The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE).
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DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, D.C., November 18, 1999.

I hereby appoint the Honorable STEVEN C. LATOURRETTE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT
Speaker of the House of Representatives.


Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 385 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 385

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 82) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2000, and for other purposes. The joint resolution shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of open debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit.

Sec. 2. Upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 83) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2000, and for other purposes. The joint resolution shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and (2) one motion to recommit.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as cosponsor of H. R. 3908.

There was no objection.

PRAYER

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the J. journal of the last day’s proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof. Pursuant to clause 1, rule 1, the journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) come forward and lead the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) in the Pledge of Allegiance?

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as cosponsor of H. R. 3908.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?
Messrs. COBURG, BLAJOEVICH, DICKEY, MULCHOW, MORAN of Virginia, LINDER, SALAMON, BENNETT, SPECE, FROST, MS. WOOLSEY, MS. SANCHEZ, and MS. DANNER changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.


The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAUROTTI). The pending business is consideration of House Resolution 305 offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Goss).

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. GOS. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MAOKEY), my colleague, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, today, we place before the House what will hopefully be the last continuing resolution for fiscal year 2000. Yesterday, I referred to the movie "Groundhog Day" to describe the events of the past few weeks, where we seemed to wake up each morning and do the same things we did the day before. And while we are here again as we were yesterday considering a rule to bring forward another short-term extension of the budget deadline, we are confident that a final agreement has been brokered and the process is finally now near total completion.

Like yesterday's, this rule is a standard closed rule providing for consideration of a continuing resolution whose expiration date is November 23. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the joint resolution, provides 1 hour of debate, equally divided between the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, and affords the traditional motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, we have all been struggling to find the right negotiating mix to bring this budget process to a conclusion. Our firm line in the sand has remained constant: we will not spend one dime of the Social Security Trust Fund. While there has been the normal and appropriate give and take between the White House and the Congress on a host of other issues, our constituents, both young and old, I think are the real winners today.

Mr. Speaker, for the first time in over the 3 decades, Washington, D.C., will not be using Social Security as a slush fund. We have made the tough choices necessary to balance the budget without touching Social Security. It has been a long, it has been an arduous process; but the end result under the circumstances, I think, is well worth the effort: a more secure retirement for all Americans.

Just as there was 5 years ago when our new majority pledged to balance the budget, some cynical naysayers have claimed that we could not do this job without touching Social Security. They were wrong in 1994, and they are wrong again today. We can do better, and this budget proves it.

Mr. Speaker, I want to particularly commend at this time the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), Speaker of the House, for his persistence and leadership, and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and all the other Members who have made this day come to pass.

It is a good victory for Congress, and a good one for the American people. I urge a "yes" vote on the rule and the underlying CR, of course.

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), who I have not see since 4 o'clock this morning, for yielding me the customary half hour, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, even though we are 49 days into the fiscal year, only eight of the thirteen appropriation bills have been signed into law. Appropriation negotiations have been going on and on, and on, with little hope in sight. That is until you and this leadership, and the President, reached agreement on an enormous omnibus appropriations bill that lumps all unfinished business together in one massive document nearly no one can understand. And supposedly, we just need to pass a couple of more continuing resolutions to keep the government open until the appropriation process is mercifully behind us, and the President signs this behemoth bill.

Mr. Speaker, we are considering today makes in order not one, but two continuing resolutions. The first expires on November 23, and the second expires on December 2. I am told this is done to accommodate the deliberations of the Senate, so I see no reason to oppose it, despite the strange and inefficient process.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule, and support the continuing resolution.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), my...
Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Goss) for yielding me the time, and I think we are going to pass the rule very, very quickly.

But, Mr. Speaker, if I could have the attention of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) just mentioned the 4 o'clock hour, and he is right on target. At 6 minutes after 3 p.m., this morning, with the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) in the chair, I was able to file the final agreement on the last appropriations package.

We went to the Committee on Rules at 20 minutes after 3:00 and by 3:45, my part of it was complete and I was home by 4:30 this morning. I am not sure when the gentleman from Massachusetts got home, but the important issue here is that I have the opportunity to compliment and congratulate the Massachusetts delegation and the subcommittee chairmen and all of those who have done such a good job through this process.

But, Mr. Speaker, the unsung heroes do not often get those accolades, and I think it is appropriate that they do. Those heroes are the members of the Committee on Rules. They are here for early morning meetings and late night meetings. I want to compliment the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) and all of the members of the Committee on Rules for being available when the legislative process requires their presence.

In the last 10 days of our very serious negotiation with the representatives from the President's office, there have been numerous evenings when the Committee on Rules was told, be available, because we think we might have a bill for their consideration tonight. They have had to sit here until 10 o'clock at night, or midnight, and then the appropriators were not ready or the deal had not been struck yet. They have been so faithful to their responsibilities, and I just think it is timely to call attention to the work that they do and the generous giving of their time to help this process move.

Again, I want to thank the gentleman from California (Chairman DREIER) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), the ranking member, and all of the members of the Committee on Rules for being so patient with us as we move this process through.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OSEY), ranking member on the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OSEY. Mr. Speaker, first of all, before I begin, I simply want to say something about two people. I would like to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) is one of the most decent human beings I have ever dealt with in the over 30 years I have been a Member of this House. He and I do not share the same political philosophy on many, many issues; and he and I have different institutional responsibilities. We try to meet our institutional responsibilities to this House as one.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say with all the sincerity at my command that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), in the way that he deals honorably with each and every other Member of this House, is the way every Member of this place ought to deal with each and every other Member of this House. And I know that if every Democrat does that, he will stick to it. And I know that he will do the best job that he can to deal with the concerns of each and every Member of this House.

I also want to say that with respect to his counterpart in the other body, Senator STEVENS, Senator STEVENS and I are both known for our placid temperaments. I simply want to say that I regard Senator STEVENS as one of the easiest people to deal with. Not because he is easy; because he is as hard as nails. But one always knows where he is coming from, and he plays it straight; and I, again, appreciate that very much.

Mr. Speaker, I want to explain why I called the last motion, and why I will be calling a number of other motions today. I think there are certain requirements that this House ought to meet in dealing with the most basic responsibility it has each year, which is to pass the budget for the coming year. Budgets are not just numbers. They define our priorities. They indicate our values. The budget is the primary document by which Congress tries to influence the future direction of this country. We owe it to the country to consider that budget in a serious, thoughtful, fair-minded and honest way.

We are not going to do that today. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) indicated that this rule was put to a vote at almost 4 o'clock this morning. It looks like it. I saw Arianna Huffington, again a person with whom I do not share much in common philosophically, but I saw her on a television program on women's issues a few nights ago; and she observed that she was very concerned about politicians who would brag about the fact that they were up until 4 o'clock in the morning making decisions. She said, "I do not trust any decision that is made at 4 o'clock in the morning," and I think she is largely right.

My problem, and I have numerous problems with this bill and I will explain more of them in detail when we get to the actual appropriation vehicle on the floor, and sequentially for at least an hour and a half, I have had to sit here until 3 o'clock today and sequentially for at least an hour and a half, and the one fact is that there are two problems that I have that override all others. First of all, we have at least nine separate authorization measures which are being folded into this bill. One of them, a more than 300-page authorization bill which is yet to be considered, and yet it is being thrown in here. I defy my colleagues to tell me what is in it, and I urge my colleagues to remember that we will probably be, long after this bill is done, we will be trying to find out what is in it.

There are nine separate authorizations. I believe instead of having only 1 hour to debate all of those authorizations, plus the bills that were added here in the bill before us today, I believe each of those authorizations should be pulled out of the bill. They should be debated separately and sequentially for at least an hour before we vote on each and every one of those.

Secondly, I think we should have had 24 hours to understand what is in this bill. We are going to be haunted by a number of things that are in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, among the authorizations that are added to this bill are the Medicare, Medicaid and State Children's Health Insurance program, which I probably favor. But I think we ought to know more about how they are being put together.

Second, we have the Admiral James W. Nance and Meg Donovan Foreign Relations Authorizations Act. I do not have the foggiest idea what is in that and neither does anybody else on the floor. We have H.R. 3428, which brings several other authorization measures to this floor, including the Northeast Compact. That compact was slipped into the law in the first place several years ago without ever having been voted on by either body. It was slipped in by the Senate, and now we are again slipping it in without it ever having been considered by either body. I think that is illegitimate.

The Intellectual Property and Communications Omnibus Reform Act. That is the satellite bill. I understand, coming from a rural area, the loan guarantees that are useful in rural areas have been taken out of that bill.

