is a fitting tribute to name a great building, the Old Executive Office Building, for this great American. The Old Executive Office Building is symbolic of Ike's career. Constructed in 1871, 19 years before Ike's birth, the Executive Building was first the home of the State, War and Navy Departments. Ike had a personal connection to the Old Executive Office Building. He was first assigned there in 1927 as aide to General John J. Pershing. Following his victories in Europe, Ike returned to the building as the Army Chief of Staff. General Eisenhower served in the State, War and Navy Building a total of 7 years and 2 months. On January 19, 1955, Ike made history by holding the first televised presidential press conference on the building's fourth floor.

Knowing of this connection, it is not surprising that as President, Eisenhower was fundamental to the building's survival. In 1957, according to the White House historian and scholar William Seale, the advisory committee on presidential office space recommended that the building be demolished and replaced with an expensive modern structure. Mr. Seale reports that the architect in charge of the project tried to persuade President Eisenhower, who recently had suffered a heart attack, that a new building would not have as many stairs to climb. ''Nonsense,'' said Ike. ''My doctors require I climb so many steps a day for the good of my heart.'' Following that conversation, efforts to replace the building lost steam and the building and history were saved.

Both as a soldier and a statesman, Ike's more than 50 years of service to his country have had a profound effect upon the course of mankind. Considering his work as soldier, staff member, chief executive, the dedication of the Old Executive Office Building is an especially fitting tribute to the memory of this great man. The naming of this building is supported by many, including those who know his historic life the best. The great historian of Eisenhower's life and the chronicler of World War II has indicated his support. Stephen Ambrose has written:

''Renaming the Old Executive Office Building for him would be appropriate as well as much deserved. He served in the building in the early 1930s as an aide to General Douglas MacArthur, then Chief of Staff, U.S. Army. In the late 1950s as President, Eisenhower saved the building from demolition. Eisenhower was a leader in war and in peace of the men and women who saved our country and democracy. Surely something can be done in Washington to pay at least a bit of our eternal respect and gratitude for this great man.''

Stewart R. Etherington, President of the Eisenhower Foundation, has lent support of the foundation to this effort of national significance. Dwight David Eisenhower's life achievements should encourage all of us as Americans to aspire to greatness, to respect those around us, and to take great pride in our country. His character teaches parents the importance of instilling values, such as hard work, determination and honesty in our children.

I still like Ike, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this fitting tribute.

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

THE EISENHOWER FOUNDATION,
Abliene, KS, October 22, 1999.

Re Executive Office Building, Washington, DC.

Congressman JERRY MORAN,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MORAN: The Eisenhower Foundation has been watching the progress in the legislation to name the Executive Office Building for President Eisenhower. We fully support this effort as a way of honoring a man that worked in the building and helped save the building from destruction, but more importantly, a General and President that can still be looked at as a role model.

I thank you for the endeavors in this matter.

Sincerely,

STEWART R. ETHERINGTON,
President Eisenhower Foundation.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER LIBRARY,
Abilene, KS, October 26, 1999.

Hon. JERRY MORAN,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MORAN: Our staff notice several instances of historical errors in news accounts concerning the renaming of the Old Executive Office Building for General and President Eisenhower. As we are sure you would want accuracy in any wording prepared for any memorial inscriptions or official publicity about the renaming of the building, we offer the following chronology of Eisenhower's service in the Old Executive Office Building (previously the State, War & Navy Building), prepared from records in our archives;

January 21—August 15, 1927: Assigned to Headquarters, American Battle Monuments Commission (worked in the Office of the Chairman, General John J. Pershing), State, War & Navy Building.

July 1—July 30, 1928: Headquarters, American Battle Monuments Commission—after completing the course at the Army War College, Fort McNair (August 16, 1927—June 30, 1928)

September 24—November 8, 1929: Headquarters, American Battle Monuments Commission—after serving an assignment with the Paris, France, office of the ABMC (August 9, 1929—September 17, 1929)

November 8, 1929—February 20, 1933: Assistant Executive (General George Van Horn Mosley served as Executive), Office of the Assistant Secretary of War

February 20, 1933—September 24, 1935: Special Assistant to the Chief of Staff, War Department General Staff (General Douglas MacArthur)

December 14, 1941—February 15, 1942: Deputy Assistant Chief of Staff, (Pacific and Far East Section), War Plans Division, War Department

February 16—April 1, 1942: Assistant Chief of Staff, War Plans Division, War Department

April 2—June 22, 1942, Assistant Chief of Staff, Operations Division, War Department

By our calculations, General Eisenhower served in the State, War & Navy Building a total of seven years, two months.

President Eisenhower, of course, also used the E.O.B. In fact, all of his Washington press conferences were held in its press room. He did not, however have an office, per se, there.

If you have any questions about the above, or if we can be of assistance in other matters, please let us know.

Sincerely,

DANIEL D. HOLT,
Director.

THE EISENHOWER WORLD AFFAIRS INSTITUTE,
Washington, DC, October 26, 1999.

Hon. JERRY MORAN,
House of Representatives, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MORAN: I understand that final action is about to be taken on the proposal to name the Old Executive Office Building for President Dwight D. Eisenhower, and I write to express my very strong support for this initiative. I have two outstanding reasons.

First, I think it is especially appropriate that his name be given to this building in view of the fact that he served for many years in the building as the Principal Staff Assistant to General Douglas MacArthur when General MacArthur was the Chief of Staff of the Army and the building was known as the State-War-Navy Building. Also during his time as President, many of the key staff and supporting agencies on which he strongly relied and which made major contributions to his governance—including the Bureau of the Budget, as it was then named, and the National Security Council supporting staff and organization as well as the Council of Economic Advisers which played a major role during his Administration—were located there.

A second reason of key importance is that when a governmental commission studied

the problem of an acute need for additional executive office space, and recommended demolition of this fine historic building in favor of a building of more modern design, he took steps to see that this recommendation was not carried into effect. In actuality, he saved the building.

For these reasons and many others—especially to memorialize his contribution to our country in a particular fitting way—I strongly endorse the proposal that you have under consideration.

Sincerely,

ANDREW J. GOODPASTER,
General, U.S. Army (Ret).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the distinguished ranking member of the full committee, a gentleman of many talents, so those of us who saw him in full bike regalia this morning found.

□ 1515

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for those kind remarks and compliment her on her leadership on the Metropolitan Branch Trail that was dedicated this morning.

I, too, rise in support of the bill to designate the Executive Office Building as the Dwight D. Eisenhower Executive Office Building. Others have already detailed the long and illustrious career of President/General Eisenhower who was a towering figure. There are many other qualities and aspects of this great leader's career that I would like to underscore.

It was during President Eisenhower's tenure that the charter for the Federal Aviation Administration was crafted and that the first program of Federal grants to airports was initiated. It was on the result of a commission which he crafted, headed by General Lucius Clay to evaluate the status of airports in America and the future of aviation, and the Clay Commission reported in 1957 that within 10 years there would be a need to double, Mr. Speaker, double airport capacity in America and urged the establishment of a Federal grant and aid program to support and establish a national system of airports, and that resulted in the old Civil Aviation Administration being recrafted and created as we know it today as the Federal Aviation Administration, the first Federal grant program, a wise move and for once a prediction that fell far short of what really happened because airport capacity more than doubled in less than 10 years, but it was President Eisenhower's understanding of the power and the importance of aviation that moved him to support this initiative by the Federal Government.

It was also Captain Eisenhower taking a convoy across America in the 1920s who, seeing the condition of the roads, wondered to himself and to others what would happen in time of national emergency if we needed to move men and materiel rapidly in defense of the Nation. The road system would not support it. As President, he acted upon a recommendation of the Congress in 1944 to establish a national system of highways and refined the proposal to submit to the Congress the national system of interstate and defense highways and establishment of the highway trust fund, a dedicated revenue stream for the financing of the Nation's interstate highway program, the largest infrastructure program in the history of the world. $135 billion later this system represents 1 percent of the total highway mileage supported by Federal funds but carries 26 percent of all the traffic, which is well over a trillion miles traveled nationwide.

President Eisenhower clearly was a visionary and set the stage for our action in 1998 to restore the highway trust fund to its dedicated status as a guaranteed revenue stream protected by firewalls within the Federal budget under the leadership of our great chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER).

It was also President Eisenhower who saw the need to serve the great heartland, the industrial and agricultural heartland, of America and supported the legislation introduced by my predecessor in Congress, John Blatnik and supported by George Don Darrow, then the chairman of the Public Works Committee from Michigan. In the 2 years at that point that the Republicans had the majority in the House to establish the St. Lawrence Seaway, which was opened by President Eisenhower and Queen Victoria in 1959 and has now carried well over 2½ billion tons of cargo, and of course, as with the interstate highway system, it is now known as the Dwight D. Eisenhower National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and there is at the St. Lawrence Seaway on the U.S. side, the Eisenhower lock, which appropriately gives credit to the man who had the vision to support this great inland waterway system.

It was also President Eisenhower who gave the initial support for a national center for the performing arts that we today know as the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts and within which is the Eisenhower Theatre, appropriately named again for this President who had the sensitivity to understand that the arts are for all Americans.

There is more to a man of this stature than a legislative legacy or military leadership or accomplishments on the field of battle. There is a human dimension.

Last night, as I was driving home, I heard a segment of the LBJ tapes in which there was a conversation, a phone call placed by then retired President Eisenhower to then President LBJ to disavow a story that he thought was going to appear from a report of a closed session in which, as President Eisenhower said, of course I was talking to Republicans, and we were advocating a strong campaign, but I did not say things that I understand may make their way into print and told President Johnson that he had called the publisher of the news organization to disavow the statement and to urge that it not be published, and it was a very touching and a very warm and a very personal conversation between two truly great leaders, and it took, I think, extraordinary character to make the phone call and to talk in such a warm and touching way as President Eisenhower did to President Johnson.

That is a dimension that we cannot write in stone, that we cannot affix on buildings, but when that touches us very deeply as a great humane and humanitarian leader of this country, this building is appropriately named for Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT).

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding the time to me and congratulate him and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) for leadership on this measure as well as to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), who spoke so well a moment ago about Dwight D. Eisenhower. I am delighted to support this bill and I urge my colleagues to support it overwhelmingly to rename the Old Executive Office Building after President Eisenhower.

As was stated, General Eisenhower served in the building at the time the building housed the War Department for our country under General George C. Marshall, and then certainly General Eisenhower went on to lead the forces of Americans to freedom in World War II, and it is remarkable that there are no memorials or buildings or monuments in Washington, D.C. remembering the life and the service of President Eisenhower. This is a great time to make sure that that condition no longer exists, that we do remember President Eisenhower with a fitting building as a memorial to his life and his service to our country.

Certainly this bill ensures that visitors to our Nation's capital will have a place to pay respects to our 34th President and our supreme commander in World War II which invaded France on D-Day and went on to wage a successful war effort so that those of us who succeeded that generation can now live in freedom.

It is fitting that this building be named for President Eisenhower because like the Old Executive Office Building, President Eisenhower was towering and unique in appearance. He was unmistakable in his style and his dignity and his military demeanor, and he also had a tough and lasting personality throughout the war, one that I think those of us who came later in the generations that followed his do not fully appreciate sometimes.

The gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) mentioned the author, Mr. Ambrose, Stephen Ambrose, who has written a number of books on World War II

that are certainly worthy of our consideration because they chronicle the courage and the dignity and the bravery and the sacrifice and the hardship and the duty and the honor that so many of the World War II generation, men and women, provided so that we could be free, and these books by Mr. Ambrose chronicle those efforts so well and so beautifully, and we owe so much to the generation of President Eisenhower, the generation that produced him and the other heroes of the war who served in the infantry in the nursing core and the airmen and all those who served in the Armed Forces to preserve liberty and protect freedom.

So I am delighted certainly to join my colleagues in supporting this measure. It is about time that President Eisenhower is properly recognized in this city, and I am delighted that we can come together to do so today.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL).

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to be a cosponsor. Certainly Dwight David Eisenhower is a great man. I support Senate bill 1652.

As my colleagues know, one way to remember the legends of our country is to from time to time do like we are doing right here today, have a time to discuss their past and their service and to have a living or an existing memorial, as this bill will spawn, as an archive that will link us to some great days in this country, the time when we had the strongest financial position and the strongest geopolitical position of any country in the world that Dwight David Eisenhower was in leadership. I think this gives us a good feeling today, and it gives us confidence in tomorrow because of all the good things this great man did for us yesterday.

I recognize that he made a meteoric rise as a man in the military. I think in 1935 he was in the Philippines with General Eisenhower. In the early 1930s he attended college, of course, at the U.S. Military Academy, drenched in military tradition, and this may be my week to honor Texans because just earlier this week one of our United States Senators and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON) and others of us spoke in Dallas about Audie Murphy, Audie Murphy who was honored by having a stamp stamped with his name and his picture on it, his portrait there. It is a 33-cent stamp, and Audie Murphy was given 33 medals. I think that is coincidental, but many of those medals were given and presented to Audie Murphy by Dwight D. Eisenhower, and it is also kind of a Texas day because Dwight David Eisenhower was born in Texas, and we have a library, we have a boulevard named after him in Denison, Texas in Grayson County.

I also see a Texas connection to Dwight David Eisenhower, not that he was born there, but he gave his greatest service amid Texans. Sam Rayburn was Speaker of this House, Lyndon Johnson was majority leader, and they worked with this Republican, two staunch Democrats, to have good government and to render him a great and an acceptable President.

So I think as we today, as we rise in honor of Eisenhower, a man who received the greatest popular vote, over 62 million cast their votes in the polls in November of 1956, we honor a man not just for his victories in war, but for standing tall in peace at a time when we needed it.

□ 1530

It is an honor to cosponsor this resolution and to recognize one who answered the call, stood tall, gave to all of us, and I think will go down as one of the great generals in history, and certainly one of the fine Presidents. It is good that we recognize him by passing this act today.

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. TIAHRT).

Mr. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, some wonder why we remember and why we honor men and women who have passed on before us, why we name buildings after them. We remember because in their lives, we see our better angels. We are reminded that we, too, can rise above the problems we face.

Dwight D. Eisenhower was a fellow Kansan, and I am proud of that. I am pleased to tell others that he represented Kansas values. He was a hero who lived the values we all strive to reflect.

Let me just focus on one of those values, courage. In the face of adversity, he made a conscious decision to do the right thing. His family tells me that of all his accomplishments, he was the most proud of being the Supreme Allied Commander of the European Forces during World War II. There is good reason for that.

In Stephen Ambrose's book, ''D-Day,'' there is an excellent description of the anguish that he went through to make that decision to send our young men to the shores of France. He struggled with the decision. He paced back and forth, he inquired with his peers, he watched the weather reports, and then he came to the decision. I remember in the movie, ''The Longest Day,'' as the decision became so evident, he finally says, ''There it is.'' And it fell on his shoulders, and he accepted that, and he made the decision, because in the face of all that adversity, he knew in his heart it was the right thing to do.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is very appropriate that we recognize the Supreme Allied Commander, because in honoring his greatness, his courage, we tell ourselves and our children that character matters, that within all of us are better angels that can change our world for the better.

So, Mr. Speaker, there it is. I urge all my colleagues to support the designating of the Executive Office Building as the Dwight D. Eisenhower Executive Office Building.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR).

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I will include in the RECORD the list of the more than 127 items in this country, places, objects, monuments, that are named for President Eisenhower.

Lest there be any question whether former President Dwight D. Eisenhower has been appropriately recognized, I submit the following astonishing list on highways, Acts of Congress, buildings, golf courses, scholarships, and even an aircraft carrier named for this great American:

Dwight D. Eisenhower System of Interstate and Defense Highways Congressional Acts;

Dwight D. Eisenhower Mathematics and Science Education Act;

Eisenhower Exchange and Fellowship Act of 1990;

Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Bicentennial Civic Center Act; and the

Dwight David Eisenhower Commemorative Coin Act of 1988.

NAMED FOR DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER—

INDEX

1. Schools
2. Buildings, Rooms, Halls, Auditoriums, etc.
3. Awards, Funds, Foundations, etc.
4. Medical
5. Statues
6. Veterans' and Political Organizations
7. Geographic Features
8. Recreation
9. Miscellaneous
10. Philatelic and Numismatic

1. Schools

Dwight D. Eisenhower Elementary School, 848 N. Mesa Drive, Mesa, Arizona.

Dwight D. Eisenhower School (elementary), Garden Grove, California.

Dwight D. Eisenhower Elementary School, Indio, California.

Dwight D. Eisenhower School (elementary), Cupertino, California.

Dwight D. Eisenhower High School, Rialto, California.

Eisenhower Elementary School, Santa Clara, California.

Eisenhower Elementary, Eisenhower Drive, Boulder, Colorado.

Colegio Eisenhower, Guayaquil, Ecuador.

Dwight D. Eisenhower Elementary School, Clearwater, Florida.

Dwight D. Eisenhower Elementary School, 3600 Southwest College Avenue, Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33314.

Dwight D. Eisenhower Elementary School, Jacksonville, Illinois 62650.

Dwight D. Eisenhower School, 206 S. School Lane, Prospect Heights, Illinois 60070.

Eisenhower Junior High School, Darien, Illinois.

Eisenhower School (elementary), Lansing, Illinois.

Eisenhower Schools (elementary), South Holland, Illinois.

Dwight D. Eisenhower High School, Decatur, Illinois.

Dwight D. Eisenhower High School, Blue Island, Illinois.

Dwight D. Eisenhower School, 153 South Ottawa Street, Joliet, Illinois.

Dwight D. Eisenhower Junior High School, DuPage County, Illinois.

Dwight D. Eisenhower Elementary School, 1450 South Main Street, Crown Point, Indiana.

Dwight D. Eisenhower Elementary School, Ottunwa, Iowa.

Dwight D. Eisenhower Elementary School, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

Eisenhower Elementary School, Dubuque, Iowa.

Dwight D. Eisenhower Elementary School, Community School District, Davenport, Iowa.

General Dwight D. Eisenhower School, (elementary), Ft. Leavenworth, Kansas.

Eisenhower Elementary School, Wellington, Kansas.

Dwight D. Eisenhower Middle School, Topeka, Kansas.

Eisenhower School (elementary), Hoisington, Kansas.

Eisenhower School, (elementary), Junction City, Kansas.

Dwight D. Eisenhower Middle School, Kansas City, Kansas.

Eisenhower School, (elementary), Ottawa, Kansas.

Eisenhower School, (elementary), Great Bend, Kansas.

Eisenhower School, (elementary), Norton, Kansas.

Dwight D. Eisenhower Elementary School, Louisville, Kentucky.

Dwight D. Eisenhower School, Laurel, Maryland.

Dwight D. Eisenhower Middle School, Prince George's County, Maryland.

Eisenhower Elementary School, 8985 Newburgh Road, Livonia, Michigan 48150.

Dwight D. Eisenhower Elementary School, Fraser, Michigan.

Dwight D. Eisenhower Elementary School, Flint, Michigan.

Dwight D. Eisenhower High School, Saginaw, Michigan.

Dwight D. Eisenhower High School, Utica, Michigan.

Eisenhower Elementary School, Fergus Falls, Minnesota.

Dwight D. Eisenhower Junior High School, Township of Wyckoff, Wyckoff, New Jersey.

Dwight D. Eisenhower Elementary School, Piscataway Township, New Jersey.

The Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial School, West Berlin, New Jersey.

Dwight D. Eisenhower Elementary School, Sayreville, New Jersey.

Eisenhower Junior High School, Carlsbad, New Mexico.

John Rosenkrans, President, Eisenhower College, Seneca Falls, New York 13148.

Dwight D. Eisenhower Junior High School, Oregon, Ohio.

Dwight D. Eisenhower School (elementary), Enid, Oklahoma.

Dwight D. Eisenhower Elementary School, Tulsa, Oklahoma.

Eisenhower Junior and Senior High Schools, Lawton, Oklahoma.

Eisenhower Junior High School, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.

Dwight D. Eisenhower Elementary School, Indiana, Pennsylvania.

General Dwight D. Eisenhower High School, Akeley, Pennsylvania.

Eisenhower Elementary School, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania.

Dwight D. Eisenhower School (elementary), Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Dwight D. Eisenhower Elementary School, Camp Hill, Pennsylvania.

Dwight D. Eisenhower High School, Warren, Pennsylvania.

Dwight D. Eisenhower Elementary School, Levittown, Pennsylvania.

Dwight D. Eisenhower Elementary School, Middletown Township, Bucks County, Pennsylvania.

Dwight D. Eisenhower Junior High School, San Antonio, Texas.

Dwight D. Eisenhower Elementary School, Grand Prairie, Texas.

Dwight D. Eisenhower Senior High School, Yakima, Washington.

Dwight D. Eisenhower School (elementary), Green Bay, Wisconsin.

Eisenhower High School, New Berlin, Wisconsin.

Eisenhower Elementary School, Wauwatosa, Wisconsin.

2. BUILDINGS, ROOMS, HALLS AUDITORIUMS, ETC.

Edifico ''Ike'' (Apartment Building), Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

General Dwight D. Eisenhower Library, Sir Winston Churchill Cultural Institution, Guaxupe, Brazil.

The General Eisenhower Hall (dormitory), Brown Military Academy, Glendora, California.

Dwight D. Eisenhower Tower, California State College at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California.

Eisenhower Chapel, Denver, Colorado.

The General Dwight D. Eisenhower Auditorium, The National War College, District of Columbia.

Eisenhower Room for Heads of State, Blair House, District of Columbia.

Eisenhower Corridor, The Pentagon, District of Columbia.

Eisenhower Theater, John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, District of Columbia.

Dwight D. Eisenhower Library, Workers' Liberal-Radical Society of Guayas, Ecuador.

Eisenhower Pavilion (New part of American hospital) Paris, France.

Eisenhower Hall (school hall), Glenbrook South High School, Glenview, Illinois.

Dwight D. Eisenhower Library District, Norridge-Harwood Heights, Illinois.

Eisenhower Hall, Command and General Staff College, Ft. Leavenworth, Kansas.

Dwight D. Eisenhower Gymnasium, Hyde School, Bath, Maine.

The Eisenhower Library, Yeshivath Shearith Hapletah (Rabbinical School), Brooklyn, New York.

Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Hall, Delmar, New York.

Eisenhower Hall, U.S. Military Academy, West Point, New York.

Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Center, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio 43210.

Dwight D. Eisenhower Hall (Officers Mess), Valley Forge Military Academy, Wayne, Pennsylvania.

Eisenhower Ballroom, Officers Open Mess, Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania.

Eisenhower House (a ''game house''), Que Que High School, Que Que Southern Rhodesia.

Eisenhower Auditorium, Dension, Texas.

Eisenhower National Bank, Stanley Road at Henry T. Allen, Fort Sam Houston, Texas 78286.

Eisenhower Church of Christ, Odessa, Texas.

Dwight D. Eisenhower Building, Spokane, Washington 99202.

3. AWARDS, FUNDS, FOUNDATIONS, ETC.

Eisenhower Scholarship Fund, Johns Hopkins University, (Established by The Capitol Hill Club), District of Columbia.

Dwight D. Eisenhower World Affairs Institute, 918 16th Street, NW., Suite 501, Washington, District of Columbia 20006.

E.M. Sears, Executive Director, Eisenhower Memorial Scholarship Foundation, P.O. Box 1324, Bloomington, Indiana 47401.

Col. Howard Pars, General Dwight D. Eisenhower Award, U.S. Army Command & General Staff College, Office of the Commandant, Fort Leavenworth, Kansas 66027.

Bill Reese, Eisenhower Golf Fellowship, Burning Tree Club, Burdette and River Roads, Bethesda, Maryland 20817.

Dwight D. Eisenhower Scholarship Fund, Harvard University Cambridge, Massachusetts.

William G. Bowen, President, Dwight D. Eisenhower Fund, (Foreign and International Affairs), Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey 08544.

Debra Doame, Director, Dwight D. Eisenhower Scholarships and Fellowships Columbia College, New York City, New York 10028.

General Eisenhower Scholarship Fund, LaSalle Military Academy, Oakdale, Long Island, New York.

Rita Treacy, Awards Clerk. Eisenhower Award, United States Military Academy, West Point, New York, 10996.

Eisenhower Youth of the Year Award, (Given by the Youth Hall of Fame), Allentown, Pennsylvania 18105.

Col. Duey, Dwight D. Eisenhower Chair of Strategic Appraisal, US Army War College, Strategic Studies Institute, Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania 17013.

Eisenhower Exchange Fellowships Inc., Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Eisenhower Scholarship Fund, 120 S. Payne Street, Alexandria, Virginia 22314.

4. MEDICAL

Richard R. Augustine, Eisenhower Medical Center, 39000 Bob Hope Drive, Palm Desert, California 92260.

Eisenhower Hospital Osteopathic, Colorado Springs, Colorado.

Eisenhower Cardiac Unit, Spalding Rehabilitation Center, 1919 Ogden Street, Denver, Colorado.

Dwight D. Eisenhower Electronic Exercise Room, The Cardiac United of Spalding Rehabilitation Center, Denver, Colorado.

Major Foster, Dwight D. Eisenhower U.S. Army Hospital, Fort Gordon, Georgia 30905.

Dwight D. Eisenhower Department of Veterans, Affairs Medical Center, Leavenworth, Kansas.

The Dwight D. Eisenhower Institute for Stroke Research, 420 East 72nd Street, Suite 1–A, New York, New York.

The Eisenhower Cerebral Palsy Training Center, Cerebral Palsy of Greater Milwaukee, Inc., Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

Dwight D. Eisenhower Research Fund, (For United Cerebral Palsy Research and Education, Inc.)

Dwight D. Eisenhower Research Fund, (For American Heart Association).

5. STATUES

American Embassy, London, England.

City of Bayeux, Bayeux, France.

Eisenhower Center, Abilene, Kansas.

US Military Academy, West Point, New York.

Gettysburg College, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania.

Eisenhower Birthplace, Denison Texas.

6. VETERANS' AND POLITICAL ORGANIZATIONS

General Dwight D. Eisenhower Award, Arizona Young Republican League, Arizona.

The Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Post, Orange County, California.

Dwight D. Eisenhower Unit, Women's Political Study Club of California, Inc. California.

The Dwight D. Eisenhower Barracks, Veterans Home of California, California.

The Eisenhower Republican Center, District of Columbia.

Eisenhower Platz, (Plaza and adjacent Street, Holocaust Museum), Washington, District of Columbia.

Dwight D. Eisenhower Amvets Memorial Post No. 44, New Orleans, Louisiana.

Veterans Post Camp Ike, Albuquerque, New Mexico.

The Dwight D. Eisenhower Foundation for G.I. Joe, Inc., 82 Beaver Street, New York, New York.

The General Dwight D. Eisenhower Amvets Post No. 102, Spring Valley, New York.

The General Dwight D. Eisenhower Senior Village, (Disabled American Veterans), Farmingdale, New York.

The Eisenhower Federation of Republican Women, Gauley Bridge, West Virginia.

7. GEOGRAPHIC FEATURES

The Dwight D. Eisenhower System of Interstate and Defense Highways, [Entire 43,000-mile network of Interstate highways in the U.S.A].

Eisenhower Street, Los Angeles, California.

Eisenhower Street, San Mateo, California.

Mount Eisenhower, Canada.

Eisenhower Memorial Tree Forest, Lowry Air Force Base, Colorado.

Eisenhower Tunnel, Interstate Highway 70, Colorado.

Esplanade Eisenhower, Caen, France.

Eisenhower Parkway, Macon, Georgia.

Dwight D. Eisenhower Expressway,Chicago, Illinois.

Eisenhower Memorial Highway (K–15), Central Kansas.

Eisenhower Street, Wichita, Kansas.

Mount Eisenhower, New Hampshire.

Dwight D. Eisenhower Mall, (in Battery Park).

Castle Clinton—National Monument New York, New York.

Eisenhower Street, Dallas, Texas.

Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, Virginia.

Dwight D. Eisenhower Freeway, Washington, District of Columbia.

8. RECREATION

Dwight D. Eisenhower Park, Skagway, Alaska.

General Dwight D. Eisenhower Park, Orange County, California.

Eisenhower-Sunburst Tournament, Eldorado Country Club, Palm Desert, California.

Eisenhower Golf Course, Los Angeles County, Los Angeles, California.

Eisenhower Heart Fund Golf Tournament, Riverside County Heart Association, Inc., Riverside, California.

Eisenhower Golf Course, United States Air Force Academy, Colorado Springs, Colorado.

One hole on golf Course, Cherry Hills Country Club, Englewood Colorado.

Eisenhower National Memorial, District of Columbia.

1st Hole, Omaha Beach Golf Course. Colluvial sur Mar., France.

Eisenhower Pool, Springfield Park District, Springfield, Illinois.

Eisenhower Park. Abilene, Kansas.

Eisenhower League, (High school sports conference in north central Kansas), Kansas.

Dwight D. Eisenhower Park, Evesham Township, Burlington Co., New Jersey.

Dwight D. Eisenhower Park, Nassau County New York, Elmont, New York.

Eisenhower Braves, (Children's baseball team), Seminole, 1, Oklahoma.

General Dwight D. Eisenhower Trophy, Pennsylvania Horse Show, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

Dwight D. Eisenhower Campership, Penn Laurel Girl Scout Council, Inc., 1245 West Princess Street, York, Pennsylvania.

Eisenhower Park, Newport, Rhode Island.

Dwight D. Eisenhower Park, Houston, Texas.

Eisenhower State Park, Denison, Texas.

Eisenhower International Golf Classic, Eisenhower Tournament Office, P.O. Box 7363, Tyler, Texas 75711.

Eisenhower Trophy, (World Amateur Golf Championship).

Eisenhower Ski Trophy (Annual trophy awarded by United States Ski Educational Foundation, Inc.).

29th Annual ''Pike's Peak or Bust'' Rodeo Program (Dedicated to General Dwight D. Eisenhower).

9. MISCELLANEOUS

Dwight D. Eisenhower Room, Palm Desert Community Church, Palm Desert, California.

Larry Adams, Curator, Mamie Doud Eisenhower Birthplace Foundation, P.O. Box 55, Boone, Iowa 50036.

Ernest A. Morse, The Eisenhower Foundation, 1302 North Buckey, Abilene, Kansas 67410.

Eisenhower Chapter People-to-People, Abilene, Kansas.

Eisenhower Athletic Association, Inc., Until 7806, Saginaw, Michigan.

Eisenhower Patrol, Boy Scout Troop 56, Niagara Falls, New York

Ike Patrol, Girl Scout Troop, New Cumberland, Pennsylvania.

Eisenhower Class, Order of De Malay, San Antonio, Texas.

USS Dwight D. Eisenhower, Newport News, Virginia.

Dwight D. Eisenhower Engine, National Railroad Museum, Green Bay, Wisconsin.

IKE Livestock Brand, Wyoming.

Dwight D. Eisenhower Lock, St. Lawrence Seaway.

Eisenhower Alumnae Reunion, (Members of Eisenhower Administrations).

Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Bible Fund, American Bible Society.

Dwight D. Eisenhower Pledge Class, Kappa Omicron Chapter, Alpha Pi Omega (National organizations composed of former members of Boy Scouts of America).

Eisenhower Toile (drapery fabric).

Harry S. Truman, Dr. Howard A. Rusk, Irvin Geist Fund for the People-to-People Committee for the Handicapped RENAMED The Harry S. Truman, Dr. Howard A., Rusk, Dwight D. Eisenhower Fund for the People-to-People Committee for the Handicapped.