I understand there are also patents and trademark items in that bill. I think we ought to know more about that.

We have the Superfund Recycling Equity Act. This bill reminds me of what Churchill said about Russia, "A riddle wrapped in a mystery inside an enigma." We do not have any idea what that bill is really going to do in the fine print.

Then we have the Canyon Ferry Reservoir provisions, and international debt relief (again which I favor); but I am concerned, very, very concerned, about one section of that bill, which I think may not in fact deliver what it appears to promise.

Then we have a number of private bills which have been attached, one of which I think I would favor and the other which I am concerned about because it only includes a few people out of a much broader class that ought to be included in the kind of relief contemplated by that bill that is going to be given.

In my view, every time I make a motion which requires a rollcall before we
can proceed to the next stage, that gives Members more time to find out what is in this bill before they actually cast the most important vote of the session. That is why I intend to make numerous motions today, and I most definitely would not count on being out of here by 4 p.m. or 5 p.m., or maybe even today.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LA TOURETTE). The Chair would remind all Members that it is not appropriate to make any reference to the decorum of Senators, even favorable characteristics.

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by associating myself with the comments of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Today, we have before us an omnibus bill which bears many similarities to the legislation that we considered a year ago at the close of the session. And for many of us, we promised we would never again let ourselves be trapped in this situation. We had a bipartisan budget process reform task force that worked. We do not work with a series of recommendations. But, tragically, none of these recommendations was even brought to the floor for debate. I hope that in the year 2000 we can indeed take up this budget reform properly and, hopefully, avoid an omnibus catch-all bill of the type that is being criticized today.

I recognize there are many good points to the bill, and I too would compliment the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations for his work. I have deep respect for him. But I would like to point out that there are many things in there that ought to be separately considered or are simply inappropriate in the bill, and commitment. I do not wish to mention any provisions, by the majority leader and others that these provisions would not show up in an appropriations bill.

One such provision relates to dairy policy. In this country we have endured a dairy policy which has split our Nation into separate zones for no good reason other than to try to maintain some anti-competitive framework in dairy. This is crazy. In early December, we will go to Seattle, many will go to Seattle, and I hope to be there. We will be urging that Congress expand our international trade opportunities. And why is it at the same time that we are expanding international trade opportunities we continue to balkanize our country with respect to dairy programs?

Mr. Speaker, it makes absolutely no sense that we would continue to balkanize this country for purposes of dairy policy so that fluid milk from one state can be taxed and charged at a higher price than the same fluid milk in another state of the country. We cannot allow this type of antiquated dairy policy to survive, and for this reason and others I will be opposing the bill.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE).

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by associating myself with the comments of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Today, we have before us an omnibus bill which bears many similarities to the legislation that we considered a year ago at the close of the session. And for many of us, we promised we would never again let ourselves be trapped in this situation. We had a bipartisan budget process reform task force that worked. We do not work with a series of recommendations. But, tragically, none of these recommendations was even brought to the floor for debate. I hope that in the year 2000 we can indeed take up this budget reform properly and, hopefully, avoid an omnibus catch-all bill of the type that is being criticized today.

I recognize there are many good points to the bill, and I too would compliment the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations for his work. I have deep respect for him. But I would like to point out that there are many things in there that ought to be separately considered or are simply inappropriate in the bill, and commitment. I do not wish to mention any provisions, by the majority leader and others that these provisions would not show up in an appropriations bill.

One such provision relates to dairy policy. In this country we have endured a dairy policy which has split our Nation into separate zones for no good reason other than to try to maintain some anti-competitive framework in dairy. This is crazy. In early December, we will go to Seattle, many will go to Seattle, and I hope to be there. We will be urging that Congress expand our international trade opportunities. And why is it at the same time that we are expanding international trade opportunities we continue to balkanize our country with respect to dairy programs?

Mr. Speaker, it makes absolutely no sense that we would continue to balkanize this country for purposes of dairy policy so that fluid milk from one state can be taxed and charged at a higher price than the same fluid milk in another state of the country. We cannot allow this type of antiquated dairy policy to survive, and for this reason and others I will be opposing the bill.
bill, it is sad and it is not worthy of the American people. Earlier this morning we heard a point that I think is very well taken. The American people do not even know what we are doing up here. They do not understand the concept, and all of the mishmash and misinformation that has been given to them leaves them confused.

I think this bill has some valuable points. Ultimately, when it comes to the floor, we are told that teaching hospitals, Medicare payments to hospitals, and health care providers are included. That is a positive. It helps my community in Houston. My own school district suffered for the lack of teachers, so 100,000 teachers will be valuable. Fifty thousand police will be valuable as well.

But I cannot tell for the life of me whether we are spending the Social Security system on whether we are helping it. And because my seniors are extremely important to me, I have great doubts about this bill. And, in fact, since it is not here on the table, I think all Members should be questioning this bill.

Then it is interesting that although we have argued continuously about riders and legislating on appropriations bills, because every time we bring up the idea of a patients' bill of rights, which 80 percent of the American people would like to see us pass, or prescription protection for our seniors, who are begging for relief because they cannot pay for housing and food and prescription drugs, for the same time we are able to make an argument that we cannot legislate on appropriations bills. Yet we have a 300-page State Department bill, which nobody knows what is in it; we have satellite TV special interests, and I am sure that the American people do not know whether we are saving Social Security or spending every dime.

I would simply say, Mr. Speaker, that this continuing resolution really needs to be extended so that we can go through the law and deal with this bill in the way that the American people would like us to do so. And that is to include the likes of prescription protection for our seniors; include a patients' bill of rights; to discuss a real estate crisis (we have compensation for the families who lost loved ones in the bombings in Africa; to keep family planning in; and, yes, to take care of our teaching hospitals, the 100,000 teachers and the 50,000 police.

But for God's sake, let us not vote on a ghost of a bill when we do not know whether we are saving Social Security or spending every dime. Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON). Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, thank you for yielding me the time. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY). This is no way to do the process and the work of the House. As the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) pointed out, we have many opportunities to make the appropriate provisions in this bill. I give the House this opportunity to pass a bill.

So we went through that process. The results did not please the people that put this forward, so now they have turned around 180 degrees and they say, yes, it is not appropriate to do this by rule; now we are going to legislate. I would tell Members who are considering voting for this that it is not worth voting for and sacrificing principles when they do not know whether they are saving Social Security or whether they are digging a big, deep hole.

If we had gone through this process the way we were supposed to go through it and had the appropriate review of these appropriations bills, maybe we would have been able to have a considered process in dealing with this omnibus bill.

I would simply say, Mr. Speaker, that this continuing resolution really needs to be extended so that we can go through the law and deal with this bill in the way that the American people would like us to do so. And that is to include the likes of prescription protection for our seniors; include a patients' bill of rights; to discuss a real estate crisis (we have compensation for the families who lost loved ones in the bombings in Africa; to keep family planning in; and, yes, to take care of our teaching hospitals, the 100,000 teachers and the 50,000 police.

But for God's sake, let us not vote on a ghost of a bill when we do not know whether we are saving Social Security or spending every dime. Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON). Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, thank you for yielding me the time. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY). This is no way to do the process and the work of the House. As the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) pointed out, we have many opportunities to make the appropriate provisions in this bill. I give the House this opportunity to pass a bill.

So we went through that process. The results did not please the people that put this forward, so now they have turned around 180 degrees and they say, well, it is not appropriate to do this by rule; now we are going to legislate. I would tell Members who are considering voting for this that it is not worth voting for and sacrificing principles when they do not know whether they are saving Social Security or whether they are digging a big, deep hole.

If we had gone through this process the way we were supposed to go through it and had the appropriate review of these appropriations bills, maybe we would have been able to have a considered process in dealing with this omnibus bill.

I would simply say, Mr. Speaker, that this continuing resolution really needs to be extended so that we can go through the law and deal with this bill in the way that the American people would like us to do so. And that is to include the likes of prescription protection for our seniors; include a patients' bill of rights; to discuss a real estate crisis (we have compensation for the families who lost loved ones in the bombings in Africa; to keep family planning in; and, yes, to take care of our teaching hospitals, the 100,000 teachers and the 50,000 police.

But for God's sake, let us not vote on a ghost of a bill when we do not know whether we are saving Social Security or spending every dime. Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON). Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, thank you for yielding me the time. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY). This is no way to do the process and the work of the House. As the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) pointed out, we have many opportunities to make the appropriate provisions in this bill. I give the House this opportunity to pass a bill.

We have seen a drop of $6 a hundredweight a few months ago. We just saw another big drop recently. We are not going to fix this by stalling this whole process and legislating, basically, the status quo on dairy.

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, first of all, this is certainly a very terrible process, and it is no way to run a railroad. There are many things that I would add. There are so many things that I would take out if I were in charge and was able to do it. But that is not the way the process works. And now we are at this particular point.

I think that there are more good things in this package than there are things that cause me concern to vote against it. One, I would like to focus on in particular is dairy.

The policies that we have been hearing talked about as it pertains to dairy does not take away from the issue of recognizing that the USDA's policy was going to cost small dairy farmers $200 million. It was going to leave things the way they were. It was going to take $200 million from small dairy farmers who are on the verge of collapse or death and be put out of business. It retains an extension in a dairy contract that we have with the consumers and the dairy farmers. If we look at the price differentials, we will see that the price of milk in the Northeast is five cents cheaper than the national average. So that has been a benefit for dairy farmers between the consumers and the farmers.

I am also a member of the House Committee on Agriculture, and we
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work on these issues; and there is no unanimity to these issues, but there are always disagreements. I appreciate the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations and the concerns that he shares, because some of us look at this glass of milk as half full rather than half empty.

I would also like to focus on the teachers, the teacher training, the smaller classrooms, more discipline, higher test scores. We are talking about 50,000 more police officers, safer schools, more protection in our communities. We are looking at veterans' health care. And we are talking about corrections in the balanced budget amendment that impacted on hospitals and home health agencies.

So there are many things that I think that when we look at that we could be in opposition towards. And, believe me, there are many things that I would rewrite. But, as I have learned in this process, we will have an opportunity in the future to change those things. And, another day will be in front of us.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume for the observation that this has been a debate about the continuing resolution rule, and I think it has been properly described.

I think it is a worthy rule. We all know we have to have the continuing resolution. We have provided for contingencies as this, as has been explained by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY) and myself. No matter how the Members feel about individual pieces of the appropriations process, I do urge their consideration and in a favorable way for this continuing resolution, which is necessary for us to get on with our business and the rest of the day's work.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

This will be a 15-minute vote followed by a possible 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yes 375, nays 45, not voting 13, as follows:

[Voting list]

Mr. Inslee changed his vote from "yea" to "nay." Mr. MOORE (Fl) reported for Mr. GEJDENSON, Ms. D'ELAURO, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MOON, Mr. THOMPSON (CA), Mr. WATKINS (NM), Mr. WATSON (FL), Mr. WELCH, Mr. WILSON (NM), Mr. WYNN, Mr. WYLIE, and Mr. YOUNG (NY), that they have considered the vote offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. GEJDENSON).

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MOTION TO RECONSIDER THE VOTE OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote just taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Did the gentleman from Wisconsin support the previous question?

Mr. OBEY. Yes, I did.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. GOSS

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) to lay on the table the motion to reconsider the vote offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roll No.</th>
<th>YEAS</th>
<th>NAY</th>
<th>TIE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>600</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ms. Mccarthy of Missouri, and Messrs. Oney, Lucas of Kentucky and Pentri changed their vote from "no" to "aye." So the resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. OBEX --------------
Mr. Oney. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote just taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LaTourette). Did the gentleman vote in favor of the resolution?

Mr. OBEX. Yes, I did.

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. GOSS
Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. Goss) to lay on the table the motion to reconsider the vote offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Obey).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes had it.

RECORDED VOTE
Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 294, noes 123, not voting 16, as follows:

A N O T E:

Mr. WAXMAN changed his vote from "aye" to "no." So the motion to table the motion to reconsider was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MOTION TO ADJOURN
Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes had it.

RECORDED VOTE
Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 25, noes 395, not voting 13, as follows:

A N O T E:

[Mr. Kind's amendment to H. Res. 339 was agreed to by the yeas and nays recorded in the House Journal.]
Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn. The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY). The motion was made and seconded. The SPEAKER announced that the question had been put. The Speaker sustained the previous question, and the motion to adjourn was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2420

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 2420.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn. The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY). The motion was made and seconded. The Speaker sustained the previous question, and the motion to adjourn was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, what a great day for the State of California. All of us in this House know the honor of being sworn in as a Member of the House of Representatives, the only place in Washington where everyone has to be elected in order to take the oath of office.

It is a distinct pleasure that we honor another Californian in that regard, a person who has a great deal of experience in public life, and brings to this Chamber experience as a member of the board of trustees with a community college, was elected to the California State Assembly, was elected as the first Latino pro tempore in California history to that job, served in the California State Senate, and now is elected to serve his district in Southern California.

He is following in the footsteps of a great Member of this House, George Brown. We all remember the great service that he gave to this country and the deeds that he left, the great record that he left.

So JOE BACA comes to us with his own career distinction, and I think he will be a great addition to this House. So I congratulate you.

On behalf of the California Democratic delegation, which I am Chair of, along with the gentleman from California (Mr. Lewis), who is Dean of the Republican delegation from California, and as a joint bipartisan effort, we welcome the newest Member of our delegation, a delegation that has had over eight Members elected to special elections. So we know the special moment you are having right now, you are sharing with your family who is watching this on C-SPAN, and we appreciate the fact that you are here today to get sworn in. Congratulations on a great race and a great election, special elections. So we know that we would have an occasion like this and we would have almost the entire delegation present.

But in recent years, we have had kind of a reawakening of our State. In the past, we have often been laughed at by States like Texas who come together regularly on issues relative to their own interests. Today, California is working together as it never has in its history, and our numbers are here to have a positive impact on the country.

So with working with you in the seat of the former Dean of the California delegation, you have a great career ahead of you. We look forward to your help as we go about attempting to improve the country as well as the behalf of California's interests. So welcome, JOE. It is a great day for all of us.

OPENING REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE JOE BACA
(Mr. BACA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to address the House for 1 minute. I wanted to make sure that I followed the rules and procedures that are here.

Mr. Speaker, I do appreciate the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) lowering this podium. I used to be 6 foot 5 as a paratrooper, but I made a lot of jumps; that is why I am only 5 foot 6.

It is really an honor to be here. I would like to thank the leadership for their support, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPhardt), all of the Members, the DCCC individuals who are very helpful.

I want to thank God because God gave me the courage to run and to serve. Too many times we forget that it is the strength that we have, and God provided that strength to give us that courage. So I want to thank God.

I want to thank my family. I wish my mom and dad were here to see this. They are both deceased, but I know it is the proud moment in their lives. I know that somewhere up above they are seeing this even though they cannot be here right now. But I know very well that they are proud of their son.
because I am one of 15. I am the 15th child. Like a lot of us, I come from a poor family, an individual, the only one that graduated from high school and college. My other brothers and sisters graduated, but I was able to see that. I know that they are very proud. I wish my wife were here right now. She is watching this right now. She is Barbara Dominguez Baca, with whom I will be celebrating 31 years of marriage next week. On November 23, it will be our anniversary, so it will be 31 years of marriage to one wife, not two wives or three wives, but one wife.

I would like to thank my children, because my children were supporters. I believe in strong family values, because family values are the core of what makes America great. It is what makes our country. I would like to thank my family, because they have been very supportive. I would like to thank Joe, J. R. That is my first son. He is now 30. Then my daughter, first daughter, and that is Natalie. Then, of course, my daughter that is 13 years of age. She is the reason my wife cannot be here because we are important to him. I also want to work on a bipartisan basis to make California, and sure that, as I look at the 52 Members of Congress, that is very important to support as well as we begin to work on a bipartisan effort.

Again, I thank the Speaker and my colleagues very much. The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA) yield back the remainder of his time?

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn. The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes had 24, nays 379, and the question was lost.

The SPEAKER. The House do now adjourn.
This continuing resolution extends the current CR for 5 days, until November 23, specifically for the purpose of allowing the Senate to have time to consider the measures that we will send them today.

Mr. Speaker, in the interest of allowing our Members to get home to their families and preparing for the Thanksgiving period, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I would very much like to see Members get home for Thanksgiving, but I think my public duty is to help Members understand what they are going to be voting on before they go home, because otherwise when they do go home, their experience with the news media and angry constituents is not going to be a very pleasant one; and I am afraid there are a lot of nasty surprises in this bill, some of which I will be discussing over the next 12 to 15 hours.

Let me say, first of all, that this bill has been a battleground about national priorities and national direction. It has been the arena for battles between the President and his allies on one side and his political opponents on the other. By any measure, I think it is safe to say that the President has won victory after victory. We are going to be stuck having to extend the government, I am afraid, several times through CRs like this one because of some of the decisions made in the bill that is coming next, and people need to understand how they interrelate.