Towncouncil Rijswijk, Dep. Voorlichtung en p.r., Mr. J.C. deBeer Gen. Spoorlaan 2 2283 GM Rijswijk, Holland.

Dwight D. Eisenhower Nuclear Training Center, Wolf Creek Nuclear Operating Corporation, Burlington, Kansas.

10. PHILATELIC AND NUMISMATIC

Dwight D. Eisenhower Society, Gettysburg, Pennsylvania #17325.

Eisenhower Postal Society, Box 1176, Waco. Texas.

Eisenhower Dollar Coin, (U.S. Treasury Department 5–5–70).

Postmaster General—Commemorative stamp and a regular 6-cent stamp in General Eisenhower's honor.

Eisenhower Centennial Coin, U.S. Mint 2/90, Proof Silver Dollar; Uncirculated Silver Dollar.

Postmaster General—Eisenhower Centennial 29-cent stamp. Stamp issued in Abilene, Kansas only on 10/13/90, FDI stamped in Abilene, Kansas on 10/13/90. Pictorial cancellation in Abilene, Kansas only on 10/14/90.

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

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas (Mr. RYUN).

Mr. RYUN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 1652, a bill to designate the Old Executive Office Building the Dwight D. Eisenhower Executive Office Building.

Dwight D. Eisenhower was a man that garnered respect and admiration from all those he came in contact with. Eisenhower excelled in everything, from high school sports in Abilene, Kansas, to the Supreme Commander of the Normandy invasion in 1944, and as two-term President of the United States.

General Eisenhower's 4-decade, five-star military career included distinguished assignments as the chief military aid to the Chief of Staff of the Army, Commander-in-Chief of the Allied Forces in North Africa, Supreme Commander of the 1944 invasion of Normandy, Chief of Staff of the Army and Supreme Allied Commander of NATO forces.

Mr. Speaker, in his 8 years as President, Eisenhower's major achievements included sponsoring and signing the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956 that established the current interstate highway system, ending the Korean War by persuading the Chinese to accept a mutual peace agreement, promoting peace during Cold War crises that may have broken the rational will of other Presidents, and something that this Congress is currently negotiating, he balanced the Federal budget three different times.

Dwight D. Eisenhower served this country with sacrifices in war and his triumphs as President. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to pass S. 1652 and name the Old Executive Office Building after a man that deserves to be honored and remembered for his bravery and commitment to the freedoms of the United States.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRANKS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 1652.

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.

LLOYD D. GEORGE UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 437) to designate the United States courthouse under construction at 333 Las Vegas Boulevard South in Las Vegas, Nevada, as the ''Lloyd D. George United States Courthouse.''

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 437

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

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION OF LLOYD D. GEORGE UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE.

The United States courthouse under construction at 333 Las Vegas Boulevard South in Las Vegas, Nevada, shall be known and designated as the ''Lloyd D. George United States Courthouse''.

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the

United States to the United States courthouse referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Lloyd D. George United States Courthouse''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRANKS) and the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY) each will control 20 minutes.

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

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, Senate 437 designates the United States courthouse to be built in Las Vegas, Nevada, as the Lloyd D. George United States Courthouse.

Judge Lloyd D. George was born in Montpelier, Idaho, and later moved and attended schools in Las Vegas, Nevada. He earned his B.S. from Brigham Young University in 1955, and that same year entered the United States Air Force. He participated as a fighter pilot in the Strategic Air Command, concluding his military service in 1958, holding the rank of captain. He then returned to school where he earned his J.D. in 1961 from the University of California at Berkeley.

Judge George was admitted to the Nevada Bar in 1961 and began practice in Las Vegas. In 1974 he was appointed by the Ninth Circuit to preside over the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Nevada for a term of 14 years. In 1980 he became a member of the Ninth Circuit Bankruptcy Appellate Panels.

In 1984, President Ronald Reagan appointed Judge George to the United States District Court for the District of Nevada, where he was elevated in 1992 to Chief Judge of the Nevada District.

During his tenure on the bench, Chief Judge George held a variety of distinguished memberships. He was a board member on the Federal Judicial Center, a member of the National Bankruptcy Conference, the Chair of the Judicial Advisory for Bankruptcy Rules, the Chair of the Judicial Committee on Administration of Bankruptcy System, a Fellow at the American College of Bankruptcy, and a member of the Judicial Conference on International Judicial Relations.

I fully support the bill and urge my colleagues to support it as well.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of designating the United States courthouse in Las Vegas, Nevada, as the Lloyd D. George United States Courthouse. It is my sincere pleasure to introduce this measure, and I have worked very hard to bring it to the House floor. I would like to thank all of those that helped in this endeavor, particularly the ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER), and my colleague in the United States Senate, Senator HARRY REID.

I cannot think of a more suitable honor to bestow on this beloved Las Vegan, who has served the citizens of his home State of Nevada with humility, humanity, compassion, and dignity. In fact, the new Federal courthouse which this bill names is located right across the street from where Judge George attended grade school and within one block of his high school alma mater.

I would like to highlight some of Judge George's tremendous accomplishments. From his early days, as both high school and college student body president, Judge George demonstrated outstanding leadership abilities. Judge George served our country as an Air Force pilot before receiving his juris doctorate in 1961 from the University of California at Berkeley.

Among his numerous achievements, Judge George has been the recipient of the Jurist of the Year Award, the Liberty Bell Award for public service, and the Brigham Young University Alumni Distinguished Service Award.

He has served as former chairman of the State Apprentice Council, former president of the Clark County Association for Retarded Children, and a member of the National Advisory Council for the J. Willard and Alice S. Marriott School of Management.

From 1974 until 1984 Judge George served as the United States Bankruptcy judge. He also served as a National Bankruptcy Conference member and an American College of Bankruptcy fellow and a Judicial Conference member.

In May of 1984, Judge George was appointed U.S. District judge for the District of Nevada. He served as Chief District judge from 1992 to 1997 and assumed senior status in December of 1997.

Not only has Judge George served our Nation, he has also participated in numerous global committees, such as the International Judicial Relations Committee of the Judicial Conference, and has led seminars on legal topics in central and eastern Europe. What an extraordinary example he is for all of us.

When I think of Judge George, I see him administering the oath of allegiance to new citizens that are receiving their citizenship in the State of Nevada. I can tell you, when he administers this oath, there is not a dry eye in the house. This very sensitive, very compassionate man welcomes these people as new citizens to our country, and he does it with such charm and dignity that it makes us all very proud to be Americans. That is why it is most fitting and proper to honor the long, distinguished career of Judge George with this designation. I urge all of us to support this.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR).

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I want to especially express my appreciation to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER) for bringing this bill forward, and to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRANKS) for acting on the bill so quickly.

After a long gestation period, this bill has been awaiting action; but it is, as both the chairman of the full committee and chairman of the subcommittee have noted, a deserving recognition for a noted jurist.

I want to also commend my colleague, the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKELEY), on her persistence in advocating for this legislation and to the Senator from Nevada, Mr. REID, for being such a strong champion of naming the building for Judge Lloyd D. George.

I did not have the pleasure, as the gentlewoman from Nevada has had, of knowing Judge George, but on a recent visit last month to Nevada, where I met with many of the gentlewoman's constituents, spontaneously and without prompting, each came forward to extol the virtues of this great jurist. He certainly is a living legend, loved and respected, admired and appreciated by all who know of him, and maybe have been adjudicated by him.

But certainly this naming by popular appeal is exceptional. He is a man of great judicial capacity, but also great compassion, as the gentlewoman has so appropriately noted; and I am delighted we at last have this opportunity to bring to conclusion the appropriate naming of the U.S. courthouse and Federal building in Las Vegas for Judge Lloyd D. George. I compliment the gentlewoman on her success in achieving this breakthrough.

□ 1545

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRANKS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 437.

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. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on S. 1652 and S. 437.

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

There was no objection.

TRADEMARK CYBERPIRACY PREVENTION ACT

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3028) to amend certain trademark laws to prevent the misappropriation of marks, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3028

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; REFERENCES.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Trademark Cyberpiracy Prevention Act''.

(b) REFERENCES TO THE TRADEMARK ACT OF 1946.—Any reference in this Act to the Trademark Act of 1946 shall be a reference to the Act entitled ''An Act to provide for the registration and protection of trade-marks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes'', approved July 5, 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1051 et seq.).

SEC. 2. CYBERPIRACY PREVENTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 43 of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1125) is amended by inserting at the end the following:

''(d)(1)(A) A person shall be liable in a civil action by the owner of a mark, including a famous personal name which is protected under this section, if, without regard to the goods or services of the parties, that person—

''(i) has a bad faith intent to profit from that mark, including a famous personal name which is protected under this section; and

''(ii) registers, traffics in, or uses a domain name that—

''(I) in the case of a mark that is distinctive at the time of registration of the domain name, is identical or confusingly similar to that mark;

''(II) in the case of a famous mark that is famous at the time of registration of the domain name, is dilutive of that mark; or

''(III) is a trademark, word, or name protected by reason of section 706 of title 18, United States Code, or section 220506 of title 36, United States Code.

''(B) In determining whether there is a bad-faith intent described under subparagraph (A), a court may consider factors such as, but not limited to—

''(i) the trademark or other intellectual property rights of the person, if any, in the domain name;

''(ii) the extent to which the domain name consists of the legal name of the person or a name that is otherwise commonly used to identify that person;

''(iii) the person's prior lawful use, if any, of the domain name in connection with the bona fide offering of any goods or services;

''(iv) the person's lawful noncommercial or fair use of the mark in a site accessible under the domain name;

''(v) the person's intent to divert consumers from the mark owner's online location to a site accessible under the domain name that could harm the goodwill represented by the mark, either for commercial gain or with the intent to tarnish or disparage the mark, by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the site;

''(vi) the person's offer to transfer, sell, or otherwise assign the domain name to the mark owner or any third party for financial gain without having used, or having an intent to use, the domain name in the bona fide offering of any goods or services;

''(vii) the person's provision of material and misleading false contact information when applying for the registration of the domain name or the person's intentional failure to maintain accurate contact information;

''(viii) the person's registration or acquisition of multiple domain names which the person knows are identical or confusingly similar to marks of others that are distinctive at the time of registration of such domain names, or dilutive of famous marks of others that are famous at the time of registration of such domain names, without regard to the goods or services of such persons;

''(ix) the person's history of offering to transfer, sell, or otherwise assign domain names incorporating marks of others to the mark owners or any third party for consideration without having used, or having an intent to use, the domain names in the bona fide offering of any goods and services;

''(x) the person's history of providing material and misleading false contact information when applying for the registration of other domain names which incorporate marks, or the person's history of using aliases in the registration of domain names which incorporate marks of others; and

''(xi) the extent to which the mark incorporated in the person's domain name registration is distinctive and famous within the meaning of subsection (c)(1) of section 43 of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1125).

''(C) In any civil action involving the registration, trafficking, or use of a domain name under this paragraph, a court may order the forfeiture or cancellation of the domain name or the transfer of the domain name to the owner of the mark.

''(D) A person shall be liable for using a domain name under subparagraph (A)(ii) only if that person is the domain name registrant or that registrant's authorized licensee.

''(E) As used in this paragraph, the term 'traffics in' refers to transactions that include, but are not limited to, sales, purchases, loans, pledges, licenses, exchanges of currency, and any other transfer for consideration or receipt in exchange for consideration.

''(2)(A) In addition to any other jurisdiction that otherwise exists, whether in rem or in personam, the owner of a mark may file an in rem civil action against a domain name in the judicial district in which the domain name registrar, domain name registry, or other domain name authority that registered or assigned the domain name is located, if—

''(i) the domain name violates any right of the owner of the mark; and

''(ii) the owner—

''(I) has sent a copy of the summons and complaint to the registrant of the domain name at the postal and e-mail address provided by the registrant to the registrar; and

''(II) has published notice of the action as the court may direct promptly after filing the action.

The actions under clause (ii) shall constitute service of process.

''(B) In an in rem action under this paragraph, a domain name shall be deemed to have its situs in the judicial district in which—

''(i) the domain name registrar, registry, or other domain name authority that registered or assigned the domain name is located; or

''(ii) documents sufficient to establish control and authority regarding the disposition of the registration and use of the domain name are deposited with the court.

''(C) The remedies of an in rem action under this paragraph shall be limited to a court order for the forfeiture or cancellation of the domain name or the transfer of the domain name to the owner of the mark. Upon receipt of written notification of a filed, stamped copy of a complaint filed by the owner of a mark in a United States district court under this paragraph, the domain name registrar, domain name registry, or other domain name authority shall—

''(i) expeditiously deposit with the court documents sufficient to establish the court's control and authority regarding the disposition of the registration and use of the domain name to the court; and

''(ii) not transfer or otherwise modify the domain name during the pendency of the action, except upon order of the court.

The domain name registrar or registry or other domain name authority shall not be liable for injunctive or monetary relief under this paragraph except in the case of bad faith or reckless disregard, which includes a willful failure to comply with any such court order.

''(3) The civil action established under paragraph (1) and the in rem action established under paragraph (2), and any remedy available under either such action, shall be in addition to any other civil action or remedy otherwise applicable.''.

SEC. 3. DAMAGES AND REMEDIES.

(a) REMEDIES IN CASES OF DOMAIN NAME PIRACY.—

(1) INJUNCTIONS.—Section 34(a) of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1116(a)) is amended in the first sentence by striking ''(a) or (c)'' and inserting ''(a), (c), or (d)''.

(2) DAMAGES.—Section 35(a) of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1117(a)) is amended in the first sentence by inserting '', (c), or (d)'' after ''section 43(a)''.

(b) STATUTORY DAMAGES.—Section 35 of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1117) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d) In a case involving a violation of section 43(d)(1), the plaintiff may elect, at any time before final judgment is rendered by the trial court, to recover, instead of actual damages and profits, an award of statutory damages in the amount of not less than $1,000 and not more than $100,000 per domain name, as the court considers just. The court may remit statutory damages in any case in which the court finds that an infringer believed and had reasonable grounds to believe that use of the domain name by the infringer was a fair or otherwise lawful use.''.

SEC. 4. LIMITATION ON LIABILITY.

Section 32(2) of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1114) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) by striking ''under section 43(a)'' and inserting ''under section 43(a) or (d)''; and

(2) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (E) and inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

''(D)(i) A domain name registrar, a domain name registry, or other domain name registration authority that takes any action described under clause (ii) affecting a domain name shall not be liable for monetary or injunctive relief to any person for such action, regardless of whether the domain name is finally determined to infringe or dilute the mark.

''(ii) An action referred to under clause (i) is any action of refusing to register, removing from registration, transferring, temporarily disabling, or permanently canceling a domain name—

''(I) in compliance with a court order under section 43(d); or

''(II) in the implementation of a reasonable policy by such registrar, registry, or authority prohibiting the registration of a domain name that is identical to, confusingly similar to, or dilutive of another's mark.

''(iii) A domain name registrar, a domain name registry, or other domain name registration authority shall not be liable for damages under this section for the registration or maintenance of a domain name for another absent a showing of bad faith intent to profit from such registration or maintenance of the domain name.

''(iv) If a registrar, registry, or other registration authority takes an action described under clause (ii) based on a knowing and material misrepresentation by any other person that a domain name is identical to, confusingly similar to, or dilutive of a mark, the person making the knowing and material misrepresentation shall be liable for any damages, including costs and attorney's fees, incurred by the domain name registrant as a result of such action. The court may also grant injunctive relief to the domain name registrant, including the reactivation of the domain name or the transfer of the domain name to the domain name registrant.''.

SEC. 5. DEFINITIONS.

Section 45 of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1127) is amended by inserting after the undesignated paragraph defining the term ''counterfeit'' the following:

''The term 'domain name' means any alphanumeric designation which is registered with or assigned by any domain name registrar, domain name registry, or other domain name registration authority as part of an electronic address on the Internet.

''The term 'Internet' has the meaning given that term in section 230(f)(1) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 230(f)(1)).''.

SEC. 6. SAVINGS CLAUSE.

Nothing in this Act shall affect any defense available to a defendant under the Trademark Act of 1946 (including any defense under section 43(c)(4) of such Act or relating to fair use) or a person's right of free speech or expression under the first amendment of the United States Constitution.

SEC. 7. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Sections 2 through 6 of this Act shall apply to all domain names registered before, on, or after the date of enactment of this Act, except that damages under subsection (a) or (d) of section 35 of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1117), as amended by section 3 of this Act, shall not be available with respect to the registration, trafficking, or use of a domain name that occurs before the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 8. ADJUSTMENT OF CERTAIN TRADEMARK AND PATENT FEES.

(a) TRADEMARK FEES.—Notwithstanding the second sentence of section 31(a) of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1113(a)), the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks is authorized in fiscal year 2000 to adjust trademark fees without regard to fluctuations in the Consumer Price Index during the preceding 12 months.

(b) PATENT FEES.—

(1) ORIGINAL FILING FEE.—Section 41(a)(1)(A) of title 35, United States Code, relating to the fee for filing an original patent application, is amended by striking ''$760'' and inserting ''$690''.

(2) REISSUE FEE.—Section 41(a)(4)(A) of title 35, United States Code, relating to the fee for filing for a reissue of a patent, is amended by striking ''$760'' and inserting ''$690''.

(3) NATIONAL FEE FOR CERTAIN INTERNATIONAL APPLICATIONS.—Section 41(a)(10) of title 35, United States Code, relating to the national fee for certain international applications, is amended by striking ''$760'' and inserting ''$690''.

(4) MAINTENANCE FEES.—Section 41(b)(1) of title 35, United States Code, relating to certain maintenance fees, is amended by striking ''$940'' and inserting ''$830''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsection (a) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act. The amendments made by subsection (b) shall take effect 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 9. DOMAIN NAME FOR PRESIDENT, MEMBERS OF CONGRESS, SNF POLITICAL OFFICE HOLDERS AND CANDIDATES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Commerce shall require the registry administrator for the .us top level domain to establish a 2nd level domain name for the purpose of registering only domain names of the President, Members of Congress, United States Senators, and other current holders of, and official candidates and potential official candidates for, Federal, State, or local political office in the United States.

(b) GUIDELINES.—The Secretary of Commerce, in consultation with the Federal Election Commission, shall establish guidelines and procedures under which individuals may register a domain name in the 2nd level domain name established pursuant to subsection (a).

(c) ELIGIBLE REGISTRANTS.—The Federal Election Commission shall establish and maintain a list of individuals eligible, under the guidelines established pursuant to subsection (b), to register a domain name in the 2nd level domain name established pursuant to subsection (a).

(d) FEES.—The registry administrator and registrars for the .us top level domain may charge individuals reasonable fees for registering domain names pursuant to subsection (a).

(e) DEFINITION.—As used in this section, the term ''Member of Congress'' means a Representative in, or a delegate or Resident Commissioner to, the Congress.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Registration of domain names in accordance with this section shall begin no later than December 31, 2000.

SEC. 10. HISTORIC PRESERVATION.

Section 101(a)(1)(A) of the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470a(a)(1)(A)) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''Notwithstanding section 43(c) of the Act commonly known as the 'Trademark Act of 1946' (15 U.S.C. 1125(c)), buildings and structures meeting the criteria for the National Register of Historic Places under paragraph (2) may retain the name by which they are listed on the Register, if that name is the historical name associated with the building or structure.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) 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 H.R. 3028, as amended.

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. COBLE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3028, the Trademark Cyberpiracy Prevention Act, is a very important and significant piece of legislation, and I rise in support of it as a cosponsor.

Over the past 2 years, the Subcommittee on Courts and Intellectual Property, through a series of oversight hearings, has become very aware of the problems faced by owners of famous marks when dealing with the issue of domain names.

Time and time again we heard stories of cyberpirates who registered numerous domain names containing the markings or trade names of American companies, only to hold them ransom in exchange for money. Sometimes these pirates will even put pornographic materials on these sites in an effort to increase the incentive for the trademark owner to protect the integrity of its mark.

The time has come, Mr. Speaker, for this practice to stop. Imagine, if you will, that you own a small company and have spent years investing and delivering the good will of your business, only to find out when you go to register for a domain name that someone else has misappropriated your trademark name.

To make matters worse, you are informed that your legal options are limited, even if the offending party has placed pornographic or hateful materials on the site with your name on it.

This is an unacceptable situation, and should not be allowed to continue. This is a measured and balanced response to a growing problem, and I would like to commend the gentleman from California (Mr. ROGAN) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BOUCHER) for their leadership in this area, as well as the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Courts and Intellectual Property.

The legal recourse provided for in this legislation, combined with the alternative dispute resolution procedures being adopted by the domain name registrars, will give trademark owners important tools to protect their intellectual property.

I am unaware of any opposition to the manager's amendment, and I urge a favorable vote on H.R. 3028.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3028, the ''Trademark Cyberpiracy Prevention Act,'' is a very important piece of legislation. Over the past two years, the Subcommittee on Courts and Intellectual Property, through a series of oversight hearings, has investigated the problems faced by owners of famous marks when dealing with the issue of domain names. There have been many evidenced accounts of cyberpirates who register numerous domain names containing the marks of tradenames of American owners only to hold those names ransom in exchange for money. In some accounts, these pirates have placed pornographic materials on these sites in an effort to increase the incentive for the trademark owner to protect the integrity of its mark. This legislation is intended to stop this practice.

H.R. 3028 is a measured and balanced response to a growing problem, and I would like to commend Mr. Rogan and Mr. Boucher for their leadership in drafting this bill. The legal recourse provided for in this legislation, combined with the alternative dispute resolution

procedures being adopted by the domain name registers, in conjunction with recommendations by the World Intellectual Property Organization, will give trademark owners important tools to protect their intellectual property.

The following is a section-by-section analysis of H.R. 3028 which will serve as legislative history for the amendments adopted today.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1. Short title; references.

This section provides that the act may be cited as the ''Trademark Cyberpiracy Prevention Act'' and that any references within the bill to the Trademark Act of 1946 shall be a reference to the act entitled ''An Act to provide for the registration and protection of trademarks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes,'' approved July 5, 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1051 et seq.), also commonly referred to as the Lanham Act.

Section 2. Cyberpiracy prevention

Subsection (a). In General. This subsection amends the Trademark Act to provide an explicit trademark remedy for cyberpiracy under a new section 43(d). Under paragraph (1)(A) of the new section 43(d), actionable conduct would include the registration, trafficking in, or use of a domain name that is identical to, confusingly similar to, or dilutive of the trademark or service mark of another, provided that the mark was distinctive (i.e., enjoyed trademark status) at the time the domain name was registered. The bill is carefully and narrowly tailored, however, to extend only to cases where the plaintiff can demonstrate that the defendant registered, trafficked in, or used the offending domain name with bad-faith intent to profit from the goodwill of a mark belonging to someone else. Thus, the bill does not extend to innocent domain name registrations by those who are unaware of another's use of the name, or even to someone who is aware of the trademark status of the name but registers a domain name containing the mark for any reason other than with bad faith intent to profit from the goodwill associated with that mark.

The phrase ''including a famous personal name which is protected under this section'' addresses situations in which a famous personal is protected under Section 43 and is used as a domain name. The Lanham Act prohibits the use of false designations of origin and false or misleading representations. Protection under section 43 of the Lanham Act has been applied by the courts to famous personal names which function as marks, such as service marks, when such marks are infringed. Infringement may occur when the endorsement of products or services in interstate commerce is falsely implied through the use of a famous personal name, or otherwise. This protection also applies to domain names on the Internet, where falsely implied endorsements and other types of infringement can cause greater harm to the owner and confusion to a consumer in a shorter amount of time than is the case with traditional media. The protection offered by section 43 of a famous personal name which functions as a mark, as applied to domain names, is subject to the same fair use and first amendment protections as have been applied traditionally under trademark law, and is not intended to expand or limit any rights to publicity recognized by States under State law.

Paragraph (1)(B) of the new section 43(d) sets forth a number of nonexclusive, nonexhaustive factors to assist a court in determining whether the required bad-faith element exists in any given case. These factors are designed to balance the property interests of trademark owners with the legitimate interests of Internet users and others who seek to make lawful uses of others' marks, including for purposes such as comparative advertising, comment, criticism, parody, news reporting, fair use, etc. The bill suggests a total of eleven factors a court may wish to consider. The first four suggest circumstances that may tend to indicate an absence of bad-faith intent to profit from the goodwill of a mark, and the others suggest circumstances that may tend to indicate that such bad-faith intent exists.

First, under paragraph (1)(B)(i), a court may consider whether the domain name registrant has trademark or any other intellectual property rights in the name. This factor recognizes, as does trademark law in general, that there may be concurring uses of the same name that are noninfringing, such as the use of the ''Delta'' mark for both air travel and sink faucets. Similarly, the registration of the domain name ''deltaforce.com'' by a movie studio would not tend to indicate a bad faith intent on the part of the registrant to trade on Delta Airlines or Delta Faucets' trademarks.

Second, under paragraph (1)(B)(ii), a court may consider the extent to which the domain name is the same as the registrant's own legal name or a nickname by which that person is commonly identified. This factor recognizes, again as does the concept of fair use in trademark law, that a person should be able to be identified by their own name, whether in their business or on a web site. Similarly, a person may bear a legitimate nickname that is identical or similar to a well-known trademark and registration of a domain name using that nickname would not tend to indicate bad faith. This factor is not intended to suggest that domain name registrants may evade the application of this act by merely adopting Exxon, Ford, Bugs Bunny or other well-known marks as their nicknames. It merely provides a court with the appropriate discretion to determine whether or not the fact that a person bears a nickname similar to a mark at issue is an indication of an absence of bad-faith on the part of the registrant.

Third, under paragraph (1)(B)(iii), a court may consider the domain name registrant's prior lawful use, if any, of the domain name in correction with the bona fide offering of goods or services. Again, this factor recognizes that the legitimate use of the domain name in online commerce may be a good indicator of the intent of the person registering that name. Where the person has used the domain name in commerce without creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source or origin of the goods or services and has not otherwise attempted to use the name in order to profit from the goodwill of the trademark owner's name, a court may look to this as an indication of the absence of bad faith on the part of the registrant. A defendant should have the burden of introducing evidence of lawful use to assist the court in evaluating this factor.

Fourth, under paragraph (1)(B)(iv), a court may consider the person's legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the mark in a web site that is accessible under the domain name at issue. This factor is intended to balance the interests of trademark owners with the interests of those who would make lawful noncommercial or fair use of others' marks online, such as in comparative advertising, comment, criticism, parody, news reporting, etc. Under the bill, the use of a domain name for purposes of comparative advertising, comment, criticism, parody, news reporting, etc., even where done for profit, would not alone satisfy the bad-faith intent requirement. The fact that a person may use a mark in a site in such a lawful manner may be an appropriate indication that the person's registration or use of the domain name lacked the required element of bad-faith. This factor is not intended to create a loophole that otherwise might swallow the bill, however, by allowing a domain name registrant to evade application of the Act by merely putting up a noninfringing site under an infringing domain name. For example in the well known case of Panavision Int'l v. Toeppen, 141 F.3d 1316 (9th Cir. 1998), a well-known cyberpirate had registered a host of domain names mirroring famous trademarks, including names for Panavision, Delta Airlines, Neiman Marcus, Eddie Bauer, Lufthansa, and more than 100 other marks, and had attempted to sell them to the mark owners for amounts in the range of $10,000 to $15,000 each. His use of the ''panavision.com'' and ''panaflex.com'' domain names was seemingly more innocuous, however, as they served as addresses for sites that merely displayed pictures of Pana Illinois and the word ''Hello'' respectively. This act would not allow a person to evade the holding of that case—which found that Mr. Toeppen had made a commercial use of the Panavision marks and that such uses were, in fact, diluting under the Federal Trademark Dilution Act—merely by posting noninfringing uses of the trademark on a site accessible under the offending domain name, a Mr. Toeppen did. Similarly, the bill does not affect existing trademark law to the extent it has addressed the interplay between first amendment protections and the rights of trademark owners. Rather, the act gives courts the flexibility to weigh appropriate factors in determining whether the name was registered or used in bad faith, and it recognizes that one such factor may be the use the domain name registrant makes of the mark.

Fifth, under paragraph (1)(B)(v), a court may consider whether, in registering or using the domain name, the registrant intended to divert consumers away from the trademark owner's website to a website that could harm the goodwill of the mark, either for purposes of commercial gain or with the intent to tarnish or disparage the mark, by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the site. The factor recognizes that one of the main reasons cyberpirates use other people's trademarks is to divert Internet users to their own sites by creating confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the site. This factor recognizes that one of the main reasons cyberpirates use other people's trademarks is to divert Internet users to their own sites by creating confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or enforcement of the site. This is done for a number of reasons, including to pass off inferior goods under the name of a well-known mark holder, to defraud consumers into providing personally identifiable information, such as credit card numbers, to attract eyeballs to sites that price online advertising according to the number of ''hits'' the site receives, or even just to harm the value of the mark. Under this provision, a court may give appropriate weight to evidence that a domain name registrant intended to confuse or deceive the public in this manner when making a determination of bad-faith intent.

Sixth, under paragraph (1)(B)(vi), a court may consider a domain name registrant's offer to transfer sell, or otherwise assign the domain name to the mark owner or any third party for financial gain, where the registrant has not used, and did not have any intent to use, the domain name in the bona fide offering of any goods or services. This factor is consistent with the court cases, like

the Panavision case mentioned above, where courts have found a defendant's offer to sell the domain name to the legitimate mark owner as being indicative of the defendant's intent to trade on the value of a trademark owner's marks by engaging in the business of registering those marks and selling them to the rightful trademark owners. It does not suggest that a court should consider the mere offer to sell a domain name to a mark owner or the failure to use a name in the bona fide offering of goods or services is sufficient to indicate bad faith. Indeed, there are cases in which a person registers a name in anticipation of a business venture that simply never pans out. And someone who has a legitimate registration of a domain name that mirrors someone else's domain name, such as a trademark owner that is a lawful concurrent user of that name with another trademark owner, may, in fact, wish to sell that name to the other trademark owner. This bill does not imply that these facts are an indication of bad-faith. It merely provides a court with the necessary discretion to recognize the evidence of bad-faith when it is present. In practice, the offer to sell domain names for exorbitant amounts to the rightful mark owner has been one of the most common threads in abusive domain name registrations. Finally, by using the financial gain standard, this allows a court to examine the motives of the seller.

Seventh, under paragraph (1)(B)(vii), a court may consider the registrant's provision of material and misleading false contact information in an application for the domain name registration. Falsification of contact information with the intent to evade identification and service of process by trademark owners is also a common thread in cases of cyberpiracy. This factor recognizes that fact, while still recognizing that there may be circumstances in which the provision of false information may be due to other factors, such as mistake or, as some have suggested in the case of political dissidents, for purposes of anonymity. This bill balances those factors by limiting consideration to the person's contact information, and even then requiring that the provision of false information be material and misleading. As with the other factors, this factor is nonexclusive and a court is called upon to make a determination based on the facts presented whether or not the provision of false information does, in fact, indicate bad-faith.

Eighth, under paragraph (1)(B)(viii), a court may consider the domain name registrant's acquisition of multiple domain names that are identical to, confusingly similar to, or dilutive of others' marks. This factor recognizes the increasingly common cyberpiracy practice known as ''warehousing,'' in which a cyberpirate registers multiple domain names—sometimes hundreds, even thousands—that mirror the trademarks of others. By sitting on these marks and not making the first move to offer to sell them to the mark owner, these cyberpirates have been largely successful in evading the case law developed under the Federal Trademark Dilution Act. This act does not suggest that the mere registration of multiple domain names is an indication of bad faith, but allows a court to weigh the fact that a person has registered multiple domain names that infringe or dilute the trademarks of others as part of its consideration of whether the requisite bad-faith intent exists.