I think you can say, for instance, that in the area of international leadership, the President and those of us who agree with him have won a great victory in funding the Wye peace process agreement. We have won a very important battle in making sure that debts that would never be repaid are going to be wiped out so that Latin America and Africa can, in fact, become good markets for our products as well as stable neighbors in an ever more complicated world.

We have won the fight to, at least for now, take the U.S. off the list of U.N. deadbeats. On the environmental front, the President has beaten down virtually every anti-environmental rider that was tossed his way. In the fight against street crime, the President won 50,000 new cops.

On the education front, it is important to understand some of the major achievements that we have made. We have seen a lot of people denigrate the President’s effort to provide for 100,000 new teachers. I want to put that effort in context. What Democrats have been steadfast in its refusal to provide the President has beaten down virtually every anti-environmental rider that was tossed his way. In the fight against street crime, the President won 50,000 new cops. On the education front, it is important to understand some of the major achievements that we have made. We have seen a lot of people denigrate the President’s effort to provide for 100,000 new teachers. I want to put that effort in context. What Democrats have been steadfast in its refusal to provide the

---

**NOT VOTING—31**

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Berman
Capps
Coley
Doyle
Ehrlich
Fowler
Frost
---

Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 82, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 82) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2000, and for other purposes, and ask for an immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk reads the title of the joint resolution.

The text of House Joint Resolution 82 is as follows:

FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2000

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 385, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 82) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2000, and for other purposes, and ask for an immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk reads the title of the joint resolution.

The text of House Joint Resolution 82 is as follows:

H.J. Res. 82

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Public Law 106-62 is further amended by striking "November 18, 1999" in section 106(c) and inserting in lieu thereof "November 23, 1999".

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). Pursuant to House Resolution 385, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) each will control 30 minutes.

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

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.J. Res. 82, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.
I believe funds will be found by the administration to initiate litigation; but as everybody knows, legal outcomes are often dictated by the relative size of legal war chests. That is one of the things, for instance, that I am told CBS news had to take into account when they discussed whether or not to put on that famous “60 Minutes” special which went after the tobacco companies for not telling the truth. I would say that while the appropriation requested by the Justice Department to audit the tobacco companies to pursue that issue is small, the long-term fiscal impact on the Federal Government could be enormous; and we have failed to recognize that in the bill that is coming to us.

The Republican majority also repeatedly refused to include language that both the White House and I asked them to include to ensure that 100 percent of the money paid from the Medicare and Social Security trust funds is returned to the advocates of those programs to protect the taxpayers’ interest. That item was repeatedly raised during negotiations. It is the fair thing to do with those funds. I find it hard to construct an argument that they should be used for a different purpose, but the Republican leadership flatly rejected that concept in both the Senate and the House.
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I think the reason (and this was even said in conference,) they did not want to approve this language is because it would provide incentives to proceed with the lawsuit. Well, we ought to proceed with that lawsuit.

I think nothing more clearly underlies or underscores the hollowness of the claim of the majority that they have suffered a recent conversion and are now strong supporters of Social Security. Nothing is more clearly underscoring the hollowness of that claim than the new-found concern over the solvency of those trust funds. It is a concern that suddenly emerged around here after Labor Day when poll data demonstrated to them how badly they had been damaged by their attempt to pass a huge tax bill that they had been damaged by their attempts to pass a huge tax bill that would provide incentives to proceed with that lawsuit.

Then we get to the question of national defense. The way national defense is treated in this across-the-board cut is very interesting. It was treated the way this bill treats it in order to protect congressional pork. So what the provision requires is that we will have to see about a $520 million reduction in operation and maintenance accounts of our military readiness, and that is occurring at the same time that the Pentagon reported that two out of the 10 divisions in the U.S. Army are now rated at C-4; in other words, not close to having the parts, people, and maintenance that are necessary to undertake military action. Yet, operation and maintenance is going to be required to be cut by a larger percentage than anything else in this bill. The reason for that is because the folks who put this bill together insist that they protect the pork and the pork in the research and procurement accounts. So we get that weird anomalous result.

I will insert in the Record at this point, Mr. Speaker, extraneous material related to my remarks, and I will expand further on that subject for the RECORD.

Mr. OBRY. Mr. Speaker, I am amazed, for instance, that on pay-fors, that the conferees chose to ignore the opportunity to recoup the taxpayers money that we should be re-couping from the sale of what is known as the Block C portion of spectrum.
Mr. OBÉY. Mr. Speaker, in this bill, for instance, they have decided now that they are going to declare Head Start to be an emergency. It has only been on the books since 1965, I guess we just found out that it is an emergency to deal with these kids. What they are really saying is they have a political emergency that requires them to hide the real cost of this bill from their taxpayers. That is the real emergency designation that is going on here.

Then they move about $4.2 billion in outlays into different years. That saves no money. It simply hides money. They have miscellaneous spending, accounting gimmicks, that save $4.5 billion on the outlays side, and $43 billion on the budget authority side. If my colleagues want to go home and explain to their constituents that kind of hide-and-seek attention to fiscal affairs, be my guest. That is not my flavor of ice cream.

Let me make one other comment, Mr. Speaker. One of the reasons that I have been so unhappy with this bill, as I said earlier, is that it stands over 1 foot high. I defy anyone to tell me, and I have a rule to prove it, I defy any of my Republican colleagues, or any of my Republican colleagues to tell me what is in these authorization bills that they are asking us to swallow. How much are we going to hear? How much are the reporters in the gallery going to dig out after we have left that we do not know about? I am afraid, a lot. But I have to say that what bothers me more than anything is that these accounting gimmicks may appear to be funny, but in fact, they are not funny at all. I would not laugh too long, because what we are witnessing here is something that is immensely corrosive of democracy and this institution's role in democracy.

Mr. Speaker, the primary job that the Gimmicks have told you this year is to pass a budget. If we cannot be honest with the American people about what we are doing in that budget, I think they have a right to question whether we are being honest with them on anything that we ask to tell all. And the fact is that the list on accounting shell games that are in this bill, not for policy reasons, but for political reasons, I think brings discredit on the entire institution. That is because I guess we are determined to live under a fiction that requires us to pretend that we are spending billions of dollars less than we are actually spending.

Frankly, a lot of this spending is perfectly justifiable. I think that the Republican educational priorities are good. I support them as well as our own. But I do not like the fact that we are hiding what we are doing in the process. I will have more to say about this along the line.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers except myself to close, so I will continue to reserve my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBÉY) has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. OBÉY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER).

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

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I came to this before this afternoon prepared to vote for a bipartisan omnibus bill, prepared to support reforms in the quality and in the resources for our education budget and for our schoolchildren across the country; prepared to defend our Social Security and further reduce the deficit and the debt, which is the best tax cut for all Americans. I have spent the last hour and a half to 2 hours in the parliamentarian's office reading through this bill and getting through a little bit of it and the more I read of it, the more concerns I have about Social Security and debt reduction.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBÉY) has said that there are some gimmicks and games, and I think a lot of people do not even realize that in this budget that we do not dip further than CBO has already said, which they have stated that Congress has dipped $17 billion into Social Security. The most important thing for me in this budget is to not touch Social Security, further reduce the debt, and get quality education reforms. I do not see any firewalls on Social Security in this. CBO has not even scored this. We do not know what it does to Social Security.

Mr. Speaker, I have further found that Head Start at $1.7 billion declared an emergency, I am not sure what that does to Social Security. I am not sure saying that $2.4 billion becomes available on October 1, 2000, the next fiscal year, what is that impact on Social Security? Delaying obligations, $3 billion for NIH, $450 million for the Centers for Disease Control. What is the impact there on Social Security?

So all of these things give me a great deal of reason and reservation and concern, and I do not intend to vote for this omnibus bill.

Now, on education, Mr. Speaker, we have $145 million for public charter schools. I think that is a step in the right direction. We have $1.4 billion for more teachers, not just for more numbers; but we say 25 percent of the funds can go to quality improvement, to professional development. That is good progress, and I highly support that discretion and flexibility.

We furthermore have $335 million for the Eisenhower Professional Development Program, again to try to address the shortage in quality of teaching and too many teachers teaching outside their subject area. So I think there are some high concerns for success in education, but I do not think this addresses the Social Security wildfires. It does not get scored by CBO, and I would encourage my colleagues to read this bill.

Mr. OBÉY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBÉY) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, the budget process obviously allows us to say what is important to the American people. It is a process where we say some are winners and some are losers. It is a process for the Nation to declare what the priorities are. Obviously we cannot win everything we want so it has to be a compromise, but I can say, Mr. Speaker, the people in North Carolina, where there was actually a disaster, never was an emergency declared because it was not politically the right thing. Maybe those who indeed would have said that would have come from Social Security, we are trying to get the kind of basic relief, not all of it, just the basic relief, for our farmers which is in doubt.

Now, I want to vote for this bill because there are winners. I know there are winners and losers but I can say, Mr. Speaker, that as we go forward I think it says something about the American people when we ignore that over 72,000 people were affected in the region, farmers lost a tremendous amount of their crops. Many of them are going bankrupt and yet there is not the kind of relief that even responds in a very basic way to their needs, not all the relief because we knew an emergency was not declared.

Mr. Speaker, I will be willing to fight for that next year, but we need at least the $81 million that was there for marketing. So I would urge, Mr. Speaker, that we look at that to try to make sure that this budget process, as we vote on it, indeed is thinking to the basic. Mr. Speaker, some will be winners, some will be losers, but the American nation should not lose the principle of responding to those who are most desperately in need, while we go forward with such an enormous amount of ray. Mr. Speaker, eighty-one million dollars is not pittance; it is what is symbolic of what we stand for that we should make sure that as we consider this bill that at least the
American farmers know that they were part of the consideration in this budget process.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. Norton).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I very much appreciate and thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the distinguished ranking member, for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, now we approach yet another CR, with all of the terrible problems that the ranking member has described, I think it fair to say that none has been more harmed by the procedures of the House this year than the people I represent.

Shall I paraphrase Elizabeth Barrett Browning? How shall I dislike it? Let me count the ways.

What is this bill? The Commerce, Justice, State, Foreign Ops, Interior, Labor, HHS, D.C. bill, plus? All of our appropriations that remain have been packed on to the tiny D.C. appropriation. Five hundred thousand people are being used to take 300 million, or bills for 300 million, across the finish line, and the Nation’s capital be damned; we just have to wait to spend our own money, understand, because almost all of the money in the D.C. appropriation is money raised in the District of Columbia.

Obviously I have to be for it. What kind of position does that put me in? The disgrace as affects the Nation’s capital is outflanked only by what the procedures of the House this year have done for democracy itself and how we have displayed ourselves before the people of the United States. We have become, in and of ourselves, a threat to democracy. We have made democratic procedures a living joke on C-SPAN.

We are going to have before us a bill that is certain to take the lives of countless of the poorest women in the world, with no chance to debate it up and down. There is the dairy controversy we have heard so much about today.

In a democracy, we vote our differences up and down. In a democracy we even vote our compromises up and down. This House has become an embarrassment to itself. However, I am very much outflanked. My family planning gag rule is that certain to take the lives of countless of the poorest women in the world, with no chance to debate it up and down. There is the dairy controversy we have heard so much about today.

The delay, with another CR, has been more harmed by the procedures of the House than any other legislation passed this session. Let us get on with the appropriations that remain have been packed on to the tiny D.C. appropriation. Five hundred thousand people are being used to take 300 million, or bills for 300 million, across the finish line, and the Nation’s capital be damned; we just have to wait to spend our own money, understand, because almost all of the money in the D.C. appropriation is money raised in the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, as I understand it section 1001 of the omnibus bill effectively waives the pay-as-you-go rules for all of the authorizing legislation included in the omnibus package. It also effectively, as I understand it, waives the pay-as-you-go rules for the outyear effects of other legislation passed this legislation.

I would like to ask the leadership of this House why these rules are being waived and how much spending is not being counted as a result of that? We have seen no CBO scoring on the omnibus package. Can anyone tell us the amount of spending covered by these budget waivers?

I would also ask why Members’ pay was exempted from this across-the-board cut when it was included in the previous across-the-board cut that was made?

I think those are but some of the questions that Members ought to be asking before they vote on the budget that is coming at us later this afternoon.

I would also say, Mr. Speaker, I regret the time that we have taken but I think every hour that we spend gives Members an additional opportunity to understand the bills, and I think in the end that serves the interest both of every Member and the taxpayers that they are trying to represent.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back my time.
Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote by which the House voted to reject the motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Mr. OBEY. Yes. I did, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question was taken; and the ayes appeared to have it.

The result of the vote was announced by the Clerk: 

AYESÐ403

A recorded vote was ordered.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. An insufficient number having arisen, a recorded vote is not in order.

So a recorded vote was refused.

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

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

Recorded Vote

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

The Speaker pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were 403 ayes, 16 noes, not voting 15, as follows:

AYES—403

Norton—13

And Ms. JACkSON-Lee of Texas changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.” So the motion to reconsider was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
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Motion Offered by Mr. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote by which the House voted to reject the motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Mr. OBEY. Yes. I did, Mr. Speaker.

Motion to Table Offered by Mr. YOUNG of Florida

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) to lay on the table the motion to reconsider the vote by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. An insufficient number having arisen, a recorded vote is not in order.

So a recorded vote was refused.

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

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

Recorded Vote

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

The Speaker pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were 403 ayes, 16 noes, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 607]

Norton—13

Msers. TANNER, HEFLEY, BATEMAN, DAVIS of Illinois, MOLLOHAN, LINDER, CLUBY, CLYON, and Ms. VELAZQUEZ
Mr. COYNE changed his vote from "no" to "aye".

So the joint resolution was passed. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COPSPONSOR OF H.R. 329**

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 329.

Mr. Speaker. The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LINDER) is from Georgia (Mr. LINDER). Is there objection to the removal of name of member as cosponsor of H.R. 329.

Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, as amended, it is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 386 is a typical rule providing for consideration of H.R. 3194, the conference report for the District of Columbia appropriations bill for fiscal year 2000. The rule waives all points of order against the conference report and its consideration and provides that the conference report shall be considered as read.

H. Res. 386 also provides that, upon the adoption of the conference report, the text of the concurrent resolution printed in the rule tabling the conference report accompanying the Department of Interior appropriations bill shall be considered as adopted.

Finally, House rules provide 1 hour of general debate equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member on the Committee on Appropriations and one motion to recommit with or without instructions as is the right of the minority.

Mr. Speaker, this rule and this conference report bring the budget process for the fiscal year 2000 to a close by implementing a bipartisan compromise on the remaining appropriations bills, District of Columbia, Interior, Commerce-Justice-State, Foreign Operations, and Education, Labor, Health and Human Services.

Only three times in the last two decades has the Congress passed all 13 appropriations bills by the fiscal deadline. I point out one was recently when Wisconsin Senator Obey (Mr. OBREY) was chairman. It is true that we did not make this deadline this year. However, it is also true that keeping our fiscal house in order does take a little longer than the free-wheeling, big-spending days of the past because we must ensure that all funding is spent efficiently and where it is needed.

In addition to meeting the fiscally responsible objectives, this conference report also ensures that our principles of quality and flexibility in the funding for teachers have been met. In the labor-HHS section of the bill, this Congress has made a commitment to protect retirement security. We worked with him in a bipartisan fashion to protect retirement security. We were determined to protect American seniors and responsibly fund important programs.

In the labor-HHS section of the bill, this Congress has made a commitment to protect retirement security. We were determined to protect American seniors and responsibly fund important programs. Including in this bill a plan to direct every Federal agency to reduce spending by more than one-half of one percent, 38 percent of one percent, by routine waste, fraud, and abuse. Surely the government can save less than about half a penny out of every dollar. This Republican Congress is simply asking those who run Federal agencies to make fiscally responsible budgeting decisions with the money taxied out of waste, fraud, and abuse. Surely the government can save less than about half a penny out of every dollar. This Republican Congress is simply asking those who run Federal agencies to make fiscally responsible budgeting decisions with the money taxied out of waste, fraud, and abuse. Surely the government can save less than about half a penny out of every dollar. This Republican Congress is simply asking those who run Federal agencies to make fiscally responsible budgeting decisions with the money taxied out of waste, fraud, and abuse. Surely the government can save less than about half a penny out of every dollar. This Republican Congress is simply asking those who run Federal agencies to make fiscally responsible budgeting decisions with the money taxied out of waste, fraud, and abuse. Surely the government can save less than about half a penny out of every dollar. This Republican Congress is simply asking those who run Federal agencies to make fiscally responsible budgeting decisions with the money taxied out of waste, fraud, and abuse. Surely the government can save less than about half a penny out of every dollar. This Republican Congress is simply asking those who run Federal agencies to make fiscally responsible budgeting decisions with the money taxied out.
conference report paves the way for
dramatic improvement in the edu-
cation of Washington’s children, the
safety of our streets, and the manage-
ment of our Nation’s Capital.