Ninth, under paragraph (1)(B)(ix), a court may consider the person's history of offering to transfer, sell, or otherwise assign domain name incorporating marks of others to the mark owners or other third party for consideration without having used, or having intent to use, the domain name. This factor should assist a court in distinguishing those circumstance more akin to warehousing versus those circumstances where the registrant has made a change is a business plan or course of action.

Tenth, under paragraph (1)(B)(x), a court may consider the person's history of providing material and misleading false contact information when applying for the registration of other domain names, or the person's history of using aliases in the registration of domain names which incorporate the marks of others. This factor recognizes that more often an applicant uses false or misleading contact information, the more likely it is that the applicant is engaging in speculative activity.

Lastly, under paragraph (1)(B)(xi), a court may consider the extent to which the mark incorporated in the person's domain name registration is distinctive and famous within the meaning of subsection (c)(1) of section 43 of the Trademark Act of 1946. The more distinctive or famous a mark has become, the more likely the owner of that mark is deserving of the relief available under this Act.

Paragraph (1)(C) makes clear that in any civil action brought under the new section 43(d), a court may order the forfeiture, cancellation, or transfer of a domain name to the owner of the mark. Paragraph (1)(D) further clarifies that a use of a domain name shall be limited to a use of the domain name by the registrant or his or her authorized licensee. This provision limits the right to use the domain name as a means to infringe on another's other bona fide trademark rights. Paragraph (1)(E) adopts a definition of ''traffics in'' which refers to a nonexhaustive list of activities, including sales, purchases, loans, pledges, licenses, exchanges of currency, and other transfer for consideration or receipt in exchange for consideration.

Paragraph (2)(A) provides for in rem jurisdiction, which allows a mark owner to seek the forfeiture, cancellation, or transfer of an infringing domain name by filing an in rem action against the name itself, if the domain name violates any right of the mark owner and where the mark owner has sent a copy of the summons and complaint to the registrant at the postal and e-mail address provided by the registrant to the registrar and has published notice of the action as the court may direct. As indicated above, a significant problem faced by trademark owners in the fight against cybersquatting is the fact that many cybersquatters register domain names under aliases or otherwise provide false information in their registration applications in order to avoid identification and service of process by the mark owner. The act alleviates this difficulty, while protecting the notions of fair play and substantial justice, by enabling a mark owner to seek an injunction against the infringing property in those cases where a mark owner is unable to proceed against the domain name registrant because the registrant has provided false contact information or is otherwise not to be found, provided that mark owner can show that the domain name itself violates substantive Federal trademark law (i.e., that the domain name violates the rights of the registrant of a mark registered in the Patent and Trademark Office, or section 43 (a) or (c) of the Trademark Act). Second, such in rem jurisdiction is also appropriate in instances where personal jurisdiction cannot be established over the domain name registrant. This situation occurs when a non-U.S. resident cybersquats on a domain name that infringes upon a U.S. trademark. This type of in rem jurisdiction still requires a nexus based upon a U.S. registry or registrar would not offend international comity. This jurisdiction would not extend to any domain name registries existing outside the United States. Nor would this jurisdiction preclude the movement of any registries to outside the United States. Instead, providing in rem jurisdiction based upon the lack of personal jurisdiction over the cybersquatter would provide protection both for the trademark owners and perhaps, more importantly, consumers. Finally, this jurisdiction does not offend due process, since the property and only the property is the subject of the jurisdiction, not other substantive personal rights of any individual defendant.

Paragraph (2)(B) states that in an in rem action, the domain name shall be deemed to have its situs in the judicial district in which the domain name registrar, or registry, or other domain name authority is located, or where documents sufficient to establish control and authority regarding the disposition of the registration and use of the domain name are deposited with the court.

Paragraph (2)(C) limits the relief available in such an in rem action to an injunction ordering the forfeiture, cancellation, or transfer of the domain name. When a court of appropriate jurisdiction receives a complaint filed pursuant to this section, the court will notify the registrar, registry, or other authority who shall expeditiously deposit with the court documents to establish control and authority regarding the disposition of the registration and use of the domain name. the registrar, registry, or other authority also may not transfer or otherwise modify the domain name in dispute during the pendency of the action except upon order of the court. The registrar, registry, or other authority shall not be liable for injunctive or monetary relief except in the case of bad faith or reckless disregard, which includes a willful failure to comply with a court order.

Paragraph (3) makes clear that the creation of a new section 43(d) in the Trademark Act does not in any way limit the application of current provisions of trademark, unfair competition and false advertising, or dilution law, or other remedies under counterfeiting or other statutes, to cyberpiracy cases.

Section 3. Damages and remedies

Section 3 applies traditional trademark remedies, including injunctive relief, recovery of defendant's profits, actual damages, and costs, to cyberpiracy cases under the new section 43(d) of the Trademark Act. The bill also amends section 35 of the Trademark Act to provide for statutory damages in cyberpiracy cases, in an amount of not less than $1,000 and not more than $100,000 per domain name, as the court considers just. The act permits the court to remit statutory damages in any case where the infringer believed and had reasonable grounds to believe that the use of the domain name was a fair or otherwise lawful use.

Section 4. Limitation on liability

This section amends section 32(2) of the Trademark Act to extend the Trademark Act's existing limitations on liability to the cyberpiracy context. This section also creates a new subparagraph (D) in section 32(2) to encourage domain name registrars and registries to work with trademark owners to prevent cyberpiracy through a limited exemption from liability for domain name registrars and registries that suspend, cancel, or transfer domain names pursuant to a court order or in the implementation of a reasonable policy prohibiting cyberpiracy. The act anticipates a reasonable policy against cyberpiracy will apply only to marks registered on the Principal Register of the Patent and Trademark Office in order to promote objective criteria and predictability in the dispute resolution process.

This section also protects the rights of domain name registrants against overreaching

trademark owners. Under a new section subparagraph (D)(iv) in section 32(2), a trademark owner who knowingly and materially misrepresents to the domain name registrar or registry that a domain name is infringing shall be liable to the domain name registrant for damages resulting from the suspension, cancellation, or transfer of the domain name. In addition, the court may grant injunctive relief to the domain name registrant by ordering the reactivation of the domain name or the transfer of the domain name back to the domain name registrant. Finally, in creating a new subparagraph (D)(iii) of section 32(2), this section codifies current case law limiting the secondary liability of domain name registrars and registries for the act of registration of a domain name, absent bad-faith on the part of the registrar and registry.

Section 5. Definitions

This section amends the Trademark Act's definitions section (section 45) to add definitions for key terms used in this act. First, the term ''Internet'' is defined consistent with the meaning given that term in the Communications Act (47 U.S.C. 230(f)(l)). Second, this section creates a narrow definition of ''domain name'' to target the specific bad-faith conduct sought to be addressed while excluding such things as screen names, file names, and other identifiers not assigned by a domain name registrar or registry.

Section 6. Savings clause

This section provides an explicit savings clause making clear that the bill does not affect traditional trademark defenses, such as fair use, or a person's first amendment rights.

Section 7. Effective date

This section provides that Sections 2 through 6 of this Act shall apply to all domain names, whether registered before, on, or after the date of enactment. However, damages as amended by section 3 of this act shall not be available to the registration, trafficking, or use of a domain name that occurs before the date of enactment.

Section 8. Adjustment of Certain Trademark and Patent Fees

The provisions of this section recalibrate the fee ratio between patents and trademarks to assure the independence for each respective operation within the United States Patent and Trademark Office (PTO). Historically, patent applicants pay a disproportionate ratio in application fees than trademark applicants, and this disparity leads to an inequity in the administration of the separate patent and trademark divisions of the PTO. These provisions will alter the fees paid by both applicants leading to an equaling of the administrative control within the PTO. The increased trademark fees will allow for greater autonomy of the Trademark Office which will promote better service to trademark applicants. The reduction in patent fees will directly correspond to the increase in trademark application fee, nullifying any detrimental affect on the overall budget of the PTO. The amendments made by this section take effect 30 days after the enactment of this legislation.

Section 9. Domain Name for President, Members of Congress, and Political Office Holders and Candidates

Section 9 directs the Secretary of Commerce to establish a second level domain under the ''.us'' top level domain for the purposes of registering only the domain names of the President, Members of Congress, United States Senators, and other current holders and official candidates and potential official candidates for federal, state and local political office in the United States. This section responds to a number of concerns raised by the Members of the Committee who have heard from citizens complaining of entering a web site thought to be that of a representative office holder or candidate, only to find the site has no connection to the office holder or candidate. Members are particularly concerned with the great potential for misinformation to the public who may believe the web site to be managed by an official source. As one of the underlying goals of this legislation is to combat public confusion and misinformation, it is entirely appropriate to establish a second level domain which allows every citizen to receive and direct information to an office holder or candidate, regardless of position or party affiliation, and be assured of the authenticity of the site. This provision will not inhibit free speech nor prevent someone from using an office holder or candidate's name on any top-level domain. It merely establishes a second-level domain where citizens can be assured of the integrity of election information. The registration of domain names shall begin no later than December 31, 2000.

Section 10. Historic Preservation

Secton 10 amends section 101(a)(1)(A) of the National Historic Preservation Act to state that the Federal Trademark Dilution Statute does not affect the ability of a building or structure meeting the criteria for the National Register of Historic Places to retain the name by which they are listed on the Register, if such name is the historical name associated with the building or structure.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3028, the Trademark Cyberpiracy Prevention Act.

First, let me just congratulate the gentleman from California (Mr. ROGAN) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BOUCHER) for introducing what I think is a very important and necessary piece of legislation, and also compliment my chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) for organizing the hearing, the markup, moving the bill through subcommittee and full committee, and now to the point where we, with some amendments that are being made, I think have made it an even better product.

Trade-, service-, and other marks that have come to represent the good will and identity of a business have an intrinsic value to a business. It is appropriate to protect that value from what amounts to embezzlement. This bill provides that protection in regard to the registration of domain names.

Domain names have become a key asset in the Internet environment. Most people looking around the Internet for a company will first type in the address, www.company.name.com. If we are looking for AT&T, all we have to do is enter the address, www.ATT.com, and we will get the official AT&T web site. Thus, use of a domain name, these plain English addresses, is very important to mark holders, similar to a shop owner being able to put a sign in front of their store letting people know where to find the store.

The problem is that under the current domain name registration process, anyone can register any name that has not yet been taken, so a single individual can register hundreds or thousands or domain names with no intent of using them on the Internet. Their only intent is to turn around and try to sell the domain name for thousands or tens of thousands of dollars to the rightful mark owner. Very simply put, under current law, someone can gather up thousands of domain names that represent marks and extort vast sums of money from the rightful owner.

This is even true as to famous personalities whose personal names qualify as a service mark. On the one hand ICANN, the private sector organization tasked by the Department of Commerce to manage domain names, is establishing a uniform dispute resolution mechanism for domain name registrars. That work is very important, and I hope the outcome of that process yields a mechanism that will be truly effective in protecting marks.

However, even with a private party dispute resolution process, there needs to be appropriate legal remedies where individuals seek to exploit through what amounts to extortion the registration of domain names. I think that this legislation sets out the appropriate legal framework and will certainly enhance the effectiveness of the protection of marks in this global electronic environment.

I have heard concerns expressed by celebrities about the misuse of their name in the same manner I have described. If we are going to do a bill on cyberpiracy, it makes perfect sense to me that we would want to address this finite problem.

So when the specific problem of cyberpirates exploiting personal names was brought to me, I asked, as did others here, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROGAN), the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE), that the interested parties on this issue come together and work through a solution. This bill reflects the very specific language that addresses this problem.

A personal name that constitutes a mark under the Lanham Act is treated the same way as any other mark protected by the Lanham Act under this bill. This bill does not create or insinuate a Federal right of publicity.

Finally, this bill establishes a very important avenue for candidates for public office to communicate their message through the Internet. Candidates for State or local office will now have a specific domain under the control of the U.S. Government where they can post their official web site. This will give voters the assurance that when they go to a site in this domain, they will be getting the official web site of the candidate, and not a site authored by an opponent, critic, or even faithful supporter. This is a major step towards enhancing the value of the Internet to our democracy.

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

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. ROGAN), the author of the bill.

Mr. ROGAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Courts and Intellectual Property for yielding time to me, and also for his incredible leadership on this particular measure.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BOUCHER) and coauthor of the bill in bringing forward the Cyberpiracy Prevention Act.

America's trademark owners are facing a new form of piracy on the Internet today caused by acts of cybersquatting. Cybersquatting is the deceptive practice of registering a domain name or establishing a web site containing a trademark name or title registered and owned by another entity with the intent to gain commercial advantage.

Cybersquatting takes place for a number of reasons: first, to extract payment from the rightful owners of the trademark. These are among the most prevalent cases, since it only costs $70 to register a domain name, and the potential for financial gain is far greater.

For example, after a cybersquatter preregistered four domain names for $280, he tried to sell to Warner Brothers the domain names Warner_Records.com, Warner_Bro_records.com, and Warnerpictures.Com for $350,000.

Second, cybersquatters will publicly offer a domain name for sale or lease to third parties. Right now we can log on and find marypoppins.com and the godfather.com for sale from an individual that does not have the trademark rights to those two popular names.

Third, cybersquatters use famous names and well known trademarks for pornographic sites that attempt to capitalize on customer confusion. Children doing homework assignments on the presidency have logged onto whitehouse.com, to find that this is a pornographic site.

Fourth, it is done to engage in consumer fraud, including counterfeiting activities. AT&T reports that a cybersquatter registered the domain names AT&T phonecard.com and at&tcalling card.com, and then established a web site soliciting credit card information from consumers.

AT&T is concerned that its brand name was being used to lure consumers to a web site that might be used to fraudulently to obtain financial information.

Despite the many problems that cybersquatting presents, there are no laws in any jurisdiction, national or otherwise, that explicitly prohibit this practice. H.R. 3208 provides a legal remedy for American businesses and individuals where traditional trademark law has failed. It protects trademarks and service mark owners while promoting the growth of electronic commerce by punishing individuals who register domain names in an attempt to profit at the expense of businesses and individuals.

This legislation specifically prohibits registration, trafficking in, or use of a domain name that is identical to, confusingly similar to, or that dilutes a mark that is distinctive at the time the domain name is registered.

This bill presents a real opportunity to strengthen the Internet's ability to serve as a viable marketplace in the 21st century. It does so by shoring up consumer confidence in legitimate brand names, discouraging fraudulent electronic commerce, and protecting the rights of legitimate trademark and service mark holders. It is time for Congress to pass this necessary legislation.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my dear friend and colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BOUCHER) for all his work and effort on this. I am especially grateful to my cosponsor, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Courts and Intellectual Property, for moving this bill so rapidly through the process, and to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN), for all his help on this.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BOUCHER), the cosponsor of the legislation.

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to join with my friend and colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROGAN) in offering this legislation. I want to join with him in expressing our mutual appreciation to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE), the subcommittee chairman, and the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN), the ranking member of the subcommittee, for their excellent assistance in processing the bill and bringing it to the floor today.

Under current law, it is hard for a trademark owner to obtain relief from someone who has obtained a domain registry of his trademarked name. The legal remedies are expensive and, at the end of the day, uncertain. Many trademark owners conclude that it is easier simply to pay the cybersquatter his ransom and in effect buy back his own trademark name than it is to enforce his legal rights in a court of law.

The gentleman from California (Mr. ROGAN) and I want to put cybersquatters out of business by providing a more certain and less expensive and more timely legal remedy to those who have trademarks and seek to enforce those trademarks. Our legislation sets forth a list of factors that can be applied in determining if a domain name registration is made in bad faith with the intent to profit from the good will that is associated with the trademark. These factors can be applied by a court. They can also be applied by the domain name registrar, who then would be given exemption from liability if, upon application of that list of factors, the determination was made that the registration was in bad faith, that the registration in fact was made by a cybersquatter, and that the registration should therefore be suspended or canceled.

Cancellation or suspension in that instance would be accompanied by the award of an exemption from liability, should the cybersquatter pursue the domain name registrar.

□ 1600

That, in my opinion, is the best change this legislation makes. It provides a remedy that is accessible, one that is timely, one that is far less expensive and uncertain than the remedies provided today.

I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, to encourage the passage of this measure, and I again want to commend the gentleman from California (Mr. ROGAN), the chief sponsor of the bill, for his excellent work.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the remaining amount of time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) each have 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) for yielding me the time.

The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) has worked with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) and I on this very important provision for a district that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) and I share.

As the chairman of the House Subcommittee on Courts and Intellectual Property, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) understands why we need this language in H.R. 3028, the Trademark Cyberpiracy Prevention Act. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) and I have worked to include a change which will protect historic landmarks in our area in South Miami Beach and around the country from unnecessary litigation due to a provision in the Federal Anti-Dilution Act.

It will preserve the historic names of hotels in our district known as the Tiffany, the Fairmont, the Essex House, and the Carlyle. These landmarks will now be able to continue with their traditional names which they have been known for for over two generations.

By supporting this bill, our colleagues will be ensuring that historic places around our Nation will be able to keep their names without fear of unnecessary legal action. Remember that to lose one's name is to lose one's identity and, even more importantly, to lose one's history.

I would also like to thank Miami Beach City Commissioner Nancy

Liebman who brought this issue to our attention. With the help of our colleagues here today, Mr. Speaker, in support of this legislation, we will be able to preserve the rich history of our Nation's historic preservation districts.

It was a pleasure for me to have worked with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) on this needed part of this bill.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW).

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Chairman COBLE) for yielding me this time.

I want to compliment the gentleman from North Carolina (Chairman COBLE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN), the ranking Democrat member, for the swift action that they have taken in bringing this matter and attaching it to this bill and bringing it to the floor.

For those of my colleagues who have not been to Miami Beach lately, there is a tremendous renaissance going on. The history of that area dates back to the early days of the 1920s when art deco was just getting started. The architecture that has evolved over the years in the 1920s, 1930s, and even into the 1940s is something really to behold and is unique in this country.

Part of that architecture is the wonderful names and the magical names that are attached to so many of the hotels in that area. Now we are seeing that the great renaissance is going on, that Miami Beach is turning back to its past and bringing out the best of the past and bringing it forward, which has become a tremendous tourist attraction.

The gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) represents the beautiful part of South Beach, which has become so famous. I wish my district went down quite that far, but I stop right at Lincoln Road.

I was born and raised right there on Miami Beach. I can remember as a child the wonderful buildings that were down there, the lights that one would go see. When someone would come to town, one would drive them down into that area and show off Miami Beach.

All of this is back. The magic of that great city is back. Nancy Liebman, who the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) mentioned in her statement, has been very active in bringing this matter back to our attention. She personally showed me and my wife Emily around Miami Beach. We were looking for the old theaters where we used to go on dates when we were both in high school together. It has really been quite good to see a city come back and bring back such a wonderful part of its past.

Due to an unexpected circumstance, unintended circumstance in the 1996 law, many of these hotels were robbed of their identity and were forced and were being made to change their name. This reverses an error that was made, and I want to compliment all of the members of the Committee on the Judiciary, and particularly the chairman and the ranking member, for bringing this back to our attention so we can correct this situation.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON), a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3028, the Trademark Cyberpiracy Prevention Act. I commend the gentleman from North Carolina (Chairman COBLE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. ROGAN) for their work on this legislation, and also the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN).

The explosive trends of E-commerce, which some experts predict will reach $1.3 trillion in total sales by the year 2003, combined with the exponential growth of the Internet, has led to a problem: The increasing epidemic known as cybersquatting.

Recently, within my State of Utah, a local paper reported that the Salt Lake City Olympic Organizing Committee has had to file a cybersquatting lawsuit against a shadowy group of defendants which infringed on its trademark rights by registering Internet domain names that mimicked names owned by the SLOC.

A small group located in Delaware registered the names

saltlakecitygames.com,
saltlakecity2002.com, and
saltlake2002.com.

These names infringe on the trademark rights of the Salt Lake Olympic Organizing Committee's authorized website: www.slc2002.org and 12 other protected phrases.

This bill is part of an overall effort to preserve legally protected names and trademarks. These are valuable corporate assets. This is how people learn to identify and contact these organizations.

The SLOC and other companies and organizations like this spend money, time, and effort in advertising these phrases. Unscrupulous cybersquatters are trying to cash in on their hard work.

In the Salt Lake example, the Olympic Committee received a phone call from a person, known only as ''John L.'' who offered to sell three sites for $25,000.

Investigators went to the address listed on the company's registration and found an empty office with no signs on the door. The registered telephone number did not work. The company was suspended for failure to pay taxes.

Another company within my district, Novell, shared with me a current problem. Apparently someone from Brazil has registered the names of each of Novell's product lines and names; but because the person is located outside the United States, there is currently no way for the company to gain judicial relief. This bill resolves that problem by allowing in rem jurisdiction.

The Rogan bill will prohibit registration, trafficking in, or the use of a domain name that is identical to, confusingly similar, or dilutive of a trademark that is distinctive at the time the domain name is registered.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will allow the trademark owners to seek the forfeiture, cancellation, or transfer of an infringing domain name if the trademark owner can prove it has attempted to locate the owner but has been unable to do so. This will discourage cybersquatters who frequently use aliases or otherwise provide false registration on their registration.

Industry and academics agree that legislative action is necessary. The uninhibited access to the Internet and E-commerce markets is vital, and First Amendment rights must also be preserved, but we must also respect the integrity of existing trademark and patent law.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, I just rise in conclusion to again tell the gentleman from North Carolina (Chairman COBLE) how much I appreciate the speedy movement of this bill, the process which I think made it better. I want to particularly thank the staff that worked on this bill, Mitch Glazier and Vince Garlock, and Bari Schwartz and Stacy Baird from my staff. I think we are all indebted to their work and their thoughts about this.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as usual, the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) is a jump ahead of me. I was going to also acknowledge the good work done by the respective staffs. It has been a good effort by all concerned.

Mrs. BONO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the worthy bill of my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROGAN), H.R. 3028—Trademark Cyberpiracy Prevention Act. This long overdue legislation is needed to address a novel practice which is essentially one of the most base forms of extortion, the cyberpiracy of famous marks for both wares and services. As the world of commerce evolves as with the growth of the Internet, we in Congress have the obligation to revisit the laws to preserve fairness for the regular order of business. The Lanham Act is an appropriate vehicle to address the concerns raised by consumers and small businesses alike regarding the cyberpiracy of famous marks in interstate, and often global, commerce. However, I am disappointed that this legislation could not go even further and my support is qualified on the ground that I intend to pursue the remaining relating issues in the future.

Unfortunately, in our effort to expedite this bill to the floor, we have failed to address another distressing form of cheap extortion,

namely the registration of personal names as domain names. My support for today's bill rests on the fact that while we address this worthy commercial problem through trademark law, we are not foreclosing the future opportunity to address this other domain name problem concerning personal privacy and autonomy in one's personae in cyberspace. This protection in my opinion must not be limited to the famous or just celebrities, it must be universal.

Certainly, many of my colleagues are aware of this issue. The main sponsor of H.R. 3028 has explained that his good name was spoofed by a political website recently. Several prominent national candidates have fallen prey to this extortion. It is a welcome improvement that the manager's amendment partially addresses the political candidate website issue. Likewise, in all candor, I too was a target of cyberpiracay last year. This is an increasing and serious problem for the parties and the public. In fact, today, I received an e-mail from one of Mr. Rogan's consititutents about this need for Congress to address this visceral problem of innocent people being victimized. Our efforts today may in fact exacerbate this problem. Since these people, whether you call them cyber-prospectors, cyber-pirates or just Joe. Q. Hacker, no longer can register the domain names that correspond to marks used in commerce, they may find profit and create mischief by registering the names of ordinary people. We need to act to remedy this outrageous problem.

Unfortunately, the necessary final solution cannot be offered today. The mechanism to remedy the concerns raised by Mr. ROGAN's constituent and so many others is difficult to identify and design in a narrowly-tailored way. Members of certain industries have voiced strong opposition to any possible establishment of a federal right of publicity with this bill. The creation of that form of intellectual protection is something that Congress must carefully and fully explore before enactment.

Frist, I call upon the companies that provide the registration of domain names to act. They must institute responsible and effective polices to prevent the registrations of personal names in bad faith, as well as provide accessible procedures for dispute resolution.

However, I wish to inform my colleagues that it is my intent to revisit this subject in the new year by introducing my own legislation on this topic. This legislation will not create a national right of publicity, but specifically address the problem at hand. It is my hope that my colleagues will join me in the important task of resolving the second and final part of the cyberpiracy problem. I am confident that we can enact such legislation that balances the interests of all concerned, including those of civil libertarians who raise legitimate First Amendment issues, the copyright bar, the e-commerce community, as well as the average citizens whose names are now literally on the line.

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 North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3028, 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.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from the further consideration of the Senate bill (S. 1255) to protect consumers and promote electronic commerce by amending certain trademark infringement, dilution, and counterfeiting laws, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 1255

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; REFERENCES.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Anticybersquatting Consumer Protection Act.''.

(b) REFERENCES TO THE TRADEMARK ACT OF 1946.—Any reference in this Act to the Trademark Act of 1946 shall be a reference to the Act entitled ''An Act to provide for the registration and protection of trade-marks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes'', approved July 5, 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1051 et seq.).

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The registration, trafficking in, or use of a domain name that is identical or confusingly similar to a trademark or service mark of another that is distinctive at the time of the registration of the domain name, or dilutive of a famous trademark or service mark of another that is famous at the time of the registration of the domain name, without regard to the goods or services of the parties, with the bad-faith intent to profit from the goodwill of another's mark (commonly referred to as ''cyberpiracy'' and ''cybersquatting'')—

(A) results in consumer fraud and public confusion as to the true source or sponsorship of goods and services;

(B) impairs electronic commerce, which is important to interstate commerce and the United States economy;

(C) deprives legitimate trademark owners of substantial revenues and consumer goodwill; and

(D) places unreasonable, intolerable, and overwhelming burdens on trademark owners in protecting their valuable trademarks.

(2) Amendments to the Trademark Act of 1946 would clarify the rights of a trademark owner to provide for adequate remedies and to deter cyberpiracy and cybersquatting.

SEC. 3. CYBERPIRACY PREVENTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 43 of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1125) is amended by inserting at the end the following:

''(d)(1)(A) A person shall be liable in a civil action by the owner of a trademark or service mark if, without regard to the goods or services of the parties, that person—

''(i) has a bad faith intent to profit from that trademark or service mark; and

''(ii) registers, traffics in, or uses a domain name that—

''(I) in the case of a trademark or service mark that is distinctive at the time of registration of the domain name, is identical or confusingly similar to such mark; or

''(II) in the case of a famous trademark or service mark that is famous at the time of registration of the domain name, is dilutive of such mark.

''(B) In determining whether there is a bad-faith intent described under subparagraph (A), a court may consider factors such as, but not limited to—

''(i) the trademark or other intellectual property rights of the person, if any, in the domain name;

''(ii) the extent to which the domain name consists of the legal name of the person or a name that is otherwise commonly used to identify that person;

''(iii) the person's prior use, if any, of the domain name in connection with the bona fide offering of any goods or services;

''(iv) the person's legitimate noncommercial or fair use of the mark in a site accessible under the domain name;

''(v) the person's intent to divert consumers from the mark owner's online location to a site accessible under the domain name that could harm the goodwill represented by the mark, either for commercial gain or with the intent to tarnish or disparage the mark, by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the site;

''(vi) the person's offer to transfer, sell, or otherwise assign the domain name to the mark owner or any third party for substantial consideration without having used, or having an intent to use, the domain name in the bona fide offering of any goods or services;

''(vii) the person's intentional provision of material and misleading false contact information when applying for the registration of the domain name; and

''(viii) the person's registration or acquisition of multiple domain names which are identical or confusingly similar to trademarks or service marks of others that are distinctive at the time of registration of such domain names, or dilutive of famous trademarks or service marks of others that are famous at the time of registration of such domain names, without regard to the goods or services of such persons.

''(C) In any civil action involving the registration, trafficking, or use of a domain name under this paragraph, a court may order the forfeiture or cancellation of the domain name or the transfer of the domain name to the owner of the mark.

''(D) A use of a domain name described under subparagraph (A) shall be limited to a use of the domain name by the domain name registrant or the domain name registrant's authorized licensee.

''(2)(A) The owner of a mark may file an in rem civil action against a domain name if—

''(i) the domain name violates any right of the registrant of a mark registered in the Patent and Trademark Office, or section 43 (a) or (c); and

''(ii) the court finds that the owner has demonstrated due diligence and was not able to find a person who would have been a defendant in a civil action under paragraph (1).

''(B) The remedies of an in rem action under this paragraph shall be limited to a court order for the forfeiture or cancellation of the domain name or the transfer of the domain name to the owner of the mark.''.

(b) ADDITIONAL CIVIL ACTION AND REMEDY.—The civil action established under section 43(d)(1) of the Trademark Act of 1946 (as added by this section) and any remedy available under such action shall be in addition to any other civil action or remedy otherwise applicable.

SEC. 4. DAMAGES AND REMEDIES.

(a) REMEDIES IN CASES OF DOMAIN NAME PIRACY.—

(1) INJUNCTIONS.—Section 34(a) of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1116(a)) is amended in the first sentence by striking ''section 43(a)'' and inserting ''section 43 (a), (c), or (d)''.

(2) DAMAGES.—Section 35(a) of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1117(a)) is amended in the first sentence by inserting '', (c), or (d)'' after ''section 43 (a)''.

(b) STATUTORY DAMAGES.—Section 35 of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1117) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d) In a case involving a violation of section 43(d)(1), the plaintiff may elect, at any time before final judgment is rendered by the trial court, to recover, instead of actual damages and profits, an award of statutory damages in the amount of not less than $1,000 and not more than $100,000 per domain name, as the court considers just. The court shall remit statutory damages in any case in which an infringer believed and had reasonable grounds to believe that use of the domain name by the infringer was a fair or otherwise lawful use.''.

SEC. 5. LIMITATION ON LIABILITY.

Section 32(2) of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1114) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A) by striking ''under section 43(a)'' and inserting ''under section 43 (a) or (d)''; and

(2) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (E) and inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

''(D)(i) A domain name registrar, a domain name registry, or other domain name registration authority that takes any action described under clause (ii) affecting a domain name shall not be liable for monetary relief to any person for such action, regardless of whether the domain name is finally determined to infringe or dilute the mark.

''(ii) An action referred to under clause (i) is any action of refusing to register, removing from registration, transferring, temporarily disabling, or permanently canceling a domain name—

''(I) in compliance with a court order under section 43(d); or

''(II) in the implementation of a reasonable policy by such registrar, registry, or authority prohibiting the registration of a domain name that is identical to, confusingly similar to, or dilutive of another's mark registered on the Principal Register of the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

''(iii) A domain name registrar, a domain name registry, or other domain name registration authority shall not be liable for damages under this section for the registration or maintenance of a domain name for another absent a showing of bad faith intent to profit from such registration or maintenance of the domain name.

''(iv) If a registrar, registry, or other registration authority takes an action described under clause (ii) based on a knowing and material misrepresentation by any person that a domain name is identical to, confusingly similar to, or dilutive of a mark registered on the Principal Register of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, such person shall be liable for any damages, including costs and attorney's fees, incurred by the domain name registrant as a result of such action. The court may also grant injunctive relief to the domain name registrant, including the reactivation of the domain name or the transfer of the domain name to the domain name registrant.