H.R. 3194 also brokers a responsible compromise on Interior appropriations section of this
conference report. Republicans rejected
attempts to impose the restrictions of the
Kyoto global warming regime on
Americans without Senate consider-
ation of the treaty. Nevertheless, the
bill may improve environmental
standards and ensures our air and
water will be cleaned into the next mil-

While I will permit the chairman of
the Committee on Appropriations to
describe fully all the contents of the
appropriations bill, I did want to note
the inclusion of the satellite copyright
legislation about which many of our
constituents have expressed concerns
during the past year. I am pleased that
this bill will provide a new copyright
license to satellite television that will
allow constituents to receive their
local television channels over their
satellite service.

In addition, this bill will bring real
competition, provide better prices and
choices for our constituents, protect
existing subscribers from having their
distant network service shut off, and
make it easier for consumers to get ei-
ther a waiver or an eligibility test for
distant network service in the event
the waiver request is denied. This bill
is good for our constituents, and I am
pleased to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend
the chairman of the Committee on Appri-
ations, the gentleman from Florida
(Mr. YOUNG), each of the subcommittee
chairmen on the Committee on Appri-
ations, and the ranking minority
member, the gentleman from Wis-
conin (Mr. Obey), for their tireless ef-
forts to get this bill such weeks to reach
an agreement on the budget.

This rule was favorably reported by
the Committee on Rules yesterday, I
think that might have been this morn-
ing, at about 3:30 a.m., and I urge my
colleagues to support the bill on the
floor so we may proceed with the gen-
eral debate and consideration of this
important conference report.

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield my-
self such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, at 3:20 a.m. this morn-
ing the Committee on Rules was con-
vened to report this rule. The chairman
of the Committee on Appropriations,
the gentleman from Florida (Mr.
YOUNG), said at that time that he
would like to take the time to explain
to the committee what was in this con-
ference agreement, but that to do so
might take 4 days. While I know he was
generously careful in saying this, I
think he was too terribly off the mark.

Mr. Speaker, this rule rolls five ap-
propriation bills, agriculture disaster
assistance funding, and $576 million for
Hurricane Floyd disaster assistance,
all into one bill. The conference agree-
ment also contains a much-needed
Medicare reimbursement fix for hos-
pitals and nursing homes, the author-
ization for the Department of State,
Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of
my time...
and it will help to not only have mitigation efforts but also do the buyout of some of these homes.

But I rise particularly today to point out, as a member of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services as well as a board member of directors of Bread for the World, that we do have in this bill a wonderful effort to help debt burden relief for those poorest countries, and I think that is very important. I want to commend the majority leader, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMENDARIZ) because it was through his efforts that we were able to get this money in there, help the hungry and the poorest countries of the world, and really help put in place reforms for the next year that will address the questions of transparency in the International Monetary Fund.

But for my part, aside from the fact that this is long overdue to help feed those poor people in the poorest countries, I also want to say that I will continue to pursue common sense debt relief and ensure that it is not being diverted by corrupt government actions. This is a wonderful activity. We cannot forget these poor people, and it is in the grand tradition of our great country, the United States of America.

Although we have spent many weeks trying to get to this point I believe we have a fair compromise for all. Although there are many items in this bill that I could speak about today there are a few I would like to mention today.

First, that this bill contains extra funding to help victims of Hurricane Floyd and the disastrous drought suffered by our New Jersey farmers.

This legislation allows FEMA to use $215 million to buyout homes severely damaged by the flood caused by Hurricane Floyd. This is very important to my state of New Jersey where many homes were damaged. This will help relocate some of those homes outside of the natural flood plain.

This legislation also allows for the additional funds to help our farmers who have suffered from weather related disasters.

I would also like to put my colleagues on notice—we, in New Jersey, are still tallying the price tag of Floyd. When the totality of the damage from this unprecedented hurricane is determined, we will most likely have to address this issue again early next year. And when we do, I strongly urge my colleagues to address the unique circumstances of small businesses that were damaged by the storm. These small businesses are the economic backbone of many of our communities and need and deserve direct grants to help them back on their feet.

Also I am pleased that this bill contains many of the provisions of H.R. 1402 which implements the Option 1-A milk pricing system that is so important to the small dairy farmers in New Jersey and the northeast. It also extends the dairy Compact for two years.

Finally, I am pleased that this bill advances the international plan to provide debt relief to the world’s poorest countries.

Mr. Speaker, I am on the Board of Directors of Bread for the World—one of the distinguished and notable groups that have been spearheading the debt relief movement. In-deed, much of the religious community is urging us to write off some of the unpayable debt of the world’s poorest countries during the year 2000. And under the right conditions, it’s the right thing to do.

The language Majority Leader ARMENDEZ has negotiated with Treasury is very helpful and I commend him for his efforts. It will increase the impact of the funding the House has already voted to appropriate for the relief of debts that very poor countries owe to the United States. This language will ensure that the International Monetary Fund and other international investors will support this debt relief. In addition, I believe it will require accountability to ensure that the monies will be directed to feeding the hungry in these poorest countries.

For my part, I will continue to track the distribution of this debt relief to ensure that it is not being diverted by corrupt government actions.

Mr. Speaker, this language will also give Congress another opportunity next year to push for IMF reform. Many Members—from both sides of the aisle have long argued that the IMF should be more transparent and more accountable—to the taxpayer’s of the United States and to people in the countries where it works.

There is also widespread agreement on the basic goal of debt relief—to support economic development and the reduction of poverty in the poorest countries. Treasury, the World Bank and IMF have adopted promising new policies and procedures recently, and Congress will need to be vigilant that these changes really do translate debt relief into help and opportunity for poor and hungry people.

Mr. Speaker, this nonomnibus package is far from perfect. Like many Members, I could find certain parts of this bill problematic. But we must look at the whole picture. And on the whole this bill is fair.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, once again I want to make clear why I have offered the motions that I have offered for the past 2½ hours. I did so because it was the plan of the leadership to bring the rule and the continuing resolution that just passed, to have that up right away at 10 o’clock, whiz it through the House, immediately move to the rule, which we are now on, and then move immediately to the omnibus appropriation bill, which none of us have read and none of us understand. And that vote would have been taken by noon without even having a single copy of that bill on the floor.

What I was trying to do is to give Members, first of all, enough time to simply get a copy on the floor; secondly, to give our staffs an opportunity to try to determine with greater certainty exactly what is in the authorization attachments and what is not; and thirdly, to develop at least some pieces of information available to rank and file Members so that those Members who were not in the negotiations understand just how replete with gimmicks and replete with fraud this upcoming bill is.

Now, we have done I think as much as could reasonably be done. We have never been more intentional once the debate on the bill starts to offer further motions because I think both parties are entitled to lay out their views on that bill without interruption, and I have no intention of making future motions once we have the bill itself.

I do ask the House, on this bill, to vote against this rule because we have no business doing business this way. We have no business adding nine separate authorization bills to the underlying appropriations bill. We have no business hiding from Members the $45 billion in spending gimmicks that are in these bills.

It just seems to me that the way we should proceed is to have an hour’s debate on the bill itself and then the provisions being added to the appropriations bills so that, whether Members are for them or against them, the House at least has an opportunity to understand what it is doing.

Anybody knows what we are doing on these bills except perhaps a few of the staffers who put them together, I will grant that. But I doubt that any Member is fully aware of all of the provisions in these bills. And we are going to get away with many of them, I am sad to say.

I would simply say, for instance, that there are pieces of this bill, and this is not true of the appropriation items, but there are other pieces of the bill which we will consider which have not yet been scored by the Congressional Budget Office. We ought to know what they estimate the cost to be before we vote on this bill.

So I would urge my colleagues to vote against the rule.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Goodling).

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

Mr. Speaker, earlier in dissertation on the floor it was mentioned that the President won something in the area of education. I want to make sure, and I do this several times this afternoon, that everybody understands that the President did not win anything in education.

The chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce did not win anything in the area of education. The children of the United States won a lot in the area of education. And, above all, the most disadvantaged children in the United States won the area of education. We were able to show to the administration that 50 percent of many of the teachers in the schools in New York City and duplicated in large cities all over the country were totally
uncertified and, beyond that, probably not qualified, some that were certified, they agreed there is no reason to put one more teacher in there. We better get those who are there properly qualified.

When they realized that last year 10 percent of all those new teachers that were hired were totally unqualified, they realized putting one teacher in there was not going to help anything, they better get the people who are there more qualified. And so, we say in that, we need to by the administration that any new hires must be properly qualified and anybody that was hired last year that was not qualified must be qualified within 1 year.

That is why the administration agreed that we should move from 15 to 25 percent in the area of flexibility. That is why the administration agreed that we should move it 100 percent in those school districts where they have all the uncertified and unqualified teachers.

That is why the administration agreed that public school choice should be available to the 7,000 schools that are Title I schools who are not doing anything about improving the quality of their education, and they said those parents should have the right, and we agreed.

We brought it up. They agreed. So nobody won except the children of the United States and, above all, those children who are most disadvantaged.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK).

(MR. STARK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk about the calendar and explain that Thursday, a week and a half ago, we were about to consider today is stuffed with a lot of horrendous gifts and failures.

For example, stuffed away in this bill, unknown to many of my colleagues, is a gift of over $500 million a year to drug companies who have their pharmaceutical drugs exempted from certain protections under the Medicare bill. But at the same time we are giving Stop Out to these pharmaceutical companies, members of the Committee on Ways and Means, all of them, all of the Republicans who were there voted to deny seniors a discount on their prescription drugs.

That means that the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY), and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. JOHNSON) all voted to deny the seniors in their district a discount on their prescription drugs, which would have cost the Federal government not one penny. Yet, grandly, they are going to vote to give $500 million a year to the pharmaceutical companies.

Now, this bill is not paid for. There is a $4 billion gift to the medical providers. Yet it shortens Medicare solvency and cuts the B premium on all of our seniors by 12.

At the same time, this bill has failed to give Medicaid to children of legal immigrants. Young children are denied medical care if they came to this country after 1996.

Yet, we had a great gift to the Blue Cross/Blue Shield company by weakening quality control standards for managed care under Medicare. We weakened the standards when this same Congress has been unable to finalize the managed care bill of rights. We are doing nothing under the Republican leadership except giving big dollars to the pharmaceutical companies in exchange for their donations, giving big gifts to Blue Cross and for-profit managed care plans who are reaming our seniors.

And yet, in the next bill to be considered, if this turkey that we will consider in the extenders happens to have a bowel movement, we are going to spend $50 million a year turning the results of that activity into energy.

I would suggest, if we are going to put up with all this Republican alchemy, why do we not ask these same poultry producers to turn that by-product into gold; and then they might find the $17 billion they cannot find to pay for in this bill and, so, it is going to come out of the Social Security trust fund.

All in all, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) is correct. It is a bill we should not be voting on in the dark. Vote "no" on the rule and the bill.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS).

(MR. THOMAS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, the Chairman of Appropriations, for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, we are supposed to be talking about a rule. But, obviously, we are into the substance of these measures. There has been a characterization of some of that substance by the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK), and I would like to take just a couple of minutes to set the stage for those of our colleagues who may be nervous about the fact that the body does not know what we are doing in terms of the Medicare reform or that items have been slipped into this bill.

Perhaps the gentleman does not remember that we had a subcommittee mark-up on October 15. We examined the bill at that time and voted it favorably to the full committee.

In between the House passage of this bill and the full committee vote, the President wrote a letter to me dated October 19 and said, "Dear Mr. Chairman, I am writing to respond to your request for administrative actions."

He goes on and provides an outline for what the administration has been trying to do notwithstanding the Y2K computer problems that the administration has had the day after he signed the Balanced Budget Act of 1997. We were not aware of them prior to signing the bill, but they discovered them immediately after they signed the legislation.

His next-to-last paragraph said this: "We believe that our administrative actions can complement legislative modifications to refine BBA payment policies. These legislative modifications should be targeted to address unintended consequences of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 that can expect to adversely affect beneficiaries’ access to quality care."

That was exactly what we did. We targeted it. This is a refinement bill. And on October 21, it passed the full committee with a bipartisan vote. This is not something that was done in the dead of night at 3 a.m. in the morning. It went through the full committee. And then it came to the floor on November 5. And with 388 Members of the House supporting the very specific provisions that have been characterized as insidious or give-backs or rip-offs, 388 Members of the House voted for it.

But beyond that, after we worked with our sister committee on this side in jurisdiction, the Committee on Commerce, with the Senate Finance Committee, and with the White House to craft an agreement that looked virtually exactly like the House bill, there was a comment by White House representative Chris Jennings, who is identified as the health policy coordinator at the White House, in news stories published on November 11, Mr. Jennings said, "This is an honorable compromise. It lays down a foundation for more significant Medicare reforms next year."

It is quite true that the gentleman from California tried to offer a number of killer amendments to fundamentally alter Medicare, to change the entire structure on a modest bill that the President agreed needed to correct some flaws in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 refinements.

No refinement bill could carry the kind of amendments the gentleman from California offered. And clearly, the purpose of those amendments was to be able to stand up on the floor and then make a statement that somehow we refused to provide prescription drugs to seniors.

It seems to me that if less of that kind of hyperbole were employed and more of a willingness to work together, as has been indicated by the White House coordinator, we could accomplish much. In a letter dated November 15 that was addressed to the Speaker signed by John Podesta, Chief of Staff to the President of the
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Social Security surplus. The comments from the White House people we worked with said it was an “honorable compromise”. CBO has scored it, and I will put it in the RECORD in terms of the dollar amounts on a 1-year, 5-year, 10-year, in fact, a detailed scoring.

Why anyone would stand up on the floor of this House and characterize the Medicare legislation as reckless or inappropriate, when Democrats that we worked with to put the package together, such as the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), White House representatives, Chief of Staff John Podesta and their health care coordinator or say this is an honorable agreement, that we have it scored that it does not affect the important hospital outpatient area, any adverse effect on Social Security, I have got to say it sounds a little desperate on the part of some individuals who voted no in subcommittee, no on the floor, and are voting no now that, frankly, their colleagues do not agree with them.

This is a good package. People are pleased to and it is endorsed by Repub-

im pleased to work together with those who want to improve Medicare to make sure that this is better for our seniors today and tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following for the RECORD:

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: We are pleased that we have been able to work out a strong, bipartisanship agreement on the Balanced Budget Reconciliation Act of 1999. All parties to the agreement are pleased that we have arrived at an outcome that is in the best interest of the American people. We thank you and your staff for your hard work on this important legislation.

Sincerely,

J O H N D . P O D E S T A, Chief of Staff to the President.

Enclosure.

BUDGETARY IMPACT OF THE “MEDICARE, MEDICAID, AND S-CHIP BALANCED BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1999” (in billions of dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program refinement</th>
<th>5-year</th>
<th>10-year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>House-Senate agreement</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Nursing Facilities</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outpatient Therapy Services</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Health &amp; Hospice</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialysis &amp; Durable Medical Equipment</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Health Services</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare-Choice</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHIP</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part B interaction and Medicare-Choice insurance</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total spending (reflecting House-Senate agreement)</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional administration request</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration’s request for Hospital Outpatient PPS Clarification</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Components may not add to total due to rounding.
2 Request detailed in letters from the OMB (10/18/99). Clarification will be scored by OMB. With this in mind, we would not characterize such legislation as having an adverse effect in any way on the Social Security surplus. Achieving a bipartisan consensus on addressing the unintended consequences of the BBA is an important accomplishment. The President hopes that we can build on this achievement and pass legislation to strengthen and modernize Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, I rise reluctantly in opposition to this rule and wish to record straight on the swirling misperceptions that have surrounded the West Virginia delegation’s efforts to provide a balance between protecting jobs so essential for our Nation’s energy security and protecting our environment at the same time. Over the past several weeks, the national media, environmental organizations, and the White House have engaged in a campaign of misinformation regarding a proposal by the West Virginia congressional delegation to address a coal mining crisis in our State.

Over the years, litigation in the State of West Virginia has resulted in some of the toughest mining reclamation laws in the Nation. Indeed our coal industry in West Virginia operates under greater environmental scrutiny than the industry does in any other State in our Nation. As a result of litigation, environmental plaintiffs entered into a settlement agreement with the United States on matters involving both the Clean Water Act and the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act.

On October 20 of this year, a Federal court decision rendered a rather unique interpretation of the relationship between provisions of the Clean Water Act and SMARA. This interpretation in my view is contrary to congressional intent in enacting the applicable statutes. Our delegation has sought to reaffirm the interpretation of these provisions of law so that they have been upheld by the EPA, the Corps of Engineers and the Interior Department. Nothing, and I repeat, nothing in our efforts have sought to undercut the
Clean Water Act. In fact, the provision of our legislation clearly states, and I quote, "nothing in this section modifies, supersedes, undermines, displaces or amends any requirement or any regulation issued under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act."