''(v) A domain name registrant whose domain name has been suspended, disabled, or transferred under a policy described under clause (ii)(II) may, upon notice to the mark owner, file a civil action to establish that the registration or use of the domain name by such registrant is not unlawful under this Act. The court may grant injunctive relief to the domain name registrant, including the reactivation of the domain name or transfer of the domain name to the domain name registrant.''.

SEC. 6. DEFINITIONS.

Section 45 of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1127) is amended by inserting after the undesignated paragraph defining the term ''counterfeit'' the following:

''The term 'Internet' has the meaning given that term in section 230(f)(1) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 230(f)(1)).

''The term 'domain name' means any alphanumeric designation which is registered with or assigned by any domain name registrar, domain name registry, or other domain name registration authority as part of an electronic address on the Internet.''.

SEC. 7. SAVINGS CLAUSE.

Nothing in this Act shall affect any defense available to a defendant under the Trademark Act of 1946 (including any defense under section 43(c)(4) of such Act or relating to fair use) or a person's right of free speech or expression under the first amendment of the United States Constitution.

SEC. 8. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this Act, an amendment made by this Act, or the application of such provision or amendment to any person or circumstances is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this Act, the amendments made by this Act, and the application of the provisions of such to any person or circumstance shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 9. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall apply to all domain names registered before, on, or after the date of enactment of this Act, except that statutory damages under section 35(d) of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1117), as added by section 4 of this Act, shall not be available with respect to the registration, trafficking, or use of a domain name that occurs before the date of enactment of this Act.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. COBLE

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. COBLE moves to strike all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill, S. 1255, and to insert in lieu thereof the text of H.R. 3028 as it passed the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. 3028) was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.Con.Res. 190, by the yeas and nays;

H.Con.Res. 208, by the yeas and nays;

H.Con.Res. 102, by the yeas and nays;

H.Con.Res. 188, by the yeas and nays; and

Concurring in Senate amendments to H.R. 1175, by yeas and nays.

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

URGING UNITED STATES TO SEEK GLOBAL CONSENSUS SUPPORTING MORATORIUM ON TARIFFS AND SPECIAL, MULTIPLE, AND DISCRIMINATORY TAXATION OF ELECTRONIC COMMERCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H.Con.Res. 190, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H.Con.Res. 190, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 423, nays 1, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 537]

YEAS—423

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

Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
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
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—1

Abercrombie

NOT VOTING—9

Granger
Hinojosa
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Latham
Mascara
McNulty
Menendez
Rush
Scarborough

□ 1636

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

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). 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 motions to suspend the rules on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

SENSE OF CONGRESS THERE BE NO INCREASE IN FEDERAL TAXES TO FUND ADDITIONAL GOVERNMENT SPENDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 208.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 208, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 371, nays 48, answered ''present'' 3, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 538]

YEAS—371

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

NAYS—48

Berman
Borski
Brady (PA)
Coyne
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
Delahunt
Dicks
Dixon
Fattah
Frank (MA)
Hastings (FL)
Hinchey
Hooley
Jackson (IL)
Kanjorski
Klink
Lee
Lofgren
Markey
McDermott
McGovern
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Moakley
Mollohan
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Nadler
Neal
Oberstar
Olver
Payne

Pelosi
Rahall
Sabo
Sanders
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Stark
Tierney
Vento
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Wynn

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—3

Capuano
Johnson, E.B.
Owens

NOT VOTING—11

Ganske
Granger
Hinojosa
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Latham
Mascara
McNulty
Menendez
Obey
Rush
Scarborough

□ 1647

Messrs. BERMAN, DELAHUNT, DEFAZIO, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. MARKEY and Mr. SERRANO changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

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.

Stated for:

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 538, had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

CELEBRATING 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF GENEVA CONVENTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 102.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 102, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 423, nays 0, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 539]

YEAS—423

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

NOT VOTING—10

Granger
Hinojosa
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Latham
Mascara
McNulty
Menendez
Obey
Rush
Scarborough

□ 1656

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.

COMMENDING GREECE AND TURKEY FOR PROVIDING EACH OTHER HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE AND RESCUE RELIEF AFTER RECENT EARTHQUAKES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 188.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 188, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 424, nays 0, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 540]

YEAS—424

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Clay
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
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
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
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—9

Granger
Hinojosa
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Latham
Mascara
McNulty
Menendez
Rush
Scarborough

□ 1705

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.

AUTHORIZING AN INVESTIGATION INTO THE DISAPPEARANCE OF ZACHARY BAUMEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). The pending business is on the question of suspending the rules and concurring in the Senate amendments to H.R. 1175.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the bill, H.R. 1175, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 421, nays 0, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 541]

YEAS—421

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Clay
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
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
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
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden

Walsh	Weldon (FL)	Wise
Wamp	Weldon (PA)	Wolf
Waters	Weller	Woolsey
Watkins	Wexler	Wu
Watt (NC)	Weygand	Wynn
Watts (OK)	Whitfield	Young (AK)
Waxman	Wicker	Young (FL)
Weiner	Wilson	

NOT VOTING—12

Granger	Latham	Rush
Hinojosa	Mascara	Scarborough
Houghton	McNulty	Spence
Jackson-Lee (TX)	Menendez	
	Pickett	

□ 1716

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendments were concurred in.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 106–148)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TANCREDO) laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning herewith without my approval H.R. 2670, the ''Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2000.''

This legislation should embody the continuing commitment of this Administration on a broad range of fundamental principles. First and foremost amongst these tenets is the notion that the United States of America should be the safest country in the world. Our families must feel secure in their neighborhoods. Since 1993, the progress realized toward that end has been impressive and must not be impeded.

Moreover, America must continue to lead the community of nations toward a safer, more prosperous and democratic world. This guidepost has for generations advanced the cause of peace and freedom internationally, and an erosion of this policy is untenable and unacceptable at this critical moment in history.

This great Nation serves as example to the world of a just and humane society. We must continue to lead by our example and maintain a system that vigorously protects and rigorously respects the civil rights of individuals, the dignity of every citizen, and the basic justice and fairness afforded to every American.

Unfortunately, this bill fails to uphold these principles.

Specifically, and most notably, the bill fails to adequately fund the proposed 21st Century Policing Initiative, which builds on the success of the Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) program. I requested $1.275 billion in new appropriations, and this bill provides only $325 million. To date, the COPS program has funded more than 100,000 additional police officers for our streets. The 21st Century Policing initiative would place an additional 30,000 to 50,000 police officers on the street over the next 5 years and would expand the concept of community policing to include community prosecution, law enforcement technology assistance, and crime prevention. Funding the COPS program required a bipartisan commitment, and it paid off; recently released statistics show that we have the lowest murder rate in 31 years and the longest continuous decline in crime on record. I strongly believe we must forge a similar commitment to support the COPS program's logical successor.

The bill would also threaten America's ability to lead in the world by failing to meet our obligation to pay our dues and our debts to the United Nations. This is a problem I have been working with the Congress to resolve for several years, but this bill fails to provide a solution.

Though the bill does include adequate funds to support our annual contribution to the United Nations regular budget, it conditions the funding on separate authorizing legislation, continuing an unacceptable linkage to an unrelated issue. For this reason, because of additional provisions, and because the bill is inconsistent with provisions agreed to by the authorizing committees, the bill would still cause the United States to lose its vote in the United Nations. It would undercut efforts that matter to America in which the U.N. plays an important role, from our fight against terrorism and proliferation, to our efforts to promote human rights, the well-being of children, and the health of our environment. It would undermine our ability to shape the U.N.'s agenda in all these areas and to press for reforms that will make its work more effective. All this is unacceptable. Great nations meet their responsibilities, and I am determined that we will meet ours.

In addition, the bill includes only $200 million for International Peacekeeping Activities, a reduction of almost 60 percent from my request. The requested level of $485 million is necessary to meet anticipated peacekeeping requirements in East Timor, Sierra Leone, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ethiopia, and Eritrea. In each of these places, the United States has worked with allies and friends to end conflicts that have claimed countless innocent lives and thrown whole regions into turmoil. In each case, the U.N. either has been or may be asked to help implement fragile peace agreements, by performing essential tasks such as separating adversaries, maintaining cease-fires, enabling refugees to go home, training police forces, and overseeing civilian institutions. In each case, as in all U.N. peacekeeping missions, other countries will pay 75 percent of the cost and provide virtually all the military personnel.

It is clearly in America's national interest to support an institution through which other countries share the burden of making peace. Refusing to do our part would be dangerous and self-defeating. It could undermine fragile peace agreements that America helped forge, and spark new emergencies to which we could only respond later at far greater cost. It would leave America with an unacceptable choice in times of conflict and crisis abroad: a choice between acting alone and doing nothing.

The bill includes a number of provisions regarding the conduct of foreign affairs that raise serious constitutional concerns. Provisions concerning Jerusalem are objectionable on constitutional, foreign policy, and operational grounds. The actions called for by these provisions would prejudice the outcome of the Israeli-Palestinian permanent status negotiations, which have recently begun and which the parties are committed to concluding within a year. The bill also includes a provision that could be read to prevent the United States from engaging in diplomatic efforts regarding the Kyoto protocol. Applying restrictions to the President's authority to engage in international negotiations and activities raises serious constitutional concerns. Other provisions that should be deleted from the bill because they would unconstitutionally constrain the President's authority include provisions on Haiti, Vietnam, and command and control of United Nations Peacekeeping efforts. My Administration's objections to these and other language provisions have been made clear in previous statements of Administration policy regarding this bill.

This bill does not contain a needed hate crimes provision that was included in the Senate version of the bill. I urge the Congress to pass legislation in a timely manner that would strengthen the Federal Government's ability to combat hate crimes by relaxing jurisdictional obstacles and by giving Federal prosecutors the ability to prosecute hate crimes that are based on sexual orientation, gender, or disability, along with those based on race, color, religion, and national origin.

The bill freezes the funding level for the Legal Services Corporation. Adequate funding for legal services is essential to ensuring that all citizens have access to the Nation's justice system. I urge the Congress to fully fund my request, which provides an increase of $40 million over the FY 1999 enacted level. Also, funding for the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) is frozen at the enacted level. This level would undermine EEOC's progress in reducing the backlog of employment discrimination cases.

Similarly, inadequate funding is provided for the United States Commission on Civil Rights and the Civil Rights Division of the Department of

Justice. The bill does not fund my requested $13 million increase for the Civil Rights Division, including increases for law enforcement actions related to hate crimes, the Americans with Disabilities Act, and fair housing and lending. I ask the Congress to restore requested funds for these law enforcement enhancements.

The bill contains adequate funding for the decennial census, but I oppose language that could inhibit the Census Bureau's ability to actually conduct the census. The bill would require the Census Bureau to obtain approval from certain committees if it chooses to shift funds among eight functions or frameworks. This approval process would impose an unnecessary and potentially time-consuming constraint on the management of the decennial census. It is imperative that we move forward on the census; this legislation could impede it.

The United States has recently entered into the U.S.-Canada Pacific Salmon Agreement. The agreement ends years of contention between the U.S. and Canada regarding expired fishing harvest restrictions and provides for improved fisheries management. This bill includes extraneous legislative riders that would hinder the implementation of that important Agreement. These riders would prohibit the application of the Endangered Species Act to Alaskan salmon fisheries and would change the voting structure of the Pacific Salmon Commission, the decision-making body established by the Agreement. In essence, the voting structure rider would prevent the Federal Government from negotiating agreements that balance the interests of all States. In addition to the riders, the bill provides only $10 million of the $60 million requested to implement the Salmon Agreement. Similarly, funding for the Salmon Recovery Fund falls far short of that needed to work cooperatively with the States of Washington, Oregon, California, and Alaska and with Treaty Tribes to help them mount effective State-based plans to restore Pacific coastal salmon runs. These shortfalls together would severely inhibit our ability to recover this important species.

In addition, the enrolled bill does not provide my request for a number of other environmental programs, including my Lands Legacy Initiative, Endangered Species Act activities, the Clean Water action Plan, and the Global Learning and Observations to Benefit the Environment program. The additional funds required to bring these programs to my requested levels are small compared to the benefits they provide to our natural resources.

The bill does not include $100 million in new funding for the Drug Intervention Program, which would have provided critical assistance to State and local governments developing and implementing comprehensive systems for drug testing, drug treatment, and graduated sanctions for drug offenders. These resources are critical to reducing drug use in America.

The bill does not provide additional requested funding to the Justice Department for tobacco litigation. Smoking-related health expenses cost taxpayers billions of dollars each year through Medicare, veterans' and military health, and other Federal health programs. The Department of Justice needs the $20 million I requested to represent the interests of the taxpayers, who should not have to bear the responsibility for these staggering costs.

This bill would also hurt our Nation's small businesses. The level provided for the Small Business Administration's (SBA's) operating expenses would inhibit my Administration's ability to provide service to the Nation's 24 million small businesses. The bill also fails to provide sufficient funds for the Disaster Loan program within the SBA. Without additional funding, the SBA will not be able to respond adequately to the needs arising from Hurricane Floyd and other natural disasters. In addition, the bill does not include funds for my New Markets Initiative to invest in targeted rural and urban areas.

The bill fails to include a proposed provision to clarify current law and protect taxpayer interests in the telecommunications spectrum auction process. Currently, $5.6 billion of bid-for-spectrum is tied up in bankruptcy court, with a very real risk that spectrum licensees will be able to retain spectrum at a fraction of its real market value. The requested provision would maintain the integrity of the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) auction process while also ensuring speedy deployment of new telecommunications services. The bill would also deny funds needed by the FCC for investments in technology to better serve the communications industry. Also, the bill does not provide sufficient funds for the continued operations of the FCC. The Commission requires additional funds to invest in technology to serve the communications industry more effectively.

In conference action, the rider was added that would amend the recently-enacted Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act to expand the prohibition of discrimination against individuals who refuse to ''prescribe'' contraceptives to individuals who ''otherwise provide for'' contraceptives (all nonphysician providers) in the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program. As an example, this language could allow pharmacists to refuse to dispense contraceptive prescriptions. This action violated jurisdictional concerns and is also unacceptable policy.

The bill underfunds a number of high-priority programs within the Department of Commerce. My Administration sought an additional $9 million to help public broadcasters meet the Federal deadline to establish digital broadcasting capability by May 1, 2003. The bill would provide less than half of last year's funding level for the Critical Infrastructure Assurance Office. The bill also fails to fund the Department's other programs to protect critical information and communications infrastructures. The Congress must restore these funds if the Department is to continue performing its important and emerging role in coordinating activities that support our economic and national security.

The bill does not include any funds to reimburse Guam and other territories for the costs of detaining and repatriating smuggled Chinese aliens. These entities deserve our support for assisting in this interdiction effort.

I look forward to working with the Congress to craft an appropriations bill that I can support, and to passage of one that will facilitate our shared objectives.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 25, 1999.*

□ 1730

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TANCREDO). The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and the message and bill will be printed as a House document.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the message, together with the accompanying bill, be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1475

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor from H.R. 1475.

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

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE RICHARD A. GEPHARDT, DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable RICHARD A. GEPHARDT, Democratic Leader:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER,
Washington, DC, October 26, 1999.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 1404 of Public Law 99–661 (20 U.S.C. 4703), I hereby appoint the following individual to the Barry Goldwater Scholarship and Excellence in Education Foundation: Mr. Owen B. Pickett, Virginia.

Yours Very Truly,

RICHARD A. GEPHARDT.

STRENGTHEN SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE ACT OF 1999—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 106–149)

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 Ways and Means, the Committee on Rules, and the Committee on the Budget, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith for your immediate consideration a legislative proposal entitled the ''Strengthen Social Security and Medicare Act of 1999.''

The Social Security system is one of the cornerstones of American national policy and together with the additional protections afforded by the Medicare system, has helped provide retirement security for millions of Americans over the last 60 years. However, the long-term solvency of the Social Security and Medicare trust funds is not guaranteed. The Social Security trust fund is currently expected to become insolvent starting in 2034 as the number of retired workers doubles. The Medicare system also faces significant financial shortfalls, with the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund projected to become exhausted in 2015. We need to take additional steps to strengthen Social Security and Medicare for future generations of Americans.

In addition to preserving Social Security and Medicare, the Congress and the President have a responsibility to future generations to reduce the debt held by the public. Paying down the debt will produce substantial interest savings, and this legislation proposes to devote these entirely to Social Security after 2010. At the same time, by contributing to the growth of the overall economy debt reduction will improve the Government's ability to fulfill its responsibilities and to face future challenges, including preserving and strengthening Social Security and Medicare.

The enclosed bill would help achieve these goals by devoting the entire Social Security surpluses to debt reduction, extending the solvency of Social Security to 2050, protecting Social Security and Medicare funds in the budget process, reserving one-third of the non-Social Security surplus to strengthen and modernize Medicare, and paying down the debt by 2015. It is clear and straightforward legislation that would strengthen and preserve Social Security and Medicare for our children and grandchildren. The bill would:

—Extend the life of Social Security from 2034 to 2050 by reinvesting the interest savings from the debt reduction resulting from Social Security surpluses.

—Establish a Medicare surplus reserve equal to one-third of any on-budget surplus for the total of the period of fiscal years 2000 through 2009 to strengthen and modernize Medicare.

—Add a further protection for Social Security and Medicare by extending the budget enforcement rules that have provided the foundation for our fiscal discipline, including the discretionary caps and pay-as-you-go budget rules.

I urge the prompt and favorable consideration of this proposal.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 26, 1999.*

SPECIAL ORDERS

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

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

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.)

CONGRESS IS TRYING TO STOP THE RAID ON SOCIAL SECURITY FOR THE PEOPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Kentucky (Mrs. NORTHUP) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. NORTHUP. Mr. Speaker, this Congress is committed to restoring the faith and opportunity into our government system.

For years, Congress after Congress has dipped into the social security trust fund to pay for new programs with little accountability of how funds were to be used and an empty promise to pay it back. The Congresses of yesteryear broke trust with the American people, and now all generations are suffering.

Mr. Speaker, it is enshrined forever in the three opening words of the living document that we swear our allegiance to, our Constitution. Our Founders had the great and good sense to use the words ''We, the people.'' The people is why Congress is fighting so hard to stop the raid on social security.

It is not about which party is in control, who kept their promises, and who broke theirs. It is about having a social security system for the people when they need it, our parents and grandparents who need it now and in the future. It is about maintaining the system so that our children may be protected, and it is about the price our children must pay to get the same benefits as their descendents did. It is about drawing the line on new Federal spending now, so that our children do not have to continue to fund this never-ending stream of new programs being requested by this administration.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress is very much about the people. We are listening to the conversations around dinner tables, in bingo halls, and in the grocery store parking lots. This is why this House has restored the faith by having every penny in the social security surplus to provide the retirement system for working Americans. It is the common sense of the American people which tells us to stop the raid on social security.

This Congress is using common sense, and will continue the commitment to social security and the people of this Nation. Our only hope is that this administration will stop calling for more spending and make this commitment, as well. We, the people, will prevail again.

ON THE PASSING OF JAMES ALEXANDER FORBES, SENIOR

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

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about a man that really has made a difference in this Nation, James Alexander Forbes, Senior, a minister who passed away just recently. The funeral was yesterday.

He had eight children. Of course, he educated all of his eight children. They received at least a masters's degree, and four of the eight children have doctor's degrees. He did this at the same time he was in school himself. He went to school with his three children that were in college, and he was in college right along with them. Of course, it shows us his commitment to education. He was not able to start out early in life, so therefore he felt it was important to get an education and to encourage his children, as well. He was a man who truly pulled himself up by his bootstraps.

When we look at his family in terms of what the children were able to accomplish, we look at the pastor of Riverside Church, Dr. James Alexander Forbes, Junior, one of the children, of course, and then we have David Forbes, who is one of the outstanding ministers in the State of North Carolina, and then, of course, we have another daughter that is a lawyer here and working in HUD, and then we have several that are in education, and another son that is a psychiatrist practicing in Richmond, Virginia, it goes to show us in terms of the fact that if we are committed, the kind of things we can do. The Forbes family has demonstrated that in a very eloquent fashion.

I also think about how he touched lives. When we talk to people who walk

the street, they will tell us how Dr. James Alexander Forbes, Senior, was able to motivate people. Young people would just sort of come and spend time with him, because he had so much to offer.

I am certain that in his homegoing, that many people wanted to say things and wanted to be part of the ceremony, but were not able to be part of that ceremony because of the fact that he was such a special person.

I remember from my early years, in terms of dealing with him, how he always wanted you to have all the facts, wanted you to have all the information. If you decided to talk to him, if you were not prepared, he would tell you to go away and come back after you have collected all the data.

So I would say to the family and to all the friends of Dr. James Alexander Forbes, Senior, here is a man who has really made a difference in the lives of people. As much as he is gone now, think of the fact that he has touched so many lives, and the people that he has touched. I am certain that he will continue to live through those people that he trained, through those people that he was able to help, through those people that he counseled. I think that will make a difference in terms of their lives as well.

In closing, let me just say to the family that, sure, they are going to miss their dad, their granddad, their uncle, and of course, brother, all of that, and friend. But I think we need to just, at this moment in time, think about the contributions that he has made. I am certain that the angels in heaven are probably being told by God today, step aside, angels, let me handle Reverend Forbes myself, because that is the kind of life that he lived. I think that he would say to the angels, you are not prepared to handle this right now.

TRIBUTE TO DAN GABLE

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

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to invite my colleagues' attention to the career of Dan Gable, an Iowan who has made a unique contribution to amateur wrestling, and in the process, become a hero and role model for athletes in the United States and around the world.

Based on his personal record and that of his team's, Dan Gable may well be the greatest competitor and greatest coach in the history of sports. After winning a series of State championships for Waterloo West High School in Waterloo, Iowa, Dan attended Iowa State University, where he won two national collegiate championships.

Subsequently he won the prestigious Tblisi Tournament in Russia, captured championships in the Pan American games, and the world wrestling tournament. In the 1992 Olympic games, Dan not only won a Gold Medal, but in the six matches he had to win to do so, he did not give up a single point. It was the first time an American had ever gone through an entire Olympics unscored upon.

Dan concluded his career as a wrestler with an overall record of 307 wins and 7 losses, with no new worlds to conquer. He turned to coaching, beginning at the University of Iowa as an assistant, and soon taking over as head coach.

As head coach of the Iowa Hawkeyes, his teams won 15 NCAA team championships in 21 years, including nine straight between 1978 to 1986, and three in a row on two subsequent sessions.

In listing Iowa University wrestling alongside the New York Yankees and the Green Bay Packers as one of the greatest sports dynasties in the 20th century, Sports Illustrated said, in part:

> As terrifying as Dan Gable was to opposing wrestlers when he won the Olympic Gold Medal in 1972, he was just as discomfiting matside as he seemed to will his Hawkeyes to total dominance.

In the final analysis, Dan Gable's influence cannot be measured simply in wins and losses. By precept and example, he has both taught and embodied the values wrestling preeminently imparts: equality of opportunity, discipline, and respect for self and opponent.

There is no more egalitarian circle than a wrestling mat. While all sports involve God-given athleticism, wrestling eliminates the advantages of size and rewards hard work and conditioning. The talented, unschooled athlete simply cannot prevail over the dedicated plugger.

Wrestling teaches a healthy respect for the role of limits in life. All experienced wrestlers know the structure of all the moves. Unlike the professional entertainment that is its namesake, amateur wrestling is devoid of tricks. Yet, within the context of a limited number of moves, each wrestler develops his own style which best reflects his nature, physique, and ability.

Just as the successful wrestler must know his limits, he must understand his opponent, modifying his moves to adjust to his opponent's strengths and weaknesses. Wrestlers learn to live within limits imposed by the exacting discipline of the sport, a sport that is uniquely individualist, yet fosters team comraderie.

Wrestling teaches that, as in life, nothing serious can be accomplished without a work ethic. Above anything else, Dan Gable exemplifies the work ethic. In his career as a wrestler and coach, he stands as the apotheosis of American competitive values.

On Sunday, November 14, the cable television channel HBO Signature will air a documentary on the career of Dan Gable entitled ''Freestyle: The victories of Dan Gable.''

□ 1745

It will introduce millions to this exemplary American athlete. I highly recommend young people in particular to watch this program with the understanding that excellence is a worthy goal, but it does not come easily.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TANCREDO). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

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

A.C. GREEN IS A TRUE ROLE MODEL FOR OUR CHILDREN

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

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, one night last week, I watched Hannity & Colmes on the Fox News Channel. The show featured two professional athletes and a discussion on whether sports figures should be role models.

The men and women our children look to for guidance is an issue I have taken a great deal of interest in, especially in the last few years. In fact, I have come to the House floor a number of times to discuss the lack of morality within our society and its potential impact on our Nation's future.

Too many times the leaders and public figures our children look to for guidance fall short in their responsibility. Thank goodness for men and women at the local level who work to teach our youth the value that they need to succeed in life. They are the parents, the little league coaches, Boy Scout and Girl Scout leaders, and volunteers across this country. These individuals work directly with our children to encourage character and integrity in their lives and the lives of our children.

As Oliver Wendell Holmes once said, ''The noblest services come from the nameless hands, and the best servant does his work unseen.''

Mr. Speaker, I agree with this statement. In fact, I wish that more of our children could see their parents and community leaders as the heroes they truly are. Too often the athletes and actors our children look up to fail our children. They may have money or fame, but their own behavior often lacks the sense of responsibility our children must see in order to succeed in life.

Thank goodness there are exceptions. As I watch Hannity & Colmes, I was most impressed to see one fine athlete

who takes his position as a role model very seriously. In fact, he uses his success and popularity to help children gain the skills they need to succeed.

A.C. Green is a forward with the Los Angeles Lakers. He began his professional basketball career in 1985 after graduating from college. He has a record-setting career, playing for such teams as the Phoenix Suns, the Dallas Mavericks, and the L.A. Lakers, that has earned him recognition among sports fans and respect among his colleagues.

While A.C. Green is best known for his talents on the court, it is his dedication to our Nation's children that makes him a role model we can all respect.

In 1989, A.C. Green created a youth foundation in his name to help our children realize their potential and work to achieve their goals. In fact, the foundation's mission statement reads, ''Our goal is to serve both the youth and the communities in which they live by providing information about sexual abstinence and social issues that concern our young people and educating them to make responsible choices to prepare them for their future.''

The A.C. Green Youth Foundation believes that young people must develop morally, ethically, educationally, physically, and mentally to fulfill their dreams and goals in life.

Mr. Speaker, as part of his program for youth, A.C. Green created a leadership camp that over 100 boys and girls take part in each year. The summer basketball camp focuses on academics, career discovery, and offers self-esteem counseling. It reaches out to those children who have been abused or maybe economically disadvantaged and encourages leadership and teamwork. Perhaps most important, A.C. Green takes the time to personally supervise the camp and interact with the children.

In addition, his foundation has also created abstinence curriculum for today's youth called ''I've Got the Power.'' The program teaches students to recognize their self worth, realize boundaries, and learn to make responsible decisions. These are the values we must work to encourage in the lives of our children.

Mr. Speaker, A.C. Green's commitment to his community is deserving of our recognition. As a basketball player and as a community servant, A.C. Green is a true role model.

Having found success at a young age, he is now working to help those less fortunate realize their own dreams and work to their fullest potential. His efforts and those like his should be honored and encouraged.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank A.C. Green and every one of our Nation's role models who make a difference in the lives of our Nation's children, for the children are America's future.

I thank A.C. Green for helping to ensure a strong America tomorrow and in the future.

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

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

BAN TOY GUNS

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, as I think a majority of the members of this House know, it is imperative for the safety of the citizens of this country and for the security of our children that we do something to crack down on the trafficking of guns.

To discuss this further, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TOWNS).

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, let me point out that the gun that I have in my hand is a toy gun. It looks like a real gun, but it is a toy gun. This is the thing that I am hoping we will be able to come to grips with, that we need to ban toy guns. Too many of these guns look like real guns. Not only that, we have young people in this country who are being killed because of toy guns.

In my own district, I have had youngsters killed because they had a toy gun in their hand, and the police officer did not know it was a toy and ended up shooting the person, and the person ended up dying.

Not only that, we have people that are wounded and end up in the hospital and have hospital costs as a result of toy guns.

Then someone said, well, put a red sticker on them, and then that way the person will know that it is a toy. Well, two things are happening with that. The criminals are now putting red around the front of their guns, and then the other thing is that one can take and pull this right off in no time flat. Then it looks like a real gun again. So we need to sort of make a decision to do something about toy guns.

I have a display here. All these guns here look like real guns. We brought it into the airport, and all the people in the airport started ducking because they thought they were real. So if we have young people getting killed with these toys as a result of having these toy guns, it seems to me we should do something.

Let me just give my colleagues some statistics that might be alarming to them, that every day in the United States of America, we lose a classroom full of children from guns. A classroom full of children die every day in the United States of America because of guns.

Then we have toy guns, which I think that only wets a child's appetite to go get a real gun, and so, therefore, why should we not ban them? Because if it wets their appetite to go get a real gun, then I think that we need to do something.

But the other part, which I do find this extremely alarming, that we have the criminals now robbing with toy guns. In New York, we have the Sullivan law. Of course, if they rob with a toy gun, then they are not violating the Sullivan law, so, therefore, the charges are less. But the point is that the crime still took place.

Nobody is going to interview one to find out whether the gun is real or not. When one sticks it into a teller's face, the teller is going to give up the money. That is the problem, because they look like they are real.

So I think the time has come when we must do something about it. I have been working on this in my own district. I had what we call a toy gun turn-in, that one turns in one's toy gun, and I would give one an educational toy. Let me tell my colleagues that children were coming and bringing these toy guns and getting these educational toys, which points out that once we begin to remind them, remind the parents and the grandparents about the danger of these toy guns, then people will get the message.

So I am hoping that the Congress will go along with the bill that I have put forth and hope that I will be able to get the kind of support, to be able to get a hearing, and to be able to do the kind of things that need to be done to be able to protect our children.

I think that, in a civilized country, to allow this kind of thing to happen and not to address the issue, to me, just is very alarming. So I am hoping that we will be able to save the lives of our children by making certain that these kind of guns are banned.

I think that anybody could understand, in terms of police officers, a police officer is not going to interview a child. If a child is standing there with a gun like this in his hand or her hand, the police officer is not going to ask, is that gun real or is that gun a toy? The police officer is not going to do any interviewing. The police officer is going to shoot; and then after that, then we have got a problem.

So I think that the time has come when we, as a Nation, should begin to address this issue and address it in a very serious fashion. I think that the best way to address it is to say that toy guns have no place in our society. We should move to eliminate them and to eliminate them now.

So I ask my colleagues to join me in the gun turn-in, the toy gun turn-in, so that our children will be much safer in this Nation.

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

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

TRIBUTE TO PAYNE STEWART

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

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, yesterday our Nation and world lost a great golfer in Payne Stewart. He died in a very tragic accident that most of the Nation followed in a plane crash that occurred many miles away from his home in Florida.

He was a great golfer for many reasons, obviously 20 years in the professionals, 3 majors wins, 8 PGA tours, and 7 victories worldwide. Who could forget that famous 15-foot birdie putt in the U.S. Open this year and give him the great victory that he had just a few months ago at Pinehurst, a victory that came as the longest putt in the tournament in the history of the country in the U.S. Open.

But Payne Stewart was much more than a great golfer. He was a very, very deeply religious man. He held great convictions. He was a humanitarian. He was a father and a husband, a dedicated father and husband.

Orlando became his home in 1983 in my congressional district. I can tell my colleagues that the people of central Florida benefited greatly from Payne Stewart's generosity and his warmth and compassion for other people.

Perhaps his most well-known charitable contribution came back in 1987 when he donated $108,000, his winnings from the Bay Hill Classic tournament to Florida Hospital. Those funds went to the Florida Hospital Circle of Care home in Altamonte Springs for the out-of-town parents of cancer patients.

But he sponsored many other charitable events and, as recently as this year, just a few days ago, gave a $500,000 bequest to the First Baptist Church in Orlando, to their foundation.

I know that many Floridians will miss him deeply. Many in central Florida will miss him, not alone because of his golf career and because of his wit, but because of these charitable contributions. But a lot will miss him personally.

I know that Jack Nicklaus was quoted in the paper this morning, in my hometown paper of the Orlando Sentinel, saying, ''Payne always had a sharp wit, a tongue-in-cheek that came with a little bit of a needle, which is something everyone always enjoyed.''

But I think the people who are obviously going to miss him most will be his wife Tracy and his two wonderful children. Our heart tonight goes out to them, to Payne's family. He is a great man, a great golfer. His life ended in tragedy, but he gave so much to so many. He will be long remembered and long cherished.

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

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

SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is going to be sort of like a lesson plan. It is about Social Security. Next Wednesday at 11 a.m., a week from tomorrow, I will have a press conference on a Social Security bill that I am introducing that will keep Social Security solvent forever. I have been working on Social Security for the last 5 years, developing what I think is a reasonable proposal to keep Social Security solvent and protected. We are going to hear later tonight about the importance of not spending the Social Security surplus.

A year ago last April, I was asked to chair a bipartisan task force on Social Security. At that time, most everybody thought that the Democrats and Republicans would not come to any agreement on what we should do about Social Security. But after 15 hearings with two or three or four witnesses per hearing, we became so convinced and, therefore, unified about how serious the problem of keeping Social Security solvent was and how important Social Security was to so many Americans that Republicans and Democrats came together and agreed on 18 findings.

I just want to quickly go through these finding. I know it is sort of like a lesson plan, but if my colleagues have a mental attitude that this is going to tremendously affect their future retirement, the retirement of their kids, and the retirement of their parents, then bear with me on these 18 findings, because this is what I have patterned my new Social Security program after.

□ 1800

I am going to start. ''Background Social Security is a universal program that has provided a safety net for Americans.'' One-third of seniors today depend on Social Security for 90 percent or more of their total retirement income.

''Time is the enemy of Social Security reform and we should move without delay.'' Time is the minimum because we are running out of money. It is expected that by 2012 to 2014 there is going to be less FICA tax coming in than is able to accommodate existing benefits at that time. The longer we put off not utilizing the surplus that is coming in for the next several years, the more drastic that solution is going to have to be.

''Change should be gradual to allow workers to adjust their retirement plans, and any change for current or near-term retirees should be minimal.'' And that is what we have been working on the last several weeks in my bill, and it will be a bipartisan bill with Democrats and Republicans sponsoring that bill. It will keep Social Security solvent not just for 75 years but forever.

The next item we agreed on is, ''Social Security under the current structure is projected to become insolvent during the next 75 years.'' And that is the problem. That is why it is important not spending the surplus now, because it is going to be that much more difficult to pay that back to Social Security when the time comes.

''Any reform must consider the effects on all generations, genders and those currently receiving Social Security benefits.''

''Solvency and reform are not necessarily tied together.''

''No payroll tax increase.'' And again I remind my colleagues that this is Democrats and Republicans on this task force agreeing.

''Social Security surpluses should only be spent on Social Security.'' That is what we are fighting about here in Congress now.

''Social Security reform should encourage savings and overall economic growth.'' And that is why investing some of that money in the capital markets and how that might be best utilized is so important in how we develop a final plan.

''The Social Security Trust Fund is a secure, legal entity comprised of U.S. Treasury bonds backed by the full faith and credit of the U.S. Government.'' Listen to this, though. ''While the U.S. has never defaulted on any of its obligations, these bonds represent a claim on future Federal revenue. Such securities will have to be redeemed from funds outside of the Trust Fund.'' That means we either cut other spending, we increase taxes, or we reduce benefits.

''The current demographic projections may very well underestimate the future of life expectancy.'' We had testimony that within 25 years anybody that wanted to live to be 100 years old would have that option; within 40 years anybody that wanted to live to be 120 years old would have that option. Tremendous implications not only on Social Security but on everybody's retirement plans. And that is why we, in the bill we will be introducing, encourage additional savings.

I am going through the rest of these very quickly. ''Guaranteed return securities and annuities can be used with personal accounts as part of an investment safety net.'' We have financial managers now that will guarantee investments in the stock market and guarantee that investors will not have a loss.

''A universal Social Security survivor and disability benefit program needs to be maintained.'' No changes in that part.

''Congress should consider paying for a portion of the disability benefits for certain workers that have only been working a short time.''

Again, our press conference will be next Wednesday at 11 a.m., a week from tomorrow. We hope all our colleagues will attend, Mr. Speaker. I think it is important that we look at the long-range solutions for Social Security.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

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

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

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

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

COMPUTERS ARE NOT NECESSARILY THE ANSWER TO EDUCATION CRISIS

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, usually when I rise to speak in the period of special orders it is to talk about some specific bill or specific legislation. Tonight I am doing something a little different and discussing something that I think has the potential of becoming a problem in some ways, and I would just like to call some attention to it and get some people, hopefully, to start thinking about it.

In doing so, I will start by reading a quote that I read, I think sometime last year in, I believe, an Associated Press story, and it was a quote from David Geleanter, who is a professor of computer science at Yale University. He said this. ''Computers themselves are fine. But we are in the middle of an education catastrophe. Children are not being taught to read, write, know arithmetic or history. In those circumstances, to bring a glitzy toy into the classroom seems to me to be a disaster. It reinforces our worst tendencies. The idea that children are in educational trouble because they do not have access to enough glitz and what they really need is a bigger database is staggeringly ludicrous. They need practice in the basics.'' That is a quote by a professor of computer science at Yale.

What I am saying tonight is let us do not forget the basics in education. Sure, it is important to learn about computers, but we seem to be worse off with the computer today in thinking that it is the end-all of education and we are neglecting the basics in many, many ways. Children still need to learn to read and write and know arithmetic and know history and the basics.

Secondly, along this same line, I heard Tony Kornheiser, one of the sports columnists for the Washington Post and on ESPN and so forth, and he mentioned in a column, and also I heard him on the radio talking about this one time, about three young men who had called him at different times during the time of the last World Series, and he said they each asked for Tony Kornheiser's e-mail address. He said when he told them that this was Tony Kornheiser to whom they were speaking, he said they got so flustered that a couple of them hung up, and one got so nervous that he could hardly speak. He asked the question, are we raising a generation of young people who are spending so much time in front of the television set and so much time in front of the computer screens that they are not developing the social skills that they really need or that people have developed in past years.

We became concerned as a society because children were spending so many thousands and thousands of hours in front of the television set. So we took them from in one of one screen and placed them in front of another screen called a computer, and I am just wondering if they are not isolating themselves. It is getting where people can shop at home, work at home, and we can all become Unibomber hermits if we want to, I suppose, but I do not think it will be good for society.

I tell young people at home to watch a little television. I have no objection to that. Learn the computer. We all have to do that today. It is an important and valuable thing. But every once in a while get out and get involved with a real life human being. Life will mean more if you do. Unfortunately, we are having fewer and fewer people who are joining the American Legion and the Kiwanis and the Shrine and all the various civic and charitable organizations that have been so very important to this country for so many years.

Thirdly, Madam Speaker, I heard a few months ago Barbara Walters on 20/20 one night saying she was going to present the most important hour she had ever presented on television. That got my curiosity up because she has been on television for so long. And what it was, it was a program devoted to warning parents about the sick, evil things that are on the Internet. There again, that is another facet of this same problem.

I am not against computers. I am all in favor of computers. But what I am saying is we still need to make sure our young people learn the basics in school, like reading, writing, and history. We still need to make sure that our young people develop the social skills that they need to survive.

My father told me many years ago, half jokingly and half seriously, that the problems of this country grew worse when they stopped putting front porches on the houses. People stopped visiting with each other. They tell us many people do not know their next door neighbors. All I am saying is we need to make sure we do not get isolated unto ourselves to where we do not really know people and get involved helping other people in their lives.

During this program by Barbara Walters, she told the story of a little boy who had actually become involved with such terrible things over the Internet that he ended up with such rage built up in him that he killed another child. Barbara Walters thought it was so very important to warn parents about some of these horrible things that are on the Internet and that children are exposed to that they were not exposed to so many years ago.

So all I am saying tonight is we need to be aware of those three things, those three concerns, because it is very, very important to this country and to its future that we make sure that young people get the benefits of all this new technology but are not harmed by it.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SENATOR CHAFEE

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

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise in great sadness to offer my sincere thanks to a man known as an outstanding example of a true leader among his colleagues in the Senate and indeed in life.

Senator Chafee was known as an old-fashioned legislator. He took his job very seriously but he eschewed politics. He cared about public policy and doing his best for the people of this Nation, never cowing to the partisanship in which we so often becoming entangled.

I knew him best as a modern man in the Senate, as the co-chair of the Congressional Prevention Coalition. As its co-chair, Senator Chafee worked to spread crucial health information to Members of the House and Senate so that they could spread the word to their constituents throughout the United States.

That was just one of the many ways Senator Chafee reached across the aisle to make America a better place to live. We are all better people for his efforts. As the Washington Post said this morning, the Senate will be a lesser place without him. He will be sorely missed by us all.

THE BUDGET PROCESS

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

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I and a group of colleagues come here tonight to discuss the approaching conclusion of the budget process. A lot of people do not get too excited about budgets, but that is really what it is all about. Whether it is our family, our business, or the

government, the budget is the working document of how we are going to spend our money, how we are going to use our resources, and what our priorities are.

I find it pretty exciting this year, as we come down to this budget conclusion, that we really have the mechanism in place to balance the budget and not use any Social Security. That is going to be historic, because for decades the Social Security fund has been used routinely to fund general government.

Now, this process has been going on for a while. It started back in February when the President came and addressed us and he gave us his State of the Union message and presented us with his budget proposal. That proposal is a lot different than I think what we are going to end up with, I hope, because he had $42 billion of new spending. He had $19 billion of tax increases. Not tax cuts, increases. And those were soundly rejected here a short time ago by this body, and should have been.

The budget framework was created by the Committee on the Budget, and this process started right after the President's message. And, actually, they held hearings and worked on it for many weeks. On March 25, both the House and Senate Committees on the Budget presented their budgets to this House, and the House and Senate both approved a budget proposal on March 25. Now, there were differences between the House and the Senate, which there always is, but they brought their programs together and, on April 15, we passed a conference report that was sent to the President that was our budget outline for this year.

The Committee on Appropriations then started their work. And as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I can tell my colleagues that hearings are held. I do not think a lot of people realize the work that goes into it, to outline where the cuts should be, where the increases should be, what the changes are, what are the changes in priorities. There are 13 working subcommittees in the Committee on Appropriations that work on each of their part of this process.

So we are close to completing that process today without spending Social Security. Unfortunately, most Congresses have not completed this process of sending 13 bills to the President for him to veto or sign. They usually do four, five, or six, and then when it gets tough and short on time, they go to the proposal of having an omnibus bill. This is where the majority leader and minority leader of the Senate, and the Speaker and the minority leader of the House would go up to the White House and sit down with the President and negotiate this omnibus spending plan.

□ 1815

Now, I guess the problem that I have had with that since have I been here is that that throws away all the work that the appropriators did, that throws away all the information that came in the hearing process.

Four or five people write our spending plan. And, of course, using Social Security to balance the budget, it was easy to do. But it has been tougher this year because the Social Security lockbox that we passed earlier took a hundred-some billion dollars away from this process.

So it is, again, why I am excited about this year's process that we are not allowing the President and four or five leaders of Congress to just sit down and decide how we are going to spend the people's money.

This year, I believe, and this week we will complete our work of having all 13 bills in front of the President. He has had 12, he signed 8, and he has vetoed four, if my information is correct. And, hopefully, tomorrow or Thursday he will get that 13th bill up to him.

Now, that is pretty good. We have had two signed for every one he has vetoed. So the President has agreed with Congress on two-thirds of what work we have sent him. And from what I read, the differences are not real big. I think they are not insurmountable. So I think we are chugging down that rail to again having this budget process completed without spending Social Security. Bill by bill, we will negotiate and finalize this process.

Now, to make this work there has not been a lot of cash sticking around, there has not been a lot of money to spend. In fact, we have had to say, how can we look for 1.4 percent savings?

Now, my colleagues, is there any House budget, is there any business budget, or is there any government budget that cannot find 1.4 percent that is in fraud, abuse, or just plain waste or just plain lack of management? I believe there is the ability to save 1.4 percent without cutting programs that affect people out in the hinterland.

Because we all know here in Washington, and I am a product of State government and local government and business, I want to tell my colleagues, I have been surprised at the growth and the size of the Federal bureaucracy. There are a lot of good people there, and I am not here to bad-mouth them. But there are huge bureaucracies. There are huge costs. The Federal Government spends a whole lot more money in managing Government percentage-wise than State and local governments do, in my opinion. Because, historically, Congress has never had any limits on what they spend.

So I think it is exciting when the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, came up with a concept of a 1.4 percent savings for each department to look within themselves, within their own operating budgets, and look for ways to save 1.4.

I think that is pretty doable. I think the American public would find that pretty doable in their own household budgets, in their own community budgets, in their State budgets. There just has to be waste, fraud, and abuse of 1.4 percent in every budget.

I am pleased to be joined tonight, and I will call on one of them now, from people from Texas and California and South Dakota and my colleague from Pennsylvania. So we are from all over the country agreeing on what we must accomplish in this budget conclusion process.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) who is from the Fifth District of Texas. He is in the Results Caucus, and he is also a member of the powerful Committee on Rules. So I thank him for joining us.

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague very much for bringing this information to the American public tonight.

Obviously, what we are talking about here is the budget process where we are attempting to make tough decisions in Washington, D.C., to ensure that we balance the budget, that we do not spend Social Security, and that we ensure that the Government is fully funded, as we say in the Results Caucus, every single dollar that the Government needs but not a penny more.

Tonight what I would like to do is run through with the American public what we are trying to do now that we have gotten to the very end of this process. And we recognize that we are probably going to perhaps end up being slightly over when we aggregate all the bills together what we would spend. So we are trying to make sure that there will be provisions by which the President and the Congress will act.

What we are talking about here is, if we exceed with all of our 13 budgets, if we go over that amount of money, which we really do not want to do, but if we end up at that, that we will have a provision that says any amount that is over this budget amount, so that we do not spend Social Security, will then come as an across-the-board budget cut. We are estimating tonight that it will be anywhere from 1 to 1.4 percent.

Where does this come from and how much money does that equal? Well, it is about $3.5 billion in outlays. All the money will come directly from discretionary funds, with the knowledge that here in Washington we work off a mandatory budget.

A mandatory budget is those things that are Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. They will be exempted from this 1- to 1.4-percent budget cut, which means we will not deal with any mandatory spending on that side that we will cut but, rather, it will be in discretionary. It will equal about one penny of a dollar that the Government gets. One penny we are asking the Government to give back across-the-board.

Now, what is interesting about this is that when we look at this we are saying that this budget savings will be done to ensure that Social Security is taken care of.

What I would like to now get into a debate and a discussion about with the American public is to talk about those things that today and have been happening in Government that we think

fall under the auspices of waste, fraud, abuse, or waste fraud and error; and that is the large Government programs that we know could be run better, that we know that if we will say to the bureaucrats, that if we will say to the people in the agencies, we want you and expect you to prioritize in a better sense the opportunity to manage your budget, that you would then have a 1-percent savings across the board.

That is what we want to spend the remaining part of this hour to talk about, those opportunities that the Government Accounting Office, GAO, has documented for year after year, good ideas for people to know why this can be done without harming anyone or the essential services of Government.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for his comments.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE).

Mr. THUNE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding and my friends from Texas and California and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) also for joining us here this evening and for the leadership that each has taken the respective ways to address this issue and to help us drive home the message about what we are attempting to accomplish here in this Congress.

I would like to share, if I might, just a statement that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), Speaker of the House, made today regarding this whole issue of the Social Security Trust Fund and what we are talking about doing in terms of reducing Federal Government spending, doing away with waste, fraud, and abuse, but also as this applies to individual Members of Congress.

Because there have been some questions: If you guys are so serious about taking care of waste, fraud, and abuse of the Federal Government, how about yourselves, how about your own salaries? This is what the gentleman from Illinois (Speaker HASTERT) had to say:

> Protecting the Social Security Trust Fund has been the number-one priority of the Republican Congress. In order to further that goal, the Congress will consider legislation that will shave back Government spending in all discretionary budget programs. It will also shave back the pay of Members of Congress by one percent. The pay of all other Government employees in all other branches of Government should not be affected by this legislation.
>
> Republican Members of Congress believe that the Government can find a penny on the dollar in waste, fraud, and abuse in order to protect the Social Security Trust Fund. We also believe that they can set an example by shaving back their own pay by that same percentage.
>
> I hope the President and the Democrats in Congress will drop their opposition to our common-sense plan to protect Social Security.

I would say, Madam Speaker, that this whole debate over the budget reminds me a little bit of when I was growing up a conversation I had with my father. My dad told me once, because I had a dog that would not obey, I could not get this dog to do what I wanted it to do, and he said, well, it is the nature of the beast and that in order to tame the beast you have to apply discipline.

Well, it is the nature of the Federal beast to spend money, not because it needs to but because it is there. And it is our job to help tame the Federal beast and to apply the discipline that is necessary to see that we find the waste, fraud, and abuse that exists in Government programs and to root it out so that we can spend our tax dollars on those most important Federal programs and priorities, like Social Security.

It is pretty simple. It is Social Security or it is defense contractors charging the Government $714 for an electronic bell that you can get at your local hardware store for $46.

Responsible Government bodies live within their means. Responsible Government bodies know where tax dollars should be spent and where they should not be spent. Tax dollars should be spent on Social Security.

Now let me tell my colleagues a little bit about where their tax dollars should not be spent. They should not be spent on $850,000 to Ben and Jerry's Ice Cream to help them develop and distribute ice cream in Russia. This comes from an Agency for International Development Inspector General record that $850,000, Federal dollars, went to Ben and Jerry's Ice Cream to help them develop and distribute ice cream in Russia.

Tax dollars should not be spent on deceased people receiving food stamps. Again, according to the Committee on the Budget report, approximately 26,000 deceased people, people no longer living in this country, received $8½ million in food stamps. That comes from the Committee on the Budget report.

Tax dollars should not be spent on convicted murderers receiving SSI Disability payments. Again, according to an AP Wire Service story, there is a convicted murderer who received more than $75,000 in SSI Disability payments during his 14 years on Death Row.

Furthermore, the SSI fraud exceeds $1 billion annually.

Those are things that we should not be spending taxpayer dollars on. The taxpayer dollars should not be spent on $1 million outhouses at Glacier National Park.

Now, this may come as a surprise to some people around this country, but there actually was an outhouse built in Glacier National Park at a cost of $1 million to the taxpayers. I have to tell my colleagues something, that to get there you have to climb 7,000 feet and walk 6½ miles. In fact, the reason this thing cost so much money is because it took 800 helicopter trips to get up there to build the outhouse.

Now, I dare say that if anyone in this country, with the exception of those who might be an Olympic class athlete, who has walked 6½ miles and climbed 7,000 feet, the last thing they are probably going to need is an outhouse. But, nevertheless, an outhouse was built at a million dollars in taxpayer expense.

Now, I would have to tell my colleagues that some people probably think that a million dollars is chump change in a big Federal budget, but where I come from, in the State of South Dakota, a million dollars is real money, folks. It is real money.

I cannot help but think how one retired person could use a million dollars or, furthermore, how far $1 million would go if it was left where it belongs, in the Social Security Trust Fund, helping secure retirement for our retirees and for those who are paying into that system.

What we are talking about here, very simply, is million-dollar outhouses or a secure retirement for every person in America who is retiring now or hopes to retire in the future.

I think the choice is very, very clear. Saving one percent in waste, fraud, and abuse allows us to save Social Security. It is that simple. I would also add again in response to some of the suggestions that have been made that the Speaker has announced earlier today that, as an expression of the good faith of this Congress, that that one percent that will be applied to the agencies of the Government will also apply to the salaries of Members of Congress. We believe that we need to lead by example.

Now just let me say, in closing, that I had the opportunity a week ago Saturday to hunt out on a farm near Kimball, South Dakota, hunt pheasants, which is one of my favorite pastimes; and I was hunting with a gentleman who has been farming for 37 years and who is 60 years old and hopes in the very near future to retire. And as I was discussing that with him, I said, what will you do when you retire? He said, well, you know, I hope to take my farm and cash rent it out and use the income off the cash rent for my retirement along with Social Security and that will provide the basis for my retirement.

If he knew that his tax dollars were being used for $714 electronic bells and $1-million outhouses at the expense of his retirement by taking away Social Security, I think he would be outraged, like most Americans would.

□ 1830

Are we or are we not going to protect this man's retirement? That is the question before this House and that is the question before this Nation. We here today say yes. We will protect America's retirement security. Today we are waiting for the President's answer to that very same question. And so are the rest of American taxpayers. Can we find one penny, one copper penny out of every dollar in government spending to figure out a way to root out waste, fraud and abuse out of

the Federal Government? One penny out of every dollar of Federal spending is all it takes to allow us to keep our promise and our pledge to the retirees in this country and to everybody who faithfully year in and year out pays into the Social Security trust fund. That is what this debate is about. I hope the American people will tune in because it is your future that we are talking about.

I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for the opportunity to speak to this issue this evening.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman from South Dakota for his comments.

Madam Speaker, now we go to the West Coast to hear the West Coast message. Out there it is a little early in the evening but we are glad the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER) representative from the Second District of California, a member of the powerful Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on the Budget, is here to share with us his thoughts on balancing the budget.

Mr. HERGER. I thank my good friend from Pennsylvania for taking this time on this incredibly important issue. I would like just to say what an exciting time this is for me. I am now in my seventh term, my 13th year in the House of Representatives, representing the Second District of northern California. I am also in my seventh year on the Committee on the Budget and also seventh year on the Committee on Ways and Means which is over Social Security.

A number of years ago in the Committee on the Budget I became aware that not only prior to 1995 when the new Republican Congress came in, in 1994 and prior to that time that we were running 200 to $300 billion a year budget deficits, spending more than what we were bringing in. But really it was worse than that, because for some 30 years we had actually been spending Social Security and we had been borrowing that and spending it on the budget, on government spending on Federal programs. I began back then to fight, at least on the Committee on the Budget to at least, at minimum, at the first step be honest with the American public. If we are spending this Social Security money dedicated for Social Security out of the trust fund for ongoing Federal programs, then at least let us let the American public be aware of it and let us show them really what our budget deficit really would be.

I am so very pleased that at the beginning of this year, 1999, that the Republican Conference, members of the Republican Party within the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Budget made a commitment that beginning this year we were not going to spend Social Security money as we had been for about 30 years. I authored legislation, the Social Security lockbox legislation, that came before this House back in May, and that legislation passed overwhelmingly, 417–12, putting this Congress on record that for the first time in more than 30 years we were not going to spend Social Security. We had another bill that came up.

Well, with that let me mention now that in order to have a balanced budget, in order not to spend Social Security, we basically have two choices: Those choices, number one, is that we raise taxes which comes from hard-working Americans, to raise the extra money so as not to spend Social Security. That is choice number one. But there is also another choice. That choice is a tough one. That choice is what Americans do every day in their families, what small businesses do, what every company that stays in the black does, and, that is, there are times when you make difficult decisions, you tighten your belt, you set your spending priorities. If you do not have enough money coming in and you set those priorities and you determine what are some dollars we are not going to spend. Well, that is what this Congress has decided that we are going to do, this Republican Congress that was voted in, took office in 1995.

We had a vote here just about a week ago which put out the tax increases that President Clinton had proposed in his budget. Those tax increases were defeated virtually unanimously in this House. I believe there was only one vote in favor of those tax increases. So, therefore, we know what we have to do. We have to tighten our belts. What does that mean? As the gentleman from South Dakota mentioned, we are talking about one penny basically, one penny out of a dollar that we are somehow going to find in fraud or abuse or in priorities that can be set somewhere else in our government programs, that do not include, by the way, Social Security or Medicare but other spending programs that we are going to trim back. One penny out of a dollar. We are not talking about 10 cents out of a dollar or 20 cents out of a dollar. We are talking about basically somewhere between one penny and 1.4 cents out of every dollar. Can we do that? Of course we can do it.

I would like to continue, as my good friend from South Dakota was mentioning, some examples. These are some examples that have been pointed out to us in our budget this year. Here is the first one. ''That's a Big Lost and Found.'' The most recent government audit found that Federal agencies were unable to account for over $800 billion in government assets. That is a GAO, General Accounting Office, audit.

Another one, erroneous Medicare payments waste over $20 billion annually. $20 billion. We are talking about trimming back about $3.5 billion. There is 20 right there.

Another one. One out of every $18 spent in the section 8 housing program is wasted, according to HUD's own Inspector General. Another GAO audit.

Another area we can save, delays in disposing of more than 41,000 HUD properties cost taxpayers more than $1 million per day. Let us just get on the ball and do what we are supposed to be doing. $1 million a day.

Another one, FAA employees are using a program designed to familiarize air traffic controllers with cockpit operations for personal travel, including extended vacations. One employee took 12 weekend trips in a 15-month period to visit his family in Tampa, Florida. Another DOT IG report.

Another one, ''Palaces for Park Rangers?'' The Park Service spent an average of $584,000 per home at Yosemite when comparable houses near the park were being built for between $102,000 and $250,000. A report from the Department of the Interior IG report.

And then last but not least, ''Degrees for Deadbeats?'' The government lost over $3.3 billion on students who never paid back their student loans.

Madam Speaker, in closing, we are all in this together. If every government agency can find just one penny out of a dollar in waste, fraud or abuse, seniors and future beneficiaries can be assured that the raid will end and their Social Security will be protected. We can do it. And despite the moaning and groaning of some who are supporters of big government, we will do it.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman from California. Recently the General Accounting Office talked about Medicare. It is administered by HCFA, one of the largest agencies in this country and a very important one. But the GAO report estimates that $20 billion is paid out annually for inappropriate claims. If they could just cut that by 10 percent, they could save $2 billion.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS).

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding. I would like to follow up on what the gentleman from California has talked about, when he talked about one penny savings out of every dollar that is being spent, which I think is very reasonable. What I would like to do is to take just a few minutes to give some real live examples of how the government has not figured out what the right hand is doing and the left hand is doing.

The Results Caucus has spent a great deal of time working with the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight on a lot of legislation which is critical to the success of this government. I would like to go back and point out some of the areas and the statutes, the laws that we operate under and the reason why we have these. One is called results orientation. It is the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993, known as the Results Act. It was implemented so that we would have agencies' missions and strategic priorities that would be established, where we would require government agencies to be able to implement within their

core mission statement. We would have results-oriented goals, we would talk with them about goals that they were expected to achieve; and they would produce performance data, once again so that the right hand would know what the left hand is doing.

We have been engaged in financial management, the Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990, the Government Management Reform Act of 1994, the Federal Financial Management Improvement Act of 1996. These were done so that we would have annual financial statements. They were done so we would have timely and reliable information and data that would help the managers of the government to manage those assets that they have. And it would help us to look at the cost achievement results.

Lastly, we have information technology as a priority area. There was the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 and the Clinger-Cohen Act of 1996. This was done to help provide more information for the relationship of investments to the achievement of performance.

What has happened since we have had these laws in place? A lot. The government has improved upon its performance. But even today, we as Members of Congress believe that there is so much more to be done. The GAO in a report that was released on March 31, 1998, cited some examples of those things where the government cannot find from its right hand to its left hand those assets and resources and cited as ''missing and unaccounted for'' include the following: I will show you a great picture because we have got a reward that we will offer when you can find these. It is the return of two tugboats valued at $850,000 each to the Federal Government. These cannot be found. The Federal Government cannot tell us where this is.

The next one, once again, we will offer a reward. Have you seen me? This is one missile launcher. This missile launcher comes at a cost of over $1 million. Once again, we do not know where it is.

The next item. Lost jet engines, two $4 million aircraft engines. If you happen to find these, the government cannot find it. We need it back. You paid for it. The taxpayer paid for it and we want it back.

We also have a floating crane worth $500,000. Nobody knows where it is.

Ladies and gentlemen, what I am suggesting to you is that this government as broad and big as it is, it should be better at accounting for those assets and resources that it has been given. We are as Members of Congress trying to provide the correct legislation, the right oversight and enough information to where the government can work properly. But I believe that when we insist upon a 1 percent across-the-board savings that must be given to the taxpayers so that we do not get into Social Security, now what we have done is we have required government to do the same things that is done not only in our own homes, around our own tables but in small businesses and boardrooms all across this country. It is called prioritize. I am hoping that we will have a government that in the future will look at their assets and resources in a better way that will help us all.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. It is a pleasure to welcome my colleague, my neighbor in the northern tier of Pennsylvania. We collectively guard against New York coming down. We cover the northern tier of Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) of the 10th District has been a great new Member of Congress. He brings strong community leadership credentials with him, a strong businessman, good sense. I have found him a person who is not afraid to speak up. He is very effective. It is just great to have the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) here with us tonight.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Madam Speaker, my colleague from Pennsylvania, let us summarize.

□ 1845

This is a very simple solution to a problem that only government could make so complex. We have had 435 people working for 10 months in a bipartisan manner to get 13 spending bills, 13 appropriations bills, put together and live within a budget. We are down to the end of the time, and we have a hole. It is not a very big hole. It is 3, 4, $5 billion. In the general scheme of things around here that is not a lot of money. In other years we just spend it and take it out of the Social Security money. But we have pledged to the American people that we will not raise taxes and that we will not spend their Social Security money.

Madam Speaker, we all know that Americans pay too many taxes, and we all know that that Social Security fund should be sacrosanct. It is a contract with the American people, and we, as their representatives, must protect it.

So those are our criteria. We will not raise taxes, we will not spend the Social Security money.

How do we come up with this $4 billion?

Madam Speaker, business solves this problem every day. Family budgets solve it every day.

Several years ago, when one of our great American corporations, Chrysler Corporation, was about to go bankrupt, Lee Iacocca said, ''We will share the pain equally.'' Everybody took a cut or a saving, everybody. It worked. Today Chrysler has repaid their government loans, and they are a very successful, sound American company.

So let us do the same. Let us apply common sense, take an across-the-board budget cut. Only in politics would people argue against an across-the-board budget cut because it is the right thing to do. It is so simple that in the world of politics where everybody is fighting for their region or their issue we have people that are fighting this very simple proposition.

So we only have to find 1.3 or 1.4 percent savings. What budget could not find a 1.3 percent saving?

You have been given examples tonight that HUD properties, because we are not managing quite well enough, costs us a million dollars a day. That is $365 million. There is a good one. Does that mean HUD is poorly run? No. It means that there is one thing in HUD that we need to pay better attention to. We need harder work and better management, and in my 30 years in business and two-thirds of that on the school board we always needed to work harder and manage better, and the Federal Government is no exception.