I do not know how to better state it, how to make it more clear. Yet despite these facts, a campaign of misinformation has been trumpeted around this Nation and has been unfair to our West Virginia delegates. I mean, the White House certainly is to blame. This is unfortunate, because the White House and the President's senior advisors particularly have turned their back on the many hundreds of hard-working men and women whose livelihoods, whose families and whose futures now hang in the balance. These are the individuals who have toiled beneath the surfaces of this Nation in order to provide us energy security that lights this very chamber today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. Wise).

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule and to the final spending bill. There may be many admirable provisions, but unfortunately this bill does not include the important Byrd-McConnell mining amendment that the West Virginia delegation has sought so hard to include. Failure to include this language means months of uncertainty, uncertainty about whether to enter into coal contracts, uncertainty about whether to make investments in future mining, uncertainty in families' lives about whether they will continue their jobs in the mining industry and, finally, uncertainty, yes, even for the environmental advocates, because there are no final rules of the road.

If the bill passed without the important Byrd-McConnell language, I believe, though, we must continue working. First, all parties must agree that the present stay of the court decision has to remain in effect. Second, the DEP and Federal agencies must work together to analyze the full impact of the court's decision. And, third, all parties, mining, State and Federal officials, and environmental representatives must undertake serious negotiations to see if agreement can be reached to deal with the most severe impact of the court's decision.

But, Mr. Speaker, let me make a point. Great progress has been made in improving surface mining. As a result of environmental legislation and a sweeping environmental settlement just months ago, surface mining will never be the same again in the State of West Virginia. So great progress has been made. The question is whether balance will be preserved. And the court's decision takes it too far the other way. The important Byrd-McConnell language would guarantee that there would be balance, that gains in regulating mining would be preserved and at the same time the important mining jobs, particularly in those areas of high unemployment, would be preserved.

Mr. Speaker, mountaintop removal will never be conducted the same again. The Byrd-McConnell language, though, would guarantee that as we improve regulation in mountaintop removal, we do not automatically result in job removal. I wish this language had been included.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. Gutknecht).

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding me this time. I reluctantly have to rise in opposition to this rule. I want to at least explain why. Early in the process we were told that there was not going to be an omnibus bill. We now know that that is not true. We were also told that very controversial issues would not be included in the final bill. We know that is not true, either. But part of the reason I have to rise in opposition to this rule is I remember several years ago when one of my favorite Presidents stood right there and he held up a bill that weighed about 45 pounds and he dropped it on the desk right here with a big thud, and he said, Congress should not send bills like this to my office, and he said, and if they do, I will veto them. He did not keep that promise. He probably should have.

But in many respects, we all know, everybody in this body knows it is wrong to have these omnibus bills where we throw almost everything into it. If anybody here can say with an honest expression on their face that they know how big is that bill, well, God save you. We know that there is a lot of stuff in that. We are going to read over the next several months about issues that are in the bill, and we are going to be embarrassed by it.

But I am most embarrassed about what is happening to the dairy farmers in the upper Midwest. Every morning at 4:30 lights go on all over the upper Midwest, 3,000 in my district. Nobody works harder than dairy farmers, and additionally, they know that the end of it. But 62 years they have labored under the yoke of an unfair milk marketing order system, and this leadership has finally put them in the back in the 11th hour in a back-room deal. I can live with that if we have regular order. I understand democracy. If we have an honest up or down vote and we lose in the House; we have an honest up or down vote and we lose in the Senate, I can live with that. That is called democracy. It is done at the 11th hour by a handful of leaders in a back-room deal, well, I cannot live with that, and I cannot vote for a rule that would support it.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. Dicks).

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support this conference report and to commend my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Obey) specifically, and those in the administration for their efforts. Bringing this package to the floor has not been easy. I want to applaud the patience and the determination both sides showed in reaching this agreement. I humbly opposed the conference report for the Interior appropriations bill earlier in the year because of numerous anti-environmental provisions that were attached by the other body. Thankful we have removed or modified nearly all of those riders and significantly improved the Interior bill.

Additionally, though, through our negotiations with the White House, we were able to increase funding levels for key programs that will better protect our environment. In the last few weeks, we negotiated millions of additional dollars for the President's land legacy initiative to protect sensitive or threatened lands in this country. I believe the administration should be proud of the benefits this compromise means to our public lands.

Funding was included in both the Commerce Department as well as the Interior Department to help my State and the other West Coast States address the recent salmon listings under the Endangered Species Act. Funding for these programs was my top priority. I want to sincerely thank the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. Rogers), the gentleman from New York (Mr. Serrano), and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Regula) for working with me to provide these critical funds that will help our State protect and restore West Coast salmon provisions.

Additionally, funds were included to help implement the recently negotiated treaty between the United States and Canada that will aid our efforts to recover these fish by substantially reducing their harvest. I regret that the conference agreement did not provide the requested increase for the National Endowment for the Arts, but appreciate the modest increase for the National Endowment for the Humanities. I believe there is strong public support for both of the endowments and wish the funding levels to the arts better reflected that support.

Again I wish to warmly thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Regula) for his tireless work on the Interior appropriations bill. These negotiations were lengthy and tense, but he demonstrated extraordinary leadership and was instrumental in bringing this agreement to the floor today.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Ryan).

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak out in opposition to not only this rule but to this final
Mr. Speaker, I urge Members of this body to vote against this bill.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER).

Ms. SLAUGHTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. There is so much to say and so little time, but I would like to focus on two specific items of importance to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I consider the health-related provisions of this bill to be a mixed bag. I am extremely pleased to see that Congress is continuing its commitment to double the budget of the National Institutes of Health over 5 years. This is the lifesaving research which families fighting cancer and other dread diseases are depending on. The bill increases the NIH budget by another 15 percent, raising it from $15.6 billion last year to $17.9 billion in fiscal year 2000.

But, unfortunately, the shell game continues in order to pay for this spending.

The bill delays the release of $4 billion of the NIH appropriations until September 29, 2000. Twenty of our colleagues wrote to the conference urging them not to take this action, because medical research is not a faucet that can be turned off and on. No disease will wait for a clinical trial to get to the next round of funding. A colony of bacteria is not going to hibernate until it gets money to be released. Frankly, I am not sure the researcher will stick around either. I am deeply concerned about the impact of this delayed appropriations on vital medical research.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule and to the final bill. Where does a promise mean nothing anymore? Right here on the floor of the House of Representatives. Where is one of the last remaining vestiges of a Soviet style, state-controlled economic industry? Right here in the blessed United States of America, with a depression-era Federal milk marketing order. Unfortunately, because of a last minute deal brokered behind closed doors, the first significant step to reform an antiquated, senseless dairy policy will be blocked by language contained in this bill just a couple of weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, I had a meeting with some of the leaders in the Republican Party on the House floor, where they promised me and other representatives that they would not allow any anti-dairy reform legislation to be attached to one of the year-end spending bills. But we woke up this morning and, lo and behold, there it is. Promises made, promises broken. And you would think an administration whose own reform proposals are under attack after three years of exhaustive work would stand a little more firm and fight for it, but that did not happen.

Now, it is never fun or pleasant to hold up the business of the House with delay tactics, and it is unfortunate we have had to resort to that tactic today. But I for one am willing to stay here until the cows come home, until we get this budget right, right for the American people, and right for the family farmers across the country.

Because we fully believe in budget integrity and fiscal discipline, there are a number of reasons for voting against it. It is $35 billion over the spending caps from the 1997 budget agreement. We are dipping into the Social Security surplus by $17 billion to $18 billion according to our own Congressional Budget Office. We have done absolutely nothing to extend the solvency of Social Security and Medicare by one day in this budget. To top it all off, we are milk and family farmers across the country and consumers and taxpayers with this 11th hour, back-room deal that will prohibit reform of a depression-era national dairy policy.
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We can do a lot better. I think the American people demand that we do a lot better. I would encourage my colleagues to vote no on this budget agreement. Let us start over, let us get it right, and then let it be done.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this is what I have been trying to do in the last few minutes, is to review what this House has brought to the American people and calling it a budget, that has who knows what and does not address many of the concerns that the American people have asked them to address.

I just as an example, Mr. Speaker, this is what we are calling bill, looks like, lines drawn through, scribbles being made, and no one knows