As my colleagues know, 26,000 diseased persons received 8.5 million in food stamps. Does that mean the food stamp program is bad? It is a wonderful program, but we need that $8.5 million to go to the right people. We do not need it to go to people that are dead, that somebody is cashing their check. Hard work and better management.

Madam Speaker, I could go down through this and talk about $714 bells that should be $46. There are many, many examples in this huge Federal Government where we can save money.

Now this is a very, very simple solution. You ask every department to save 1.3 percent, and I agree that we should start with our own salary. Only when the impetus comes from the top can you expect every soldier and every worker to do the same, and we are asking our defense people to do more with less. We need to set the example here in our own salary.

So, Madam Speaker, I think that while we have worked very hard, the appropriators on defense and interior and education, health and human services, agriculture, that work has been done. We just need to get together and take our savings and make this budget come together.

It will be a historic thing. It has not happened in almost 30 years that we have paid down the national debt, lived within the budget and not spent the Social Security money. I think we should come together in a bipartisan manner, find these savings and pass a budget. It is for the American people, and they deserve it.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from Pennsylvania, my neighbor who helps me guard the New York State border.

It is interesting this morning when we started the day with our conference many Members said, ''Well, does this cut include our salaries?'' Well, the announcement was made this afternoon that decision was made, and I agree with it. Decided that across-the-board cut in discretionary spending will also apply to salaries for Members of Congress. Now I think that proves we are serious, we are serious that we are going to live within our means.

He went on, the Majority Leader went on to say:

''Since January House Republicans have stated our commitment to stopping the 30-year raid on Social Security. No one said this would be easy. We've done the heavy lifting. This week we will complete our spending bills and prove that we can fund the government without dipping into the Social Security fund.''

''The President said he shares our commitment to stopping the raid on Social Security, and he has vetoed four spending bills, and of course we're going to send him probably another one tomorrow. But we intend to work with him to get the job done, make our commitment real. As the sign of how serious we are we will ask more of ourselves than we are asking of any government employees. While we ask every government agency to root out waste from its budget. Members of Congress will not only root out an equal percentage of waste from Congress' budget, but will also cut their on pay.''

Now I think we are sending the President a message also: Mr. President, manage a little better.

As my colleagues know, I have always been frustrated both at the State level with Governors and at this level of Washington with the President. We do not talk much in campaigns about how they are going to manage government. That is not as exciting. It is about what new programs we are going to fund and how these new initiatives are going to make the world better and safer and how everything, all the problems that we know of, will go away if there is one more government program, if the Federal government will build one more bureaucracy and funnel money out to our communities, it will solve all.

Now, we know that does not work. There are thousands of federal programs that funnel money out.

Now one of the differences I noticed, a whole lot more of it gets chewed up in bureaucracy in Washington than it does in most States and local governments because we never challenge our Presidents to manage government. As my colleagues know, we really should be rating the President on how well he has managed each and every bureaucracy.

I have heard Presidents talk recently and in the past as if some agency was something they were concerned about. That agency just must do better, but whoever is President, Mr. President, that is your agency, that is your management that is needed. It is your direction that is needed to say, ''Stop the waste, stop the fraud, stop the abuse of taxpayers' money.''

We all know that one of our disagreements currently is foreign aid. Now, as my colleagues know, foreign aid is always a controversy. We have Americans who do not think we should have any foreign aid, we should keep all our resources. But we always come to a compromise. But I think the President who wants 4 billion more in foreign aid is not supported by the majority of taxpayers. I have not had a clamoring to increase the foreign aid budget since I have been here. In fact, I have a lot of opposition to much that we do in the foreign aid budget from my rural conservative district.

But, Mr. President, do we really need 4 more billion in foreign aid? Can we not make do with what is there?

Now the education department. I had the privilege last session of serving on the Committee on Education and the Workforce and found it an exciting challenge. But if you talk about a department that chews up a lot of money that never gets out to our school districts, look at the Department of Education. I mean I believe the figure is maybe 30 percent that is chewed up in bureaucracy. There is a state bureaucracy in every state government that is strictly paid for by the Federal government to manage the Federal programs, 50 of them. Then you have the Washington bureaucracy who we all know that I have found them to be one of the lease sensitive departments about what Congress thinks, and when they are insensitive to Congress, I think they are insensitive to the American taxpayers because that is who sent us here, a department that could very easily find more than 1.4 percent in savings in my view.

EPA, 15 or 16,000 employees in a centralized bureaucracy in Washington. Could they squeeze 1½, 1.4 percent? No problem. Now we would have a few less bureaucrats, but we still have all the programs that they run, should have little or no impact out in the districts.

And also I guess the administration. Maybe we are asking. Recently there was a foreign trip, and 1700 people went on that trip. Now I am sure it is necessary to take guests on trips, but could 1,200 have got the job done? Could 1500 have got the job done and saved a few taxpayer dollars? I think so.

So all we are saying is to this part of government that is important to us, that is vital to us, pull in the belt a little bit, cut a few of the excesses, cut a little of the waste like the American taxpayers historically do. They trim their budgets all the time, that is how they balance them. Local governments do. States who are allowed to build deficits have to pay as you go. But here in Washington we have gotten so used to not really worrying about how much money we spend because we just raise taxes enough to pay whatever the bill was when the end of the year comes.

Well, Madam Speaker, that day is over. The day of using Social Security is over, it is done, and it is time for Congress, this administration to sit down and have a good healthy discussion about our spending priorities and balance this budget, conclude it in the next few days with not one penny of Social Security. It is doable, it is workable, and it is just time to bite the bullet.

At this time I again welcome my friend from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS).

Mr. SESSIONS. Madam Speaker, as my colleagues know, what is interesting is that I have heard speakers, four or five of us tonight who have gotten up to talk about why this is important that we do not spend Social Security, why this is important that we find the savings from a trillion $700 billion plus budget and we are not yelling and screaming. We are here speaking to the American public in a regular voice, a regular tone because I believe we are optimistic. We are optimistic about the positive things that are occurring in Washington, D.C. that we, as a Republican-led Congress, are finding ways to get our work done. We need to give credit to our colleagues on the other side of the aisle because they, too, have done some responsible things. The White House, the President signing these bills as he should. What we are trying to do is to make sure that the American public understands that we will not and must not spend Social Security. This year for the first time in 39 years Social Security was not used to fund the government operations. What we want to make sure is that we make that streak continue so that we do not do it next year, and that is why this 1 percent across-the-board savings to protect Social Security that will save $3.5 billion must come internally as a result of a challenge, a challenge to the entire government, a challenge that the House of Representatives and the Senate are engaged in, and that is why I welcome the news that we have from the Majority Leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) and our Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), to say that the Congress should be included in that 1 percent budget.

What it will do is I believe it will mean to a manager of the government that they will now focus more clearly and carefully on their own mission statement, their core and basic functions that they must provide. It will require them with the impetus, the knowledge, the direction, the authority and the responsibility to make sure that they look across their areas and cut 1 percent of their budget.

Why do we need to do this? We need to do it because there is lots of money that can be cut.

□ 1900

Another example that I had not heard one of my colleagues state earlier, but that I found very interesting, it is that the government spends $1 billion on the Job Corps program, but a survey of the initial employers of former Job Corps students show that 76 percent of students had been laid off, quit or been fired from their first employers after 100 days of starting their new jobs.

Well, you see, if I were in the Department of Labor I would have known about this because it came from my own inspector general. I would be willing to look at my $1 billion program

and ascertain what is indigenous to our program that is not working? And, if the program does not work properly, if the return to the taxpayer is not there, if the benefit to the beneficiaries, the people who were expected to gain something from this $1 billion, if it is not working, then they need to do something different. They need to look at the money and the resources and the way they are spent.

So I think that this is going to be yet another opportunity for government bureaucrats, for agency heads, to look inward within themselves, to have the optimism that they can be in control of their own future, to provide services, which is what this government is all about, to people who do need those outreaches of government, and to do the right thing.

So I am very excited about the opportunity to challenge government. Instead of just throwing more money at them every year and more and more and more, we are now going to challenge them in a way and say we know you can find the 1 percent. We have talked about these savings all across government tonight. They exist in every single agency, and I think it is going to be a wonderful day for every single government administrator and the heads of these agencies to know that with the challenge, that they can accept it and excel, because of the mission that we have of not spending the future retirement of each and every American today, but rather to keep it into a fund that is ready for them in the future, is what will help and benefit all Americans.

I thank you for allowing me the opportunity to be with you tonight. I know the people of Pennsylvania are well served. You have enthusiasm and integrity, coupled with the background and experience, and I want to thank you for allowing me to be here.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. We thank the gentleman from Texas.

Tonight we have heard about tugboats that cost $875,000 apiece that were lost; a surface-to-air missile launcher that cost $1 million that was lost; 5 aircraft engines, including two that cost $4 million that were lost; a floating crane worth $500,000 that was lost. We heard about Medicare spending $20 billion annually, or paying $20 billion annually for fraudulent payments, or what they believe to be fraudulent payments.

You know, it is kind of hard to think that you could not save a penny when you look at all those examples. We have one here of a nice courthouse in Brooklyn, New York, that cost $152 million. The New York Attorney General's office has arrested 16 individuals suspected of kickback and bribery schemes in the construction of this courthouse, that is from the Citizens Against Government Waste, and $4.3 million used to tear down 19 naval radio towers. Again, that is another one pointed out by Citizens Against Government Waste. It seems pretty incredible to think that you just cannot save a penny, a little more than a penny, out of every dollar.

Now, my experience in state government, this was sort of a routine thing. We often passed budgets that cut general government 2 to 3 percent, and what that was is we said department managers, you have to cut the fat out of your general government line item. You cannot go out there and cut the hand that serves the people, because the same 2 percent, to save 2 percent or 3 percent, you do not need to do that.

If state governments can cut 2 to 3 percent of savings out of general government, Mr. President, you can too. Instead of talking about new programs, let us talk about managing the ones you have.

I vividly remember the gentleman who served us so well as Attorney General, Richard Thornburg, who was Governor of Pennsylvania and who was a real good fiscal manager. I served the whole time he was Governor of Pennsylvania in the state legislature.

He was a tough fiscal manager. Every department was asked to become more efficient. Every bureau was asked to reorganize and provide their services, do away with unneeded paperwork and become more efficient.

The state historically had, I am going on memory here, but think I am accurate, about 103,000 employees historically. When he left office after 8 years of governing I believe they had 88,000 or 89,000 employees.

I had a district office in my district, and I want to tell you, the service improved, because not only did we have less employees, paperwork and waste and redundant things were done away with, departments were asked and forced to manage themselves, bureaus were asked to provide the services more cost effectively, and they did.

Government can become more efficient if it has leadership to take it there. Now, I think we have just begun maybe a new cycle. I think this is something we ought to be looking at with some routine. Mr. President, this year trim another percentage out of general government. That is not where people are served; that is where bureaucrats are served.

In my view, this is a very appropriate way to look for savings that could, as happened in Pennsylvania, improve the quality of government, improve the services, because they are managed better.

Mr. President, it is time to manage each and every department a little bit better. It is time to look for waste and incompetency and root it out. It is time to reorganize the structure of government so it can be more efficient and better serve the needs of the people.

Let us save a penny out of every dollar by finding the waste, the fraud and the abuse, and make sure that we never again balance the budget by using Social Security; that we look to live within our needs; that we save a penny or two pennies, whatever it takes, whenever it is, and pay down the debt.

It is time for the American taxpayers to be assured that their Federal Government is going to live within its means, it is never going to look to the Social Security trust fund again to be used for general government purposes, and we are going to concentrate on making the programs we have work better, or do away with them.

We have had a hard time doing that. But the President should be leading us. His administrators know as well as anyone that there are programs that have lost their usefulness, and it seems ironic that Congress and the President in the past have had a hard time, because times change, priorities change, needs change, and the needs of 1984 may not have a whole lot to do with it. But the programs that were started in 1984 are still running. It is time to squeeze that penny until we have our fingerprint in it, that we save that penny and a little bit more out of every dollar of the taxpayers' money, and that we, once and for all, balance the budget, make Social Security safe and just make government more efficient.

POLITICAL HYPOCRISY ON THE SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUND ISSUE

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

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to know that my Republican colleagues who spoke before me this evening basically showed, if you will, their hypocrisy on the Social Security issue.

The bottom line is we all know that Republicans have always disliked Social Security, and now they are trying to have the American people believe they are suddenly the steadfast defenders of the Social Security program by essentially distorting their record on the issue of Social Security.

Let there be no question about it: The Republicans have already spent at least $13 billion of the Social Security surplus. They are trying to give you the impression that somehow that is not the case, that they are going to balance the budget without using the Social Security surplus. The reality is they have already spent at least $13 billion of it with the appropriations bills that have already passed the House of Representatives.

TOM DELAY, the Republican Whip, said at one time, this was October 1st in the Washington Times, ''I will not vote for any bill that spends any of the Social Security surplus.'' But his own Congressional Budget Office has repeatedly said, and we have said it over and over again, we need to say it as Democrats because of what the Republicans are trying to do to distort the record, TOM DELAY's own Congressional

Budget Office has repeatedly said that Republicans have already spent $13 billion of the Social Security surplus on the Republican spending bills, on the appropriations bills.

According to the CBO, their own Congressional Budget Office, Republicans are on their way to spending $24 billion of the Social Security surplus with the bills that they keep cranking out and sending to the President. I think the ultimate irony of it all is when the President vetoes these bills and basically sends them back, which means the money is not spent, they criticize the President and say he wants to spend the Social Security surplus.

Well, how can he do that if he vetoes the bill? The bills that they send to him are the spending bills. When he takes his pen and crosses it out and says I will not spend that money and he sends it back, the money is not spent. So it is the President in vetoing these bills and saying look, I want to look at this entire budget. You show me how you are going to put together these 13 appropriation bills and what that is going to add up to in the end, because he is concerned that he does not want to spend any of the Social Security surplus, and in fact it is the Republicans by passing these spending bills and sending them to him that are in fact doing just that.

Let me go beyond the immediate question of the issue of spending Social Security surplus, because I do not think there is any doubt that the Republican leadership has already done that. But they have always opposed the concept of Social Security. The members of this Republican leadership have repeatedly been on record as saying that they are opposed to or wanted to phase out or somehow suggest they do not like Social Security as a concept, as a system.

The fact is that DICK ARMEY, TOM DELAY and the rest of the Republican leadership have a long track record, from either indifference to outright hostility, toward Social Security.

Republicans wanted to eliminate guaranteed benefits for Social Security through various privatization schemes. We have not heard about that, but many, many in the Republican leadership have talked about the need to privatize Social Security, which, in my opinion, is the same thing as not having the system as a guaranteed government system. They have no plan to extend the life of the Social Security trust fund. They basically want to let it wither on the vine.

We all know that if something is not done soon, at some point into the next 10 or 20 years the Social Security trust fund is going to start to run out of money. And where is their plan? Where is the Republican plan to extend the life of that program? The only person who has put forward a plan, or I should say the only prominent person who has put forward a plan to try to shore up Social Security over the long term, is the President of the United States, Bill Clinton, who they basically distort what he says every night here.

Once again, over the weekend he put forward and said that he wanted his long-term plan to shore up Social Security to be part of this budget agreement that he wants to work on with the Republicans, with the Congress, over the next few weeks. They just ignore that. They ignore the fact that Social Security needs to be fixed on a long term basis.

You know, the amazing thing is the President's plan, if it were adopted, would basically extend the life of the Social Security trust fund by 15 years. The Republicans do not extend the life of that fund a single day.

The other thing that I wanted to point out is very conveniently my colleagues on the other side forgot what they did for the last 6 months when they put together this $1 trillion tax cut bill that primarily benefited the wealthy Americans and the corporations and would have just obliterated any effort to try to provide the surplus for Social Security. In fact, the Republican tax plan, which the President wisely vetoed, would have sucked the surplus dry, leaving nothing for strengthening the Social Security trust fund or extending the life of the Medicare Trust Fund or modernizing Medicare with prescription drug coverage.

When I go out and talk to my seniors, they are worried about the long-term impact, whether or not Social Security is going to be there. They are worried about whether Medicare is going to be there. They want to make sure that Medicare includes the prescription drug fund.

If this Republican tax plan, passed by the Republicans in both houses with few if any Democratic votes, had not been vetoed by President Clinton, there would not be anything to discuss here, because any effort to modernize Medicare, provide for prescription drugs, to make sure that we could shore up and save Social Security over the next 30 years, all that would have been out the window. They spent 6 months on that, and finally the President vetoed it. But they have forgotten. We do not hear about that anymore, because obviously it did not work and they are not getting any mileage out of it, so they do not talk about it anymore. Republicans voted for $1 trillion for tax cuts for the wealthy and the corporate special interests. Not one penny of that for Social Security.

Let me just talk a little bit, because over the weekend the president reiterated once again the need to look at Social Security over the long term, to shore it up for the future.

□ 1915

He is the one that is out there talking about this. Basically what the President is saying is that any surplus that is generated, I am not talking about the Social Security Trust Fund and the surplus that is in there, but I am talking about the general revenue, the money that comes from one's income taxes and other fees that one pays the Federal Government, the general revenue surplus, which, because of the Balanced Budget Act, is going to continue to grow over the next 10 years, he is saying that that surplus, if any, because we are not sure if there is going to be any, but if there is some, he wants to take that general revenue money, that income tax money, and he wants to apply that or a good percentage of that to Social Security so that we have enough money over the long-term.

Because my colleagues have to understand that, under the current system, if we continue the way we do, there will not be enough money for Social Security in another 20 or 30 years.

Well, the President basically said in his weekly radio address over the weekend that he would send Congress legislation next week based on a proposal he first floated earlier this year, this is almost a year ago in the State of the Union address, to shore up Social Security with projected Federal budget surpluses.

I quote, ''The American people deserve more than confusion, double-talk, and delay on this issue'', Mr. Clinton said. ''It is time to have a clear straightforward bill on the table; and next week, I plan to present one, legislation that ensures that all Social Security payroll tax will go to savings and debt reduction for Social Security.''

Now, what could be more clear. Here is the Democratic President who, in a long series of Democratic Presidents going back now to Franklin Roosevelt, is saying it is very important for us to look at Social Security over the long-term. My Republican colleagues do not even deal with the issue at all. It is not on the radar screen.

The White House said over the weekend that its plan would extend Social Security solvency from 2034 when, under current projections, it would be able to pay only 75 percent of promised benefits, to the year 2050, beyond the life-span of most of the 76 million Americans born in the 18 years after World War II.

So what the President is saying is that, at some point, I guess it is about 30 years from now, we will not have enough money in this trust fund to pay but 75 percent of the Social Security benefits. So we have to do something. He is putting forth the plan that says what we can do to extend the trust fund to at least the year 2050.

That may seem like a long time away, but for young people who are born now or who are in their twenties, that is when they will be reaching retirement age.

Here, again, is a quote from Gene Sperling, who is the director of the White House's National Economic Council. He says, ''What we have tried to do is present what we feel is the most solid bipartisan, hopefully non-controversial proposal to lock away

the Social Security surplus for debt reduction and use those interest savings to extend the solvency of Social Security.''

Now, let me explain that a little more. What the President's proposal basically does is to pay down the debt so that the money is available for Social Security. The President has been talking for some time about the need to reduce the national debt and basically saying that, if we save money, and we do not spend money, we will be able to apply that to the national debt.

The Clinton plan, again I am reading from the New York Times, this is Sunday, October 24, ''Mr. Clinton's plan is based on the idea that, by using the Social Security surplus to pay down the national debt, the government's interest bill will decline substantially. By the White House estimate, the government's interest expense will be $107 billion lower in 2011 than it would be if the Social Security surplus were not used starting this year to reduce the debt.

''Mr. Clinton's proposal would take the money saved, because of the lower amount of debt starting in 2011, and earmark it to shore up Social Security. From the years 2011 through 2015, the total savings and interest dedicated to Social Security would be $544 billion,'' Mr. Sperling said.

''And savings would continue accruing beyond 2015 at around $189 billion a year. The savings would at first go to further reductions in the national debt.

''After the debt was paid off, around 2015, under the White House's scenario, this savings would continue to be transferred to the Social Security in the form of a government IOU that would later be redeemed to pay benefits.''

The point of the matter is the beauty part of the President's proposal is that we are actually paying down the national debt, something that the Republicans claim they care about, but I do not see any action on it here. I do not see any efforts here to talk about the national debt. That is what the President is proposing to do. That is what his Social Security proposal would do, deal with this problem on a long-term basis.

Instead, the Republicans, what do they do, they do not talk about the long-term needs of the Social Security program. They just keep spending and spending so that now the appropriations bills actually dip into the trust fund and use the Social Security Trust Fund again to finance regular operating funds for the next fiscal year.

Now, I want to talk a little bit about this tax cut again that the Republican leadership and my colleagues on the other side sort of conveniently ignored in the last few days, in the last few weeks as we are talking about this budget. President Clinton vetoed this trillion dollar tax cut, which primarily benefited the wealthy corporations, for one simple reason; and that is, it wastes the surplus on special interest tax cuts instead of investing in the future of all Americans.

What the President is trying to say is that, if we give back this huge tax cut primarily to the wealthy and to the corporations, what are we doing for the future of the country? Nothing.

On the other hand, if we take his Social Security proposal and basically pay down the national debt, we are investing in the future. That is the point. What do we want to do? Do we want to give a quick giveaway to a few people, a few corporations, a few special interests, or do we want to invest money in the future so the money is there for Social Security in the future and so that, basically, the economy prospers.

The Republican tax plan basically meant $46,000 per year for the wealthiest taxpayers, but only $160 per year for the average middle class people. Republicans lavish nearly $21 billion on special interest tax breaks for big business. Let us not forget how much of that was just tax breaks for big corporations.

The Republican tax plan eats the surplus hold, preventing us from paying down a significant chunk of the $5.6 trillion national debt. Debt reduction, of course, is the best way to ensure that we continue our record economic expansion by keeping interest rates low. This was the President's economic plan, something that the GOP has basically rejected.

The Republican plan also siphoned money away from other critical areas, especially for strengthening Medicare and for providing prescription drug plans to help seniors pay for the costs of life-saving medication.

Let me talk about that briefly again, because then we do not hear anything about the long-term plans that the Republicans have for Medicare, unless they want that to also wither on the vine like Social Security.

Again, this week, I think it was Monday, the President at the White House had a press conference, talked about the need to push for a prescription drug benefit in the context of Medicare. His long-term proposal which was going to shore up Social Security also provided for revamping Medicare to provide for a prescription drug plan.

This is very important to senior citizens. When I talked to the seniors in my district and even the people who are younger who know that eventually they are going to be senior citizens, they worry about how they are going to pay for prescription drugs. Most seniors do not have a prescription drug plan, or, if they do have a plan, they have huge co-payments. It does not pay for a lot of their expenses. We find a lot of seniors that just go without prescription drugs or take half of a prescription when it is prescribed by the doctor.

What the President has basically said is that he wants to establish a new Part D benefit, very similar to Medicare Part B, where one pays a certain amount per month, and one gets half of all the costs of all of one's prescription drugs paid for.

There may be a lot of different ways to pay for prescription drugs and provide a benefit under Medicare for it, but at least he is trying. He is talking about this. He has folded this into his long-term economic plan that includes shoring up Social Security.

I do not hear anybody on the other side talking about it. I do not hear anybody on the other side suggesting that somehow they are going to deal with this problem on a long-term basis.

So, again, it is the Democratic President, it is the Democratic Party that are talking about these issues that will in the long term benefit the average senior citizen. All we see on the other side is a Republican effort to spend money and take it out of Social Security.

There is no question that there is a GOP strategy here that is a subterfuge and that is an effort to try to mask what is really going on.

In an enlightened moment back in August, this is on Friday, August 6, in the New York Times, the Republican Whip, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), who is basically running the show around here from what I can see, basically exposed what his real strategy was with spending the Social Security surplus. Basically what it is is to force the President to his knees, that is actually a quote, and spend the Social Security surplus. That is what the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) is all about.

He admitted publicly that he is misleading the public with his spend-and-deceive budget strategy. That is what we are hearing is this deceitful strategy that is being played up here on the House floor day after day the last few days, the last week.

What the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) basically confessed was that the Republican promise to join the Democrats in saving the budget surplus for Social Security was a blatant lie. He recounted in detail the Republican strategy.

If I could, I will just go through this from the New York Times. '''The plan', Mr. DELAY said, 'was for Republicans to drain the surplus out of next year's budget and force the President to pay for my additional spending requests out of the Social Security surplus,' which both parties have pledged to protect.

'''We are going to spend it and then some. From the get-go, the strategy has always been we are going to spend what is left', admitted Republican Whip TOM DELAY.

'''The Republican strategy', Mr. DELAY said, 'will also force the President to sign the Republican parties spending bills for next year.'''

He has not agreed to do so. He has been vetoing them. But they want him to sign because they want to spend the money and spend the Social Security surplus.

Again, I go back to the New York Times from August 6: ''He'', the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) ''said that even if the spending swallowed up the budget surplus, the Republicans

had a plan to use various budgetary mechanisms that would allow them to say they had stuck to the strict spending caps they imposed in 1997, the Balanced Budget Act. We will negotiate with the President after he vetoes the bills on his 'knees', Mr. DELAY said.''

Well, I am going to go into some of those gimmicks that the Republicans are using, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) is using to try to mask what they are really doing here by spending the Social Security surplus. But before I get into that, I wanted to give my colleagues some quotes from these Republican leaders where they talked about their long-term plans to get rid of Social Security.

This is in 1984 when the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the Majority Leader, in the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, October 21, 1984, said that ''Social Security was a bad retirement and a rotten trick on the American people.'' He continues, ''I think we are going to have to bite the bullet on Social Security and phase it out over a period of time.'' That was the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the Majority Leader, in 1984.

This is from CNN's Crossfire on September 27 of 1994, Michael Kinsley asked the gentleman from Texas, (Mr. ARMEY) the question: ''Are you going to take the pledge? Are you going to promise not to cut people's Social Security to meet these promises?'' The gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) said, ''No, I am not going to make such a promise.''

Lastly, this was in the same year, September 28 of 1994, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) said on a C–SPAN call show, ''I would never have created Social Security.''

So do not believe these guys when they say that they are trying to make sure they do not spend the Social Security surplus. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) have a long history of not being in favor of Social Security. That is what we are seeing. That is what ultimately will manifest itself here, because they do not have a long-term plan to deal with it other than to get rid of it.

I talked a little bit before about these creative gimmicks that are being used by the Republican leadership to try to mask that they are really spending the Social Security surplus. I do not want to spend a lot of time on them, but I do want to talk a little bit about them this evening if I could.

It is difficult when I talk to my constituents about these creative accounting gimmicks, because it sounds like a lot of bureaucracy and is very hard to explain the technicalities of what they are trying to do. But there are many ways creatively in this Congress that one can really mask what one is doing with the budget and how one is spending money and where it is coming from. We would have to probably spend hours to explain all the details about how they do it.

But there was a very good article, if I could mention it this evening, Madam Speaker, on Saturday, October 16 in the Washington Post by Eric Pianan and George Hager where they talked about Congress making greater use of creative accounting. I think they kind of distilled some of these gimmicks and put them in some common-sense terms. So I just wanted to take a few minutes if I could to highlight some of those gimmicks in this article by these two gentlemen that was in the Washington Post again on Saturday, October 16.

□ 1930

They say the Nation's defense contractors will have to wait an extra week to get paid this year. Routine maintenance of Pentagon facilities will be considered emergency spending. To keep from cutting education and health programs, lawmakers plan to borrow $15 billion from next year's budget.

So one of the ways that we can mask what we are doing with the budget is by declaring items emergency spending. We can say, oh, it is emergency spending so it does not count. That may sound crazy to my constituents and to the American public, but it is a fact. And what the Republicans have done is to declare a lot of things emergencies that really are not.

The best example probably, as has been mentioned several times on the floor of the House of Representatives, is when they decided to declare the funding for the census that occurs every 10 years as an emergency. Well, how can something that is required by the Constitution, the Constitution says every 10 years we have to do a census, how can that be an emergency when we know 10 years in advance that we have to do it? Well, that is an example.

I will go back to this article from the Washington Post. It says, ''As a Republican controlled Congress struggles to complete work on the budget, it is relying to an unprecedented degree on creative accounting to boost spending beyond what its rules allow. All told, congressional budgeteers have manufactured an additional $46 billion to spend this year on defense, farms, education and other programs. The situation underscores the immense difficulty of writing budget discipline into law and how easy it is for Congress and the President to circumvent what are supposed to be ironclad limits designed to keep spending in check. Under the 1997 balanced budget agreement, the Federal Government was supposed to spend only $592 billion in the 13 bills funding government's daily operations this year. But Congress is on target to spend roughly $640 billion.''

So the problem that the Republican leadership faces is that under the Balanced Budget Act, which we all adopted a couple of years ago, the spending for this year is supposed to be only $592 billion. In reality, they are spending about $640 billion, if we look at their budget. Well, we can see the discrepancies there and why it is necessary to come up with these accounting gimmicks.

Again, I am reading from this Washington Post article. ''Independent budget experts on the right and the left say Congress is masking the true size of its spending binge and could create serious budget problems when the obligations for the delayed spending come due. The actions also call into question whether the government will realize soaring surplus projections, which depend heavily on Congress ratcheting down on spending.''

So if we delay the spending and essentially go into next year's budget, ultimately this will come home to roost and we will have a bigger problem next year. What of course we do is, we do not have the surplus and we will not be able to generate the surplus that supposedly is going to be generated by this Balanced Budget Act we passed 2 years ago if we keep spending into it. That is exactly what they are doing, spending into the Social Security surplus to pay for these ongoing programs that they claim are not really being spent as part of the surplus. In reality, that is what they are doing.

Going back to The Washington Post article again. ''To the extent this approach is effective, it creates a bigger hole that has to be filled the following year, said The Brookings Institution's Robert Reischauer, a former director of the Congressional Budget Office.'' And it is very shortsighted, is what he says. Obviously, it is shortsighted to keep delaying spending into next year.

Just an idea of how they go about these sort of advanced appropriations. In recent years, and this is back to The Washington Post, for instance, ''Congress and the administration has balanced out their numbers by borrowing funds from future appropriations. Last year, Congress agreed to $11.6 billion of such advanced appropriations. This year congressional Republicans plan to borrow twice that amount, including funds for education, job training programs, and rental housing subsidies. That will make it even more difficult to keep spending down when they consider the same programs a year from now.

''With the approval of an $8.7 billion farm bill out this week,'' which was the week of October 16, ''Congress has declared a total of $22 billion in spending emergencies that also do not count against the budget limitations. Other such emergencies include spending for the 2000 census, fuel assistance for the poor, and maintenance of Pentagon barracks and facilities.'' Again, these are these declared emergencies which basically make it so that we do not have to count it but the money is really spent.

Finally, the article concludes that, ''Even with this more aggressive use of budget tactics, the Congressional

Budget Office has estimated that lawmakers would still tap the Social Security surplus by anywhere from $13 billion to $20 billion. Republicans may have to resort to an across-the-board spending cut of 1 to 2 percent to keep from doing that.''

Now, let me get into that, if I could a little bit, Madam Speaker, because that is basically what we were hearing from the other side of the aisle tonight. They know they have spent this $13 to $20 billion of the Social Security surplus. They will not admit it, but it is a fact. It is in the Congressional Budget Office analysis. Everyone knows it. So now they are talking about this 1 percent. I think it was 1.4 percent, but now they are talking 1 percent, so I guess they revised it, that they are trying to say they are going to implement as a way of getting around spending the Social Security surplus.

Well, this is really just an admission of the fact that they have been caught red-handed dipping into the Social Security surplus. They are looking scrambling around to make up the difference with gimmicks and these across-the-board spending cuts. This plan to require a 1 percent automatic budget cut, if the Office of Management and Budget certifies that spending would dip into Social Security, is really an admission by the chairman of the House Committee on the Budget, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), that Republicans have stuck their hands deep into the Social Security cookie jar. It is basically asking the Administration to save House Republicans from themselves.

One of the other things that they did, which I thought was particularly interesting, was this idea to raid the tax refunds of the working poor. Every day we get a different gimmick. It is either emergencies, delayed spending, 1 percent across-the-board, and the one a couple of weeks ago was this idea of taking the earned income tax from the working poor and using that. Actually, their proposal would have delayed $7 billion worth of earned income tax payments to the working poor in order to fill the gaps in the budget.

I do not know what they were thinking with that. Maybe that somehow the working poor, because they figured they do not have time to vote or do not have time to read the newspaper or something, that they were not going to notice that they did not receive their tax refund up front. I do not even know if they have dropped that. That may still be out there as another way or another gimmick of trying to somehow hoodwink the American people as to what they are really up to.

Let me just say, though, because I have heard this 1 percent plan mentioned several times this evening by my Republican colleagues who spoke before me, that even that does not add up. They are pretending a 1 percent across-the-board cut will do the trick and erase their $12 or $13 billion spending where they have dipped into the Social Security surplus. But even with that, they are still nearly $4 billion in the hole based on their own phony accounting. In reality, I say they are way on their way of dipping into even more and more of the Social Security surplus.

As we see what develops over the next few days or the next few weeks here, I am sure we will all find that, in fact, they are spending even more, and they are going to go way beyond that $12 or $13 billion that has already been spent from the Social Security surplus and even spend more before they finally wrap up this budget process.

Madam Speaker, I do not intend to spend a lot more time this evening, but I feel it is my obligation and that of my colleagues on the Democratic side to come here every night and basically present the truth and expose this GOP hypocrisy on Social Security. I have never seen an effort by my Republican colleagues to basically come to the floor every night and somehow think that if they are going to keep saying this over and over again, that the President is dipping into Social Security or the Democrats want to dip into Social Security, that somehow it is going to be believed.

They are even running these ads, very expensive ads, I should say, in a lot of the districts of my Democratic colleagues, accusing my Democratic colleagues of dipping into Social Security. I think the theory is if they tell the lie often enough that people will believe it; or if they spend enough money getting the message out, even though it is not true, people will believe it. I hope the people do not believe it. And certainly we will continue on this side of the aisle to expose the truth about what is really going on here and how much money is already being spent by the Republicans with their spending bills.

The ultimate irony is that they keep coming and talking about how the President wants to keep spending money. Well, the President does not appropriate the funds. They are in the majority. The Republicans are in the majority in both the House of Representatives and in the Senate. They are in the majority. They send him the bills. If he vetoes the bills, the money is not spent. That is the constitutional process.

So for the life of me I do not understand how any of them can suggest that by the President vetoing a bill that somehow he is spending the Social Security surplus, when all he is saying is that the money cannot be spent. If he vetoes the bill, the money is not spent. The only way the money is spent is if they appropriate the money and he signs the bill.

So the whole process, the whole way they go about describing the process, is basically not true. And I think it is incumbent upon myself and others to come here every night and to explain what is really going on here in this Republican effort and their inability to adopt a budget that does anything but spend the Social Security surplus.

ILLEGAL NARCOTICS AND ITS EFFECTS ON THE YOUTH OF OUR NATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. NORTHUP). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MICA. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to come to the floor of the House again on a Tuesday night to talk about an issue that I talk about as often as possible, and that is the problem that we have in our country and also in dealing in Congress with the issue of illegal narcotics and the tremendous impact that illegal narcotics are having on our young people.

Tonight I am going to focus a little bit on some of the issues that relate to the question of the District of Columbia's appropriation and some specific measures that are in the appropriations bill that deal with the District of Columbia.

I also intend to talk a bit about the general war on drugs and review a little bit how we got ourselves into that situation.

Time permitting, Madam Speaker, I also hope to talk some about Colombia and the administration's potential request, which certainly will dramatically affect our spending as soon as we finish with the problems we have now in funding the fiscal year 1999–2000 requirements. We are expecting a rather substantial request to come in by the administration, and we will talk about that and Colombia and how we got ourselves into that particular dilemma.

And I will also talk a bit about the situation in Panama, that whole region that has been such an active area as far as illegal narcotics trafficking and disruption in general for the entire hemisphere.

So those are a few subjects, and then, time permitting, I will get into some of the updates that I usually try to do on problems relating to illegal narcotics and how they affect all our communities across the land.

The first thing that I want to talk about tonight is something that I hear repeatedly over and over; that the war on drugs has failed; that, indeed, we have lost the war on drugs. I have some very good friends, even on the conservative side, and I noticed one of the columnists, who is very conservative in his opinion, this past week came out and said why not legalize narcotics; that the war on drugs is a failure. I always try to relate my topic of discussion to the facts and deal with the facts and statistics, information that we have had presented to us in the subcommittee which I chair, which is the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources of the Committee on Government Reform.

We have had many, many hearings since I have taken that subcommittee

over the beginning of the year dealing with illegal narcotics, and we have looked at the question of whether or not the war on drugs is indeed a failure. We have looked at the question of legalization. In fact, we probably conducted the first hearing, the only hearing to date, on the question of legalization and decriminalization of drug penalties. We have talked in our subcommittee and held hearings on the problems with Mexico, with Colombia, with some of our treatment programs and, most recently, the education program that this Congress has funded to the tune of a billion dollars over the next 5 years getting an update on that first year's progress in that program.

□ 1945

Additionally, the southwest border and the billions of dollars we spent in Federal resources at that border in trying to contain not only illegal narcotics but illegal immigration and trafficking, illegal commerce across our borders.

So we have covered the gamut of this topic. We have heard from GAO, DEA, Department of Justice, Department of Defense, Department of State, many, many agencies of Federal Government and rely on their facts and support and statistics in our reports.

Basically, I came to the conclusion, and I think my colleagues would too if they spent time in those hearings as we have done, we came to the conclusion that, in fact, the war on drugs did not fail.

What happened was we had an end of the war on drugs in 1993 with the Clinton administration, which took over not only the executive branch of Government, which executes the law, but also had very substantial majorities in both the House of Representatives and also the other body, the United States Senate. They controlled and dominated the agenda, the legislative agenda, and the executive and administrative operations of this Government for over 2 years, from 1993 through 1995.

I have had these charts out before, and I will refer to them once again. Foremost in our responsibility as a Federal Government are our programs to stop illegal narcotics at their source, outside the country. Now, State and local governments law enforcement folks cannot do that, but it certainly must be done. And whether we legalize what are now illegal narcotics or not, we would still have a fundamental responsibility in keeping what would be an illegal commodity coming into the United States. In this case, it happens to be primarily heroin, cocaine, and methamphetamines.

The first thing that the Clinton administration did after completely decimating the drug czar's office, and that was the beginning of the ending of the war on drugs, they took the drug czar's office down from a staffing level of over 120 to some less than 2 dozen personnel. That was the first cut, slash, burn that ended the war on drugs.

The next thing they did, and again Federal responsibility is to stop drugs at their source, that is, outside the boundaries of the country, clearly a Federal responsibility, if you look at the chart, Federal spending and international programs, these are source country programs we see this dramatic decline in 1993 right in this period here through 1995, up to 1996 it bottomed out. This is where the Republicans took control of the House and the other body.

Then you see a dramatic reversal in that spending. And these are really not very big dollars, this is $633 million, in the scheme of our entire war on drugs. And you have to understand that illegal narcotics and drug abuse and crime and operating our justice system and everything, all the costs run us about a quarter of a trillion dollars a year.

So this is $633 million back in 1991. And in 1999 we are up to about that level. If you look at 1990 dollars, you see that we have gotten us back into the war on drugs in the source country programs. And that has been particularly effective in cocaine, where we have had two programs that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) help start them, Mr. Zeliff, formerly a member, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) now the Speaker, when they took over this responsibility which I now chair, they began very effective international programs in both Peru and Bolivia.

I am pleased to say that, in Peru, almost 60 percent of the cocaine production has been eliminated and in Bolivia over 50 percent. President Fujimori of Peru has done an outstanding job. And the President of Bolivia has done an excellent job, too. Mr. Banzer, the President there, has, as I said, eliminated over almost half the production and has a program that in the next 2 years, 24 months, to eliminate the balance.

So we have seen cocaine production figures drop most cost effectively, small amounts of money, in those countries.

The one disaster in all of this is Colombia, and I will talk about that later, where specific administration policy closed down not only the war on drugs internationally but, more specifically, in Colombia. And that has done the most damage and where we are getting now most the cocaine and heroin entering the United States is now produced there.

But we see, in fact, our primary responsibility as a Federal Government would be in the international arena spending cost effectively these dollars, and in 2 to 3 years they did an incredible amount of damage.

The next responsibility as far as the Federal Government and working with our agencies to stop illegal narcotics would be to stop them from the source to the border coming into the United States. Again, the war on drugs basically closed down.

If we took these figures back to when Ronald Reagan was President and George Bush, we would see a dramatic drop and they made tremendous progress in stopping illegal narcotics coming in, stopping the production and also interdicting and using the resources of our various agencies.

Basically, again, the Clinton administration and the Democrat controlled Congress stopped the military from being involved in the war on drugs. And some way, well, the military should be involved in this effort. But, in fact, they do patrol outside our borders. In fact, their planes do go up every day. In fact, we have servicemen and women serving around the world.

If we looked at the impact of any type of damage to our country, I said a quarter of a trillion dollars in expenditures and lost lives and production in this effort, our military are there, they are on duty. And they were brought into this war by President Reagan and also there with the blessing of President Bush, and they did a tremendous job and we saw a decline in illegal narcotics coming into the country. And it was most cost effective since we are paying the tab for the military in these arenas anyway.

Additionally, if you took at the casualties, and I have cited the most casualties we had released just a few months ago, it was over 15,200 Americans died from drug-induced deaths, if you take from the time President Clinton was elected to today, we are probably looking at close to 80,000 Americans have died as a result of drug induced deaths. And that is as many as any of the conflicts, the Vietnam conflict, the Korean conflict. And that does not address the other social problems, the human tragedy cost to so many who are not mentioned in just the death figures but the destruction again of families.

Again, the second most important responsibility, stopping drugs before they come into our country, very cost effective again. We were up to $2 billion totally. And again this is money that would have been spent by the military in any event, almost all of this money. Because we have the planes, we have the ships, we have the personnel which are the bulk of the costs. But, again, their disdain for the military, their disdain for a real war on drugs, they took them out of this effort.

We also used the Coast Guard to protect our borders, particularly around the coastal areas. Puerto Rico is a great example. And my area has been very hard hit. I represent central Florida, Orlando, where our heroin overdoses and drug overdoses now exceed homicide as a cause of death, more deadly than any gun or knife or weapon that is used in the destruction of human life.

Drugs have decimated my area. Most of those drugs came in from a very simple action of the Clinton administration in cutting the Coast Guard budget. This House of Representatives and the Senate, dominated by the Democrats in 1993, 1994 up to 1995, slashed those budgets. Talk to anyone who is in the Coast

Guard. They cut the shield that protected Puerto Rico. And drugs float in there. Once they are in Puerto Rico, they are in the United States. And the next thing we knew, they were flooding our area and Central Florida, and other areas have been hit by the same type of heroin epidemic.

But there are consequences to our policy. The policy adopted by this Congress is very clear. They killed the war on drugs, dead as a doornail. So we had again no leadership as far as the national level. In fact, we had contra-leadership with the appointment of Joslyn Elders, who was our Nation's number one health advocate, and she said ''just say maybe.''

They slashed the drug czar's office from 120 positions down to some 20 positions. They cut the spending in the Federal areas of most critical importance. Again, source country, very cost effectively. Just a few dollars took the military of the Coast Guard and others out of this war.

So, my colleagues, that is how we got ourselves into this situation, with incredible quantities of heroin coming into the United States, incredible quantities of cocaine, methamphetamines, and other drugs coming into the United States, cheap and on our streets in large quantities.

Now, those policies had some very direct results. I wish I could take a transparency and put what they did as far as their policy over these next charts. These charts, and I showed them, one other time we have used them, but they show the long-term trend and lifetime prevalence of drug use.

If we look again, this puts it in perspective. I hope we can focus on this. If we look at the Reagan years and we see the prevalence of drug use in the Reagan years starting to decline, the Bush years declining dramatically, the Clinton years almost like a rocket it is launched from the time that Bill Clinton, with the help, assistance and aided and abetted by the House of Representatives, did what I cited in these two charts and gave us this result.

And it is dramatic, if you look at just in the short time the Republicans took control of the House and the Senate, how we have already begun to turn that tide. And that is through restoring interdiction, through bringing the military back into this effort. By a full court press, so to speak, we have restored the drug czar's office.

In fact, I checked today and we funded over 150 positions. If you are going to fight a war on drugs, you have to have the ammunition, you have to have the equipment. You cannot cut the staff out of the leadership from 120 to 20.

Barry McCaffrey, our drug czar, I will say has done an admirable job in taking up this responsibility. And he not only has to have the responsibility, but he has to have the support of the Congress; and the support was not there. We see the results again in the lifetime drug use. And it is just not coincidence. These are facts.

If we look at the long-term trend in lifetime of prevalence of cocaine, we see the same thing. We see during the Reagan administration, and I was a staffer in the United States Senate in those early days, I remember helping work with Senator Hawkins and others of the Reagan administration, the Republicans at that period of time controlled the administration and also the U.S. Senate, and we were able and we had support, I remember even the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and some of the Democrats on the other side help, and we turned around this situation with cocaine.

If you look, it goes back down to President Bush. Incredible declines in the prevalence of cocaine use through the Bush administration. And then, with ''just say maybe,'' with lack of Federal leadership, with lack of executive direction, the cocaine use takes off again under President Clinton.

These are very dramatic charts showing exactly what happened. The information is not something the Republicans have just developed or our staff just put together. These are all from solid reports. This chart should be quite startling to everyone because it shows the latest drug of choice, and it is doing so much destruction not only in my community but also the land.

□ 2000

This shows again during the Reagan administration it sort of leveled out and the Bush administration, the prevalence of heroin use. We do see some decline in the Bush years, and then we see in the Clinton years it taking off like a rocket. And then when the Republicans took over again and we reinstituted a multifaceted, as I said, a full-court press against illegal narcotics, we have seen the beginning of a turnaround.

You cannot take the critical elements out of a war on drugs, just like any war that you fight. You cannot just be treating those wounded in battle. Interestingly enough, and we have the statistics on this, but from 1993 when the other side took control of the Congress and they controlled the White House, since then we have about doubled the amount of money on treatment. There is nothing wrong with spending money on treatment so long as those treatment programs are effective. But they must be effective and they must work. They must not be a revolving door. But we have doubled the money. In fact, with the Republican leadership just since we have taken over, there has been a 26 percent increase in funding from this Congress, Republican-controlled Congress, in treatment funding.

Tonight, I want to talk again about the budget battle. We are engaged in the House and the Senate with the administration in a very serious and difficult budget battle. We must pass 13 appropriations measures to fund all the operations of government. We have passed some seven or eight of those and some of those have been vetoed by the President. The President I believe yesterday signed into law the Defense bill. That is sort of a no-brainer. It had pay raises for our military that is long overdue. Depletion of the military, we have restored funds. It has really one of the few increases, but again we have to remember that this administration that detests the military has used the military in more deployments than ever in the history of any administration that has existed. There is great cost and to that cost we must have responsibility. It is also a big agency and there is an opportunity for improving payment patterns and expenditures and cutting waste and inefficiency out of it. We are trying to do that. In fact, we are trying to do that in all of these bills. But again Defense is sort of a no-brainer.

One of the other bills that the President has vetoed is the District of Columbia appropriations bill. One of the 13 bills that we pass to fund our Federal Government, we also pass to support the District of Columbia, and that is a constitutional responsibility set out from the very beginning when we created the District in 1790, we have had that responsibility, but I think that bill is sort of a microcosm of what we are facing in the larger picture, how the Republicans inherited sort of a mess, an incredible mess, trust funds that were robbed, Social Security funds that were depleted, unfunded pensions, pension accounts; just numerous inefficiencies, programs that had been expanded. We had 760 Federal education programs, 200 job training programs, hundreds and hundreds of programs and built incredible bureaucracies in Washington. In fact, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Civil Service, I think there are somewhere in the neighborhood of a quarter of a million Federal civil servants just within 50 miles of where I am speaking around Washington. They had built this huge bureaucracy that had sort of spun out of control and in the process to fund this and also to keep power, in order to keep power you have to keep getting more people hooked on the Federal take, so to speak, and I am not speaking about just Federal employees. There are thousands of them that do a great job. I was chairman of Civil Service for 4 years. There are some great Federal employees out there. Many of them are hampered by the laws and regulations which the majority put into place and they could do a better job if we let them more effectively operate.

The District of Columbia is a great example of government gone wrong. What the folks on the other side who had 40 years to straighten out the District of Columbia, 40 years to make changes in programs, 40 years to bring the government of the District under control and the government of the United States, what they did and now

what the President is threatening to do, the President is threatening to veto again, and we have already had one veto on the District appropriations bill, but part of the discussion is, one, we are not spending enough money, the other is that we have not adopted liberal enough policies.

How do I get into this mix? I am chairman of the drug policy subcommittee but also an observer of the District and of what has gone on here, both before we came into power and after we came into power. But the same liberal policies that they are trying to adopt now, spend more and then adopt a more liberal drug policy, are exactly what got the District into difficulty. We have been able to bring the District out of some of that difficulty.

We have done the same thing with the District we have done for the country at large. Now, stop and think about this. Think about the District of Columbia in 1995 when we inherited the District of Columbia. The other side ruled it for 40 years, again very tight rule, specific rule, giving them everything they want. There was a $722 million deficit just in 1995 in running the District of Columbia. It was just like the Federal Government. We were running 200 and $300 billion deficits annually in addition to taking all the money out of the Social Security trust fund. They were taking all that money, then spending beyond that a couple of hundred billion more. They had run the District into indebtedness and reliance on the Federal taxpayers' largesse to the tune of three-quarters of a billion dollars a year. They had 40 years. In just over 4 years we have gotten their finances straightened out.

The first thing we had to do was basically take over the District, put in a control board and get some personnel who could do something. I want to cite again what we inherited here and talk about the policy that they are trying now to foster and the President is trying to impose with these vetoes.

The District of Columbia had, in 1995, 48,000 people employed in the District. It was the third in size as far as municipal employees, exceeded only by New York and Los Angeles. The revenue from all sources in 1995 was over $7,200 per capita. They had plenty of money coming in. In fact, it was the highest in the United States. When we took over, they were charging more. The expenditures per capita, $7,150, you guessed it, was the highest rate of expenditures in the country. So they had more employees than anyplace except for the two largest cities and on a per capita basis probably exceeded only by the former Soviet Union. The debt was the third highest in the United States at $6,354 per person. That is what we inherited. Again, three-quarters of a billion dollars running annual deficit.

Let me tell you what else we inherited, and this is from the folks who are now saying they are going to straighten out Social Security and the District of Columbia. Let me talk about a few of the programs that are important to people, and they always give you this baloney that the Democrats or the liberals are more interested in people than the Republicans or the conservative side of the aisle. This is what they did to the people that they are supposed to care about.

According to, and these are all articles except for one of these, it is from the Washington Post, not exactly a conservative publication but we will use the Post as a source. According to the Post in 1995, the Department of Housing and Urban Development rating system, the District's subsidized housing program achieved the lowest ranking of any urban public housing agency in the Nation. Now, that is an accomplishment. They had control of this place, control of the District and the housing program basically failed.

The prison. This is from 1995, again, the same story. ''Authorities have uncovered a multimillion-dollar heroin ring that was run out of the Lorton correctional complex. That is the D.C. prison. Prosecutors have obtained convictions on more than 30 corrections employees in the past 3 years for smuggling drugs, accepting bribes and corruption. A jail suicide expert recently described the D.C. jail situation as catastrophic.'' This is what we inherited in 1995, the new majority. We have had to basically take the Federal prison, take the housing authority and revamp all of these programs, practically eliminate the prison here because the prisoners had basically taken over control.

Now, again these are supposed to be the most compassionate people, they tell you how they are saving Social Security and children and they always line up the children in the photo ops and all of that. This is what they were doing with the children, again their liberal, failed policies. This is from the Washington Post. The article is right here. I will read right from it:

''Some mentally ill children at the District's St. Elizabeth Hospital have been fed little more than rice, jello and chicken for the last month after some suppliers refused to make deliveries because they hadn't been paid.''

Here those that are probably the least well off, least able to help themselves, the mentally ill children in the District, they were the recipients of their policy, and again this is something that we have had to straighten out in the last little more than 4 years. They had 40 years to create this mess. And now they want to go back to that.

This is a great story from the Washington Post, October 7, 1994:

A city funded program aimed at spurring economic development has made few loans, created few jobs and after 6 years is still sitting on millions of dollars, according to the D.C. auditor Russell Smith. Smith said the Economic Development Finance Corporation, which began operating in 1988, again under these folks, has failed in its mission. He contended that it has improperly invested $6 million in a private for-profit group and furthermore that again their programs were a failure. Finally, the report criticized this group, the economic development group, for improper expenses, including food, flowers and political contributions made. This is what the other side did when they controlled the District of Columbia.

One of the other areas I spoke a little bit about and I think is important to all of those who do not have housing, is public housing. The other side claims to be able to do more for folks. But again in February 1993, the Washington Post reported about the housing project, again under their watch:

''Fraught with contracting delays, staffing problems and an endless crush of maintenance requests, the city's housing department still has 1,895 units boarded up and unfit for anyone, not the record number of families in shelters for the homeless, not the 11,000 people waiting on average of 5 years for public housing.''

And then in their drug and alcohol treatment programs, trying to help those who we want to help and who we are now trying to help with our programs and policies that are incorporated in the legislation that the President has vetoed for the District.

This is 1993 again. ''Its drug and alcohol treatment programs, however, were denounced as inadequate last month by Federal officials. However, the city has also gone without a permanent mental health commissioner for the past year. Its public housing department is being sued for failing to fix apartments and its Department of Human Services, responsible for tackling most of the social problems affecting the city, is still bound by 16 court orders to improve its work.''

Now, this is what they did in 40 years and we inherited, and in a little over 4 years we have begun to straighten out this mess, but the President does not want to see that continued. He wants more spending, more liberal programs.

☐ 2015

Public housing, the situation was horrible. I remember seeing a television report with rats and infestations you would not put, as I said on the floor of the House in a previous speech, your dog in one of these units, public housing units, that were under the control and supervision of these folks here.

Again, a question of a liberal policy, a conservative policy.

Then the question of pensions, and the previous speaker to me was talking about the Republicans and how they are not good custodians of Social Security.

Now my colleagues have to remember that in 1993, 1994, 1995 and before that, they were spending 200 to $300 billion a year in excess of the revenues coming in and then all the money in the Social Security Trust Fund.

This particular chart tells it all. It shows Democrat control, spending from

the Social Security Trust Fund. Democrat control, 1984, 1985, right in this period when they took over the House and the Senate, and the Congress controls the spending, folks. The President can recommend it or veto some, but basically the authority under the Constitution is with the House of Representatives and the Senate.

This is the most graphic and telling chart that I have ever seen. Every American should look at this.

And how they can come to the floor with a face and tell us that we are not doing a good job, we are not good stewards of this, or we are proposing plans to spend from the trust fund. When you see what they did when they controlled this, they spent all the money that came in, all of that into indebtedness, and then all of the trust fund money. It is absolutely astounding that they could come with straight faces, come to the floor and accuse us of this.

They also distorted, and I heard, again, previous speakers talking about this, about Republicans wanted to do away with Social Security. Well, I do not know of any Republican who has advocated doing away with Social Security. Most of us are concerned because of their years and years of spending out of the trust fund. It is very difficult to put it back put the money back in there, and we are doing that for the first time. Without a doubt we are doing it.

But it is beyond belief that, again, they could come to the floor with a straight face and say that we have a plan to do this.

Now I cite this because they did the same thing with the District of Columbia when Marion Berry in 1994 was here, and this is from the Washington Times, the only one I have from the Washington Times. But I think the facts are correct in it. It says Marion Berry has proposed little beyond the $140 million mandate to shore up the city's sagging finances. With a $40 million deficit remaining from fiscal 1994, an $18 million shortage in payments to Metro, 5 billion in unfunded police and firefighters' pension liability; not only did they do it to the Social Security Trust Fund, they did it to the District's pension funds.

And again I just do not know how you can dispute the facts. This chart has not been doctored in any way. This tells it like it is. In fact, the other side had their chance some 40 years and a little more than 4 years. It is absolutely incredible what we have been able to do in fighting and kicking and screaming with the President vetoing our legislation, even the District bill.

Again, if you take what the Democrats did with education, and you hear them talk about how they have done so much with education. In fact, my wife was a former educator. Myself, I graduated from the University of Florida with a degree from the College of Education. Though I never professionally taught, Mr. Speaker, I am an observer of what has taken place in education, both again living with a teacher and closely monitoring what has happened.

What they have adopted as their policy for public education is what I call RAD. It is called regulate, administer and dictate, RAD; R-A-D, regulate, administer and dictate. And that is what they have done over 40 years, bringing more control and power.

Now what is interesting, only between 4 and 5 cents of every dollar that goes into education in fact comes from the Federal level; 95–96 cents comes from State and local sources. But year after year they have created more federal programs; I told you some 760; I think we have it down to a little below 700 now kicking and screaming, but consolidating some of the administration, the A in that, the regulations. They want to regulate and control. As long as they regulate and control, administer programs, decide who gets the grant, who gets this, we have said that we want 90 percent of the money in the classroom and for basic education. They, in fact, have had 90 percent of the money not going into the classroom and for education. They want to determine whether we use the money for school construction, or they want to determine the hiring and firing of teachers. We think that should be left to the local school boards and local officials.

It is a liberal philosophy, a liberal philosophy of RAD. Regulate from Washington, administer from Washington, and dictate from Washington.

Now they did the same thing with the District of Columbia, and what did we inherit in the District? We basically inherited a school system where they are spending more per student than almost any place in the United States and getting less, some of the worst performance records.

In an article in 1996, again of what we inherited, the D.C. public school system had 91 leaky roofs, currently they had 20 condemned boilers and a hundred of 230 buses are nonoperational. This is what we inherited, and, again, straightening this out has been very difficult, and again the President wants to veto our approach to education in the District, our approach to drug policy in the District, our approach to fiscal responsibility in the District and go back to the reckless ways of spending.

I love these articles because they cite again what we inherited, what this new Republican majority inherited, and I think every Republican should be proud whether it is the American who is out there and registered as a Republican, whether it is a Republican in this Congress, whether it is some of my colleagues who were beaten up and defeated for the fiscal responsibility that they brought about, but I think they should be very proud of what they have done not only in the Congress for the country, but I think what we have done for our Nation's capital.

A nation's capital should be a shining example. Instead it was a disgraceful situation here that we inherited.

This 1996 Washington Post article talks about what we inherited with some of the medical facilities; in this case, the morgue, and I have cited this one before. This is just unbelievable:

Cockroaches crawling across stainless steel autopsy tables, clogged drains that often send blood and body fluid spilling on to the faded tile floor, flies droning in the hot stench, so thick it sticks to your skin and leaves fowl taste in your mouth. And here is a quote from one of the workers there:

We try to do the autopsies early in the morning, it is cooler then.

This was the scene yesterday at the District's dilapidated morgue near the D.C. General Hospital in southeast Washington where 74 corpses, more than three times the morgue's intended capacity, are being stored in a facility where refrigeration sometimes cuts off when it rains.

This is the mess that we inherited with the District of Columbia. This is the way they operated it and administered it, a very important fiduciary responsibility in the Constitution. The Congress is responsible for the District.

It gets even worse. It says one body, and this is the report from this reporter, Washington Post, who looked at it then. One body was on the floor, and some were in body bags that had split open exposing the faces of the corpses. The backlog has occurred in parts because the crematorium the morgue uses to dispose of unclaimed bodies broke down a month ago, and the cash-strapped city had no other way to dispose of the corpses.

This is a part of this argument, and, as my colleagues know, I have said before it was easy for us to balance the budget because what we did is we limited the increases. They have you think that we took food out of the mouths of babies, we closed down social programs. The argument we got into was limiting the increases in spending. They had huge 10, 12, 14 percent, not mentioning the giveaway programs of the District. Seven hundred and twenty-two million, three-quarters of a billion in 1 year, to pay for this mess.

This is what we inherited; it is a disgrace. Can people not deal with these facts? I know this has to be embarrassing for the other side, but this, in fact, is what our majority inherited, what we have been able in a little more than 4 years to straighten out situations like this.

Then, again, we talk about caring for those who are in most need. I talked about the mentally ill children feeding them Jello and rice for months. That is the compassionate liberal solution.

Here, and I used this one last week, I will cite it again: neglected and abused children. Now what can be more responsible than taking care of neglected and abused children?

Here is a worker, a welfare specialist who came in from Guam, and said she saw some very difficult situations in Guam. This is in 1995. But after 6

months in the District's bureaucratic trenches she knows she made a terrible mistake. This is quoting from the article. She quit Friday saddened and shocked, she says, by a foster care system so bad that it actually compounds the problems of the neglected children and their families, and she said and then to come here and see one of the worst situations, it is depressing. She quit in 1995.

This is what we inherited. This is how the so-called compassionate liberals are taking care, custodians of the Nation's capital, spending huge amounts. We have gotten that into balance. We have to take it over, and we are getting these programs into order. The difficult part is getting these programs into order. But this is the disgusting and irresponsible mess that we inherited.

The trauma center, the hospitals. Basically the hospitals were defunct in the District. March 1995, another Washington Post article: Impending cutbacks at D.C. General Hospital make it apparently inevitable that Washington's only public hospital will close its trauma center. This is the busiest center in the city, and the D.C. General Hospital is the only hospital equipped to treat gun shot, stabbing and other major injuries on the city's eastern side which has the most violence and the greatest number of uninsured patients.

1995, March; this is the story. This is what we inherited.

Now, again remember $722 million supplement; in other words, they are running that debt, the taxpayers of the whole country were funding this mess. This is part of what the argument about is with the President of the United States. He vetoed our legislation which is responsible legislation. We brought the District into an administrative order. The 48,000 employees, down to some 33,000, and it should be cut even more; kicking and screaming, they came, and they picketed us, and they boycotted our offices. They kicked and screamed and yelled, but that had to be done to bring the administration, to bring the finances of the District into order.

Again, we face a veto by the president of the United States over what has been proposed as far as getting the District's house in order and as far as liberal versus conservative policies.

□ 2030

I could go on. We have even more stories about what we inherited in the District of Columbia and the battle, the budget battle that is now being fought. I guess the latest strategy from our side is to incorporate in the Health and Human Services appropriations measure the District bill and the President will veto that again.

But do we want to go back to where they had the District of Columbia? Do we want to go to where they had the people of the United States facing incredible deficits and the robbing of trust funds and taking the money from Social Security funds? I say no.

But the proposal before the Congress and the President also deals, and I want to talk specifically about that here, with whether or not to adopt liberal drug policies for the District in addition to liberal spending policies. Liberal drug policies in the bill are manifested in a prohibition of using Federal money on needle exchanges, for one matter, and the other side says give them free needles and they will not get HIV.

In fact, our subcommittee, I chair this Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources and our staff looked into some of the needle exchange programs, not only in the United States but around the world.

One of the first needle exchange programs was in Australia, and we have a report here, a 1997 report, that said free distribution of needles for injections of illicit drugs was introduced in Australia in the late 80's on the hypothesis it would play an important role in prevention of HIV transmission. Free needle distribution and exchange began officially in Sydney, where both HIV infection and IV drug use are concentrated, with a trial program in 1987.

Then a report was done in 1997 in Australia, and it said it specifically provides no evidence, let me read from it, ''it provides no evidence to support the importance of free needle or needle exchange programs and much is to indicate irrelevance to HIV infection in Australia.'' This study also goes on to cite several other areas, and I have also cited the Vancouver study, which also showed that this needle exchange program actually can have an opposite effect.

But that is what the President of the United States, that is what the liberal side of the aisle would like to impose, is a needle exchange program, federally funded by all the taxpayers, on the premise that, again, it cuts down on HIV transmission. The facts are to the contrary, the studies are to the contrary, a liberal policy versus a conservative policy.

Now, Baltimore really is the premier city that has had a liberal policy. Baltimore is a liberal jurisdiction policy and has had needle exchange. I like to use Baltimore as an example because Baltimore, which adopted a legal needle exchange program, has actually dramatically increased its heroin addicts. In 1996 they went to almost 39,000, according to this chart provided by DEA. In 1998, they were over 56,000, according to DEA. The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) has told me he estimates it to be 60,000 drug addicts.

In fact, from Time Magazine, this liberal policy, again which the President would like to have us adopt and the other side would like to have us adopt, this is from Time Magazine just a few weeks ago, not my quote, it is a quote of one of their officials, ''One of every 10 citizens is a drug addict. Government officials dispute the last claim. It is more like 1 in 8, says veteran City Councilwoman Rikki Spector. We probably lost count.'' Again, not my words, a Time Magazine report. A liberal policy.

If you look at what we have done, again, one of the things I am most proud of is we have taken a tougher stance in Washington the last four years, and the murder rate in Washington has decreased 14 percent from 1997 to 1998. We are down to 260 murders. It was in the 400-plus range when I came here. Every night young African Americans were being slaughtered on the streets. This is still not acceptable, but there has been a decrease through a more conservative oversight by, again, I think this Republican Policy Committee and the types of policy we want in the bill that we presented to the President, which he has vetoed.

The same thing has happened with New York. The murder rate decreased there 17 percent in 1997 to 1998. In fact, in Baltimore, the deaths in 1997–1998, this liberal drug policy, it is actually one of the few jurisdictions where they have stayed the same. In fact, they are exactly the same, 312 in 1997 and 312 in 1998.

This is the liberal policy that the President wants to adopt relating to drug programs and to approaches as far as legislative oversight and as far as spending. So we can see factually what happens. You get a dramatic increase in the number of addicts.

The contrary is true, and I have held this job up in New York City under the leadership and conservative zero tolerance approach of Mayor Giuliani, went from over 2,000 murders down to 629 murders. New York, I am not sure what the population of New York is, but it has to be 9 or 10 million people, at least. Baltimore has about 500,000, 600,000 population now, and it has 312 murders, about half the number. That must be 10 or 15 times the murder rate. A conservative approach of Mayor Rudy Giuliani, who has dramatically cut 70 percent of the deaths in New York City.

So we have a choice. We have a choice between a liberal policy and we have a choice between a conservative approach.

Mr. Speaker, with only 3 minutes remaining, I have spoken mostly tonight again on the situation we find ourselves in, but, you know, it is sad, because the District of Columbia has some wonderful people. They go to work and they try to make a living. There are families here, there are single parents here, there are so many good Americans in the District of Columbia, and we do have an important responsibility over the District of Columbia.

But we tried their way. The jails failed, the prisons were destroyed. The public housing was a disgrace. The programs for the mentally ill, the children

in most need, the neglected, the education programs, they all failed. Fortunately, that entire model was not transposed on the country.

The pension fund, just as I pointed out, the pension fund of the District was even taken from, just as Social Security.

I will hold this up as I close, because it is important, not only this one bill for the District of Columbia. Many people in America, many Members of Congress, may or may not care about the District specifically. We are very much, particularly in the House, oriented towards the problems of our own District. But it is a Federal responsibility. These are decent human beings.

But should we return to the chaos that they created in 40 years? After some four years-plus of hard work and effort to put money back in the trust fund, to make the District of Columbia something you can be proud of, that people can live and work here, and it is our Nation's Capital, it should be a shining example, and those trust funds should be really part of our trust. That is why the people of America sent us here, for trust, to make sure these programs operate.

So I hope that the American people will read between the lines. I hope that the President will not continue to insist on these vetoes, to bring more liberal policies on needle exchange and other drug legalization schemes, and then have the fiscal responsibility that is so important. It is tough. It is tough being a Member of Congress today because we do want to do the right thing, particularly on our side.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE HONORABLE JULIUS NYERERE

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a sad night tonight, because we will be talking about the loss of a great leader from the country of Tanzania, the former President, Julius Nyerere, who passed away last week in London at the age of 77 years of age.

One of the reasons that we mourn this loss and that we rise today to pay tribute to this great man, a great statesman, a great man of compassion, a great educator, a person with tremendous vision, is because he was a person who believed strongly in Africa's ability to forge a prosperous future through unity and peace.

At the time that Julius Nyerere moved towards his tenure as president, he was a person who had a tremendous belief in education. He was known affectionately throughout Africa as Mwalimu, which means ''teacher'' in Swahili.

My first trip to Tanzania was back in 1973 when I had the opportunity to travel to that country with a YMCA statesmanship group that was a program run by the International Division of the YMCA, at that time Mr. Frank Keeny and persons like Dr. Nicholas Ganteroff and many of the leaders, the late Bob Harlan, who was the CEO of the YMCAs of the USA, a great man of vision. We had the opportunity to travel to Tanzania, and at that time President Nyerere was the leader of that country.

The thing that struck me was that they had what they called education for self-reliance. Education for self-reliance was an educational system that brought the youngsters in about 8 in the morning, and then at noon they broke for 2 hours of work in the fields and they were learning how to be farmers, how to be self-reliant. Following that they would have a late lunch and then go back to class until close to 6 o'clock.

I had the opportunity to visit some of the classrooms, dirt floors, thatched roofs, walls made out of mud, and youngsters in the third and fourth grade were studying algebra, looking at basic trigonometry, speaking at least three to four languages, always Swahili. Everyone spoke English. They learned their local dialect. And I was very, very impressed and started to just study this whole education for self-reliance.

We had the opportunity to visit even in the more rural areas, and President Nyerere insisted that everyone must participate. He believed in the ''Ujama'' concept. That is the concept of collectivism, that everyone had to produce, everyone had to be a part of the growth and the development of their country.

Tanzania is one of the poorest countries in the world. The beautiful mountain Kilimanjaro is in Tanzania. But the educational system was almost second-to-none in that region of the world. He was a person that brought Tanzania out of the shadows of colonial rule and into independence.

□ 2045

Many of the leaders in Africa used to visit and stay in Tanzania in Dar es Salaam where they used to talk about the Pan-Africanism and the question of independence in their countries, the leaders from Namibia to SWAPO organization, the ANC, the South African organization led by Mr. Nelson Mandela, of course, in prison at that time with Mr. Mbeki and other leaders that we grew to know, Mr. Sisulu. These were ANC leaders who were also in prison, but their colleagues found themselves in Dar es Salaam.

We had leaders from Zambia, at that time Rhodesia. It was northern Rhodesia and Southern Rhodesia, which is now Zimbabwe. But people like Mr. Mugabe, Joshua Nkomo, these great leaders used to migrate down to Dar es Salaam and talk about revolution, talk about independence, talk about freedom, talk about self-reliance.

So we saw the whole area of independence led by our fallen leader who, at the age of 77, died after losing a 2-year battle with leukemia. He was a person who was the first leader to voluntarily step down. Elected in 1962, he decided that he would step down after serving 23 years as president. His people wanted him to continue on. But he said, no, he would not continue on as president, and he stepped down. Elections were held. President Benjamin Mkapa was the one who then became head of Tanzania recently.

It was interesting that, in his drive for independence, the East African countries were under the British rule. They had Uganda, Kenya, and Tanzania. An organization called the East African Federation was created by the British. They integrated the air links, the rail links, the road links.

The break-up of the East African Confederation happened when the countries became independent. It was Jomo Kenyatta who led the Maumaus who really started the whole move to independence, and Kenya was in the lead, although they were not the first. Gada received their independence in 1958, Kenya not until the early 1960s, although Sudan received their independence in 1957, 1956. So we saw, though, President Nyerere taking this country forward.

There was a mean brutal dictator from the bordering country of Uganda. During my travels in Uganda in 1973 and 1974, I was in the presence of the then dictator Idi Amin. Idi Amin was a person who turned on his people.

Idi Amin came to power by defeating President Milton Obote who served as the first president of Uganda but was not serving the people well. Idi Amin, at that time a popular figure with the people of Abu Gandon, took over, by military coups, and ousted Milton Obote. But then Idi Amin tended to turn on his people. Actually, then, with the incident in Entebbe where Israel came in to take out its citizens, that is when Idi Amin totally turned very barbaric on his people, murdering them and killing them and maiming them.

The Organization of African Unity at that time had a protocol that one nation did not interfere with another nation's problems, that although they despise Idi Amin, they said that they would not become involved in another country's problem. That was one of their founding protocols.

But this was wrong, said President Nyerere. In 1979, in defiance to the Organization of African Unity, President Nyerere sent troops to Uganda in response to this intense suffering of Ugandan people under the brutal dictatorship of Idi Amin.

That operation, one of the first humanitarian missions of its kind in Africa, would help set up a legal precedent for peacekeeping missions all over the world as we see today as a common thing, as we see in East Timor, as we see being created for Kosovo, as we hear about the discussion in Sierra Leone, as we have seen in Cambodia in the past.

So it was President Nyerere who said that the suffering has gone on too long, that the people have taken enough, that we must intervene, and, as I indicated, in defiance to the Organization of African Unity, send his troops in and ousted Idi Amin. This was a new wave, a new move, a new era for people of Africa.

Dr. Nyerere I know became concerned about the educational system in Tanzania. I had the opportunity just 2 years ago to visit him at his home outside of Dar es Salaam. He talked about the fact that the educational system was not as good as it was before. He was very, very disturbed about that. He felt that the only way out for developing countries was to have a strong educational system, the type of a system that he produced when he was in charge, even though, as I have indicated, it was a very, very poor country. They put an emphasis on education. He was dismayed about the fact that the country was not progressing as much as he felt it should.

But it was so, so peaceful to sit on his front porch of his home, very modest home, sitting on some chairs on the front porch and talking to this giant of a person. I feel so privileged to have the opportunity to know him and to have been in his company to discuss the problems of Africa to talk about the future of the continent.

As I indicated, it was in 1985 when President Nyerere stepped down and he simply devoted his time to forming and also becoming involved in diplomatic solutions in countries. He worked tirelessly to negotiate an end to violence that plagued central and southern Africa during the past decade.

Most recently, President Nyerere's efforts were directed towards mediating an end to the bloody civil war in a neighboring country of Burundi, where more than 200,000 people, mostly citizens, had been killed since 1993.

As my colleagues know, in Central Africa, the Great Lake Region, we have two countries that have been very troubled, the country of Burundi, as I indicated that President Nyerere decided to have economic boycotts so that military government would see that they had to have democracy, that they had to let all people free and to be treated equally.

Of course the other very troubled country was a country of Rwanda where, as we know, several years ago, we saw genocide when moderate Hutus and Tutsi ethnic people were killed. Numbers estimating between 500,000 and 1 million people were killed during the genocide. Once again, a country that has seen trouble and problems through the years.

Of course, the genocide in Rwanda occurred when the world sat by and said that we would not intervene, we will not send in peace keepers, we will not use Chapter 7 of the United Nations.

It was really one of the most shameful periods in the recent history of the world because the West and everyone around the world sat idly by as people were massacred by the tens of thousands.

The UN that had a small contingent there, rather than ask for reinforcements, decided to leave. As a matter of fact, they left some of their employees who were of Rwandan birth there, many of them whom, of course, were massacred along with the other people who were left in that country. So it was President Nyerere, once again, who said that this sort of thing must end.

Of course we saw Mr. Kagami come out of Uganda with the Rwanda patriotic front that routed the Hutu militia and drove them out of the country into the bordering then Zaire, which of course Zaire was a country that had been led for 30 years by the dictator of that country who robbed and raped the country of all of its resources.

We saw the fact that Mr. Mobutu, the self-declared president, stole the diamonds and the riches and allowed his people to suffer. The Hutu X-FAR and the Interahamwe, the Interahamwe were the people who planned the genocide, decided that they would go into Zaire, now the Congo, the Democrat Republic of Congo.

It was not until the Organization of African Unity and others said that enough is enough. The fact that the forces of Laurent Kabila that led a revolution to oppose President Mobutu then opened up the refugee camps to allow the people to return back from Goma, the then Zaire, back to Rwanda.

So we have seen the fact that President Nyerere has had a very, very important role in the development, because, even during that time, he counseled leaders and he convened meetings to see if there could be some negotiated settlement.

He also was a person who liked to read. What he did was to take eight books, books that should, he felt, be translated. He personally translated William Shakespeare's plays of Julias Caesar and the Merchant of Venice into Swahili. He would like to teach this.

He was a Roman Catholic. Mr. Nyerere had eight children, was married. He just did so much to make that nation, although one of the poorest in the world, a very proud country, a very popular place to visit. It is a wonderful place. The beaches down in Dar es Salaam are among the most beautiful in the world.

The United Republic of Tanzania, though, under his leadership and his consultation, amended its constitution in 1992 to become a multiparty State. In 1995, the nation conducted its first multiparty elections. At that time, it was just one political party when Mr. Nyerere was there. It was the Tanu party. In Kenya, there was only one party, the Kanu party. So we saw that Mr. Nyerere, as he left office, encouraged the country to go to multiparty elections and to become a multiparty State.

Many people wonder why many of the African countries were only one party, but those who were involved in revolution, the freedom fighters, they were the leaders who said we will fight against the colonial powers, and they did, and others who accepted the colonial powers.

□ 2100

So there was just one political party. There was just one group of people who fought to relieve the countries of the colonial powers, and that is why they justified a one-party system.

In 1992, they had these multiparty elections, and at that time we saw the President, the election of Mr. Benjamin Mkapa, who won a four-way race with 61 percent of the vote. The island of Zanzibar and Tanzania are related and together they are the United Republic of Tanzania, although the government in Zanzibar has its own parliament, it has its own president or prime minister.

And, actually, in Zanzibar, there has been questions about the elections. I visited Zanzibar several years ago and met with the prime minister there who indicated that the country is equally divided between Indian and African descent. It is about 50–50. And their dilemma is attempting to try to come up with a solution so that both parties, both groups of people, can feel that they are being represented in the government; that there needs to be a sharing of the responsibility of governing the country. We worked on some ideas about how that could happen. They need to have everyone feeling that they are included and are a part of the government.

But as Tanzania now moves with the multiparty, we had the opportunity to have Mr. Mkapa here just several months ago where he addressed the Members of Congress in the Congressional Black Caucus's legislative conference. And there was a lot of pressure for Mr. Mkapa to become involved in the conflict in the Congo. As my colleagues may or may not be aware, there was a recent conflict where seven countries became participants in sort of a mini world war in Africa. Lawrence Kabila's government was under attack from Uganda and Rwanda because the leaders of Uganda and Rwanda felt that the leaders of the genocide, the X-FAR and the Interahamwe were still in Zaire, still in the Congo, and that Mr. Kabila was not doing enough to get them disarmed and returned back to face trials in Rwanda. And so there was a conflict with Uganda and Rwanda on one side, Namibia and Zimbabwe and Angola and Sudan on the other side.

Just recently, we have seen the fact that finally there has been a negotiated settlement, a plan of the Lusaka Accords that have been led by President Chiluba of Zambia, where they have signed the accord. And we hope now that the Congo will end this fighting for good so that the people who have been under the brutal dictatorship of Mr. Mobutu for 30 years can finally start to have self-determination,

start to have educational programs, start to be relieved of the dictators and the repressive government that they have had to endure for so long. So there is hope.

We are looking towards the leaders in central Africa to come up with solutions. We can look to a place, a country like Mozambique, also one of the poorest countries in the world, where we have seen a growth in the GDP in Mozambique of about 8 or 10 percent annually. We have seen the fact that the people there are working together. The former Renamo forces now have become a political party with the MPLA and they are working together in unity to make conditions better for the people of that country. We have seen Namibia go through some problems as well as problems up close to Angola, but we now are seeing President Josh Nkomo moving to new elections so that the people once again will be able to move forward and progress as we move towards the new millennium.

We look at Nigeria with its new president, President Obasanjo, who I will have the pleasure to meet with tomorrow, that has ended the military rule of its 38 years since independence, 28 years of military rule. And we now see President Obasanjo retiring the military. As my colleagues know, the brutal dictator Abacho had imprisoned President Obasanjo and imprisoned Chief MKO Abiola, who won the June 12 elections but was imprisoned because he said he was president and they said the elections were annulled.

So now, the new Nigeria, with its elected parliament, with its new leaders, with its tremendous resources of oil and diamonds and timber and agricultural promise, we believe will once again move towards a direction of increase in its GDP and once again provide the outstanding education that it did for its people at its independence. Nigeria, with South Africa, with its new leader Thabo Mbeki can really be the engines of South Africa. A healthy South Africa and a strong Nigeria can pull the rest of the countries in Africa along into progress.

So we are encouraged by the fact that these two giants have had positive elections, have had a transition, have had a turnover from military rule. As we saw in the apartheid South Africa to a new multiracial Democratic society, we are seeing the same situation happening in Nigeria. So there is a tremendous amount of hope and there is a tremendous amount of opportunity.

We also would like to see increased trade and development between the United States and Africa. We have the technical resources to be able to assist them in this growth and development. They have the natural resources. Together we can harness tremendous energy so that both the Africans and Nigerians, South Africa, and Namibia, and all of the countries, the 50 sub-Saharan countries, 700 million people, will be able to start to benefit and enjoy the fruits of a true democracy and education and health care. The fact that everyone will be judged by their worth is something that these countries look forward to.

So as I conclude, I once again would like to say that the world is better off because of Dr. Julius Nyerere; that many of us have looked to him as a leader, a person of inspiration, a person who during my young years I looked to him as someone that I would like to emulate. And so it is with a great deal of sorrow that we have seen this fallen leader come to the end of his great career, but all of us in the world are better off for what he has done.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MCNULTY (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of personal business.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today after 2:15 p.m. on account of official business.

Mr. MASCARA (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and October 27 on account of medical reasons.

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. TOWNS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TOWNS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MEEKS of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. LEE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GEJDENSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RANGEL, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KILPATRICK, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

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

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

Mrs. NORTHUP, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LEACH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TANCREDO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCCOLLUM, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan, for 5 minutes, today and October 27.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that the committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2367. An act to reauthorize a comprehensive program of support for victims of torture.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, October 27, 1999, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

4921. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Oriental Fruit Fly; Removal of Quarantined Area [Docket No. 99–044–2] received October 21, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4922. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendments to the Regulations for Cotton Warehouses—Electronic Warehouse Receipts and Other Provisions (RIN: 0560–AE60) received October 20, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4923. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the approved retirement and advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list of Lieutenant General John B. Sams, Jr.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

4924. A letter from the Legislative and Regulatory Activities Division, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule—Extended Examination Cycle For U.S. Branches and Agencies of Foreign Banks (RIN: 3064–AC15) received October 19, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

4925. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Office of Student Financial Assistance, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule—Final Regulations—Federal Perkins Loan Program and Federal Family Education Loan Program—received October 20, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

4926. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to Norway for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 00–01), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

4927. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to Egypt for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 00–10), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

4928. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer

and Acceptance (LOA) to Egypt for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 00–09), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

4929. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to Israel for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 00–08), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

4930. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to the Republic of Korea for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 00–07), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

4931. A letter from the Executive Director, Committee For Purchase From People Who Are Blind Or Severely Disabled, transmitting the Committee's final rule—Additions to the Procurement List—received October 21, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

4932. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Glacier Bay National Park, Alaska; Commercial Fishing Regulations (RIN: 1024–AB99) received October 21, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4933. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Sharpchin and Northern Rockfish in the Aleutian Islands Subarea of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No. 990304063–9063–01; I.D. 101399C] received October 20, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4934. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting a report on compliance within the time limitations established for deciding habeas corpus death penalty petitions under Title I of the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4935. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model SA–360C, SA–365C, C1, C2, SA–365N, N1, AS–365N2, and SA–366G1 Helicopters [Docket No. 98–SW–26–AD; Amendment 39–11359; AD 99–21–14] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received October 21, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4936. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter Deutschland GMBH Model BO–105A, BO–105C, BO–105 C–2, BO–105 CB–2, BO–105 CB–4, BO–105S, BO–105 CS–2, BO–105 CBS–2, BO–105 CBS–4, and BO–105LS A–1 Helicopters [Docket No. 99–SW–52–AD; Amendment 39–11357; AD 99–19–22] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received October 21, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4937. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model CL–600–2B19 (Regional Jet Series 100) Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98–NM–385–AD; Amendment 39–11355; AD 99–21–11] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received October 21, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4938. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace BAe Model ATP Airplanes [Docket No. 98–NM–345–AD; Amendment 39–11361; AD 99–21–16] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received October 21, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4939. A letter from the Trial Attorney, Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Qualification and Certification of Locomotive Engineers; [FRA Docket No. RSOR–9, Notice 12] (RIN: 2130–AA74) received October 21, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4940. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 29786; Amendment No. 1954] received October 21, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4941. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 29787; Amendment No. 1955] received October 21, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4942. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; Lyons, KS [Airspace Docket No. 99–ACE–38] received October 21, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4943. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; Ava, MO [Airspace Docket No. 99–ACE–37] received October 21, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4944. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class D and establishment of Class E2 Airspace; Fort Rucker, AL [Airspace Docket No. 99–ASO–14] received October 21, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4945. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Establishment of Class E Airspace; Fort Bragg, CA [Airspace Docket No. 99–AWP–12] received October 21, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4946. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Establishment of Class E Airspace; Gualala, CA [Airspace Docket No. 99–AWP–13] received October 21, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4947. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Establishment of Class E Airspace; Lakeport, CA [Airspace Docket No. 99–AWP–16] received October 21, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4948. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A321 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99–NM–193–AD; Amendment 39–11362; AD 99–21–17] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received October 21, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4949. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Establishment of Class E Airspace; Clearlake, CA [Airspace Docket No. 99–AWP–15] received October 21, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4950. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Establishment of Class E Airspace; Napa, CA [Airspace Docket No. 99–AWP–17] received October 21, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4951. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Establishment of Class E Airspace; St. Helena, CA [Airspace Docket No. 99–AWP–14] received October 21, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4952. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; Nevada, MO [Airspace Docket No. 99–ACE–40] received October 21, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4953. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; Wayne, NE [Airspace Docket No. 99–ACE–29] received October 21, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4954. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of Class E Airspace; Altus, OK [Airspace Docket No. 99–ASW–16] received October 21, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4955. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; Norfolk, NE [Airspace Docket No. 99–ACE–45] received October 21, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4956. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of Class E Airspace; Georgetown, TX [Airspace Docket No. 99–ASW–18] received October 21, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4957. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 757–200PF Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98–NM–338–AD; Amendment 39–11380; AD 99–22–02] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received October 21, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4958. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Model F.27 Mark 050 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99–NM–225–AD; Amendment 39–11379; AD 99–21–33] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received October 21, 1999,

pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4959. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airwothiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model MD–90–30 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98–NM–340–AD; Amendment 39–11378; AD 99–21–32] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received October 21, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4960. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—November 1999 Applicable Federal Rates [Revenue Ruling 99–45] received October 21, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BLILEY: Committee on Commerce. H.R. 2531. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for fiscal year 2000, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 106–415). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 3145. A bill to modify the provisions of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 relating to the Medicare Program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Commerce, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BLILEY (for himself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. UPTON, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. ROGAN, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. LAZIO, and Mr. BRYANT):

H.R. 3146. A bill to amend titles XVIII, XIX, and XXI of the Social Security Act to adjust the Medicare, Medicaid, and children's health insurance programs, as revised by the Balanced Budget Act of 1997; to the Committee on Commerce, 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. DAVIS of Virginia (for himself, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. WOLF):

H.R. 3147. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to alleviate the pay-compression problem affecting members of the Senior Executive Service and other senior-level Federal employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Ms. ESHOO (for herself and Mr. UPTON):

H.R. 3148. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require any person who reprocesses a medical device to comply with certain safety requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas (for herself, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. REYES, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. OWENS, Mr. WYNN, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ORTIZ, Ms. LEE, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MATSUI, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN):

H.R. 3149. A bill to repeal the limitation on judicial jurisdiction imposed by section 377 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. STARK, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. EVANS, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 3150. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to provide bonus grants to high performance States based on certain criteria and to collect data to evaluate the outcome of welfare reform, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STRICKLAND (for himself and Mr. WHITFIELD):

H.R. 3151. A bill to provide funding for the Portsmouth and Paducah, Tennessee, gaseous diffusion plants; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. TOOMEY:

H. Con. Res. 208. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that there should be no increase in Federal taxes in order to fund additional Government spending; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANTOS (for himself, Mr. PORTER, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. HILLIARD, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KUCINICH, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. OWENS, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, Mr. SABO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. STARK, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. VISCLOSKY, and Mr. WAXMAN):

H. Con. Res. 209. Concurrent resolution expressing condemnation of the use of children as soldiers and the belief that the United States should support and, where possible, lead efforts to establish and enforce international standards designed to end this abuse of human rights; to the Committee on International Relations.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 49: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 73: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 325: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
H.R. 383: Ms. LEE.
H.R. 405: Mr. LARSON.
H.R. 420: Mr. SANFORD.
H.R. 505: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 721: Mr. THORNBERRY.
H.R. 809: Mr. STRICKLAND.
H.R. 860: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 997: Mr. LEACH, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. MASCARA.
H.R. 1006: Ms. LEE.
H.R. 1046: Mrs. EMERSON.
H.R. 1052: Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. BAIRD, and Mr. LANTOS.
H.R. 1070: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 1090: Mrs. LOWEY and Mr. TRAFICANT.
H.R. 1111: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 1115: Mr. GOODLATTE and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
H.R. 1123: Mr. CROWLEY.
H.R. 1155: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 1288: Ms. BERKLEY.
H.R. 1322: Mr. UNDERWOOD.
H.R. 1323: Mr. MCCRERY and Ms. DANNER.
H.R. 1344: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.
H.R. 1355: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
H.R. 1387: Mr. DEAL of Georgia and Mr. MASCARA.
H.R. 1388: Ms. LEE.
H.R. 1459: Mr. GREENWOOD and Mr. PHELPS.
H.R. 1485: Mr. DIXON.
H.R. 1579: Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania and Ms. BERKLEY.
H.R. 1592: Mr. MICA and Mr. DICKS.
H.R. 1598: Mr. HAYES, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. STUMP, and Mr. SUNUNU.
H.R. 1606: Mr. LARSON.
H.R. 1611: Mr. SUNUNU.
H.R. 1648: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 1760: Mr. CAMPBELL and Mrs. KELLY.
H.R. 1776: Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. HILL of Indiana, Mr. QUINN, Mr. MCKEON, Mrs. EMERSON, and Mr. BORSKI.
H.R. 1798: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin and Mr. EHRLICH.
H.R. 1839: Mr. BONIOR and Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 1869: Mrs. THURMAN.
H.R. 1890: Mr. COX.
H.R. 1977: Mrs. FOWLER.
H.R. 2121: Mr. LEVIN and Mr. FARR of California.
H.R. 2125: Mr. BERMAN.
H.R. 2200: Mr. WALSH.
H.R. 2262: Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 2263: Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 2264: Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. COYNE.
H.R. 2267: Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mrs. WILSON.
H.R. 2362: Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
H.R. 2366: Mr. STUMP.
H.R. 2376: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
H.R. 2420: Mr. BUYER and Ms. MCKINNEY.
H.R. 2486: Mr. WU and Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 2551: Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, and Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 2638: Mr. OXLEY.
H.R. 2655: Mr. TIAHRT and Mr. CRANE.
H.R. 2680: Mr. STUPAK.
H.R. 2710: Mr. GILMAN.
H.R. 2720: Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma.
H.R. 2722: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
H.R. 2726: Mr. COBLE and Mr. NEY.
H.R. 2733: Mr. MORAN of Virginia and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 2749: Mr. RADANOVICH.
H.R. 2776: Mr. DEFAZIO and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 2788: Mr. GANSKE.
H.R. 2800: Mrs. CUBIN.
H.R. 2817: Mr. MATSUI, Mr. OXLEY, and Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 2840: Mr. COSTELLO.
H.R. 2859: Ms. PELOSI, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. GEJDENSON, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 2870: Mr. PASTOR, Mr. STARK, and Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 2901: Mr. NEY.
H.R. 2963: Mr. BISHOP.
H.R. 2971: Mr. BAKER, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. ISTOOK, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. POMBO, Mr. ROGAN, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. WOLF.
H.R. 3034: Mr. HILL of Montana and Mr. ENGLISH.
H.R. 3053: Mr. HUNTER, Mr. VITTER, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. HEFLEY, and Mrs. MYRICK.
H.R. 3059: Mr. GUTIERREZ and Mr. COOK.
H.R. 3073: Ms. CARSON and Mr. SHAW.
H.R. 3087: Mr. OWENS and Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 3108: Mr. TIAHRT and Mr. RYUN of Kansas.
H.R. 3115: Mr. GRAHAM.
H.R. 3123: Mr. PICKERING.
H.R. 3132: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. DIXON, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.
H.R. 3144: Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. LATOURETTE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. CARSON, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. WYNN, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. VENTO, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. HINCHEY, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. OWENS, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. WU, Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. WISE, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. FORD, Mr. GORDON, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. KLECZKA.
H.J. Res. 53: Mr. SHAYS.
H.J. Res. 56: Mrs. MALONEY of New York.
H.J. Res. 70: Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. NETHERCUTT.
H. Con. Res. 62: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. MANZULLO, and Mrs. EMERSON.
H. Con. Res. 177: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.
H. Con. Res. 182: Mr. HORN, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Ms. STABENOW, and Ms. SANCHEZ.
H. Con. Res. 189: Mr. INSLEE and Mr. LOBIONDO.
H. Con. Res. 190: Mr. KUYKENDALL and Mr. JOHN.
H. Res. 107: Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. SANCHEZ, and Mrs. TAUSCHER.
H. Res. 169: Mr. WEXLER.
H. Res. 238: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland and Mrs. KELLY.
H. Res. 239: Mr. SOUDER.
H. Res. 340: Mr. LANTOS, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. HOYER.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1475: Mr. TOWNS.
H.J. Res. 2: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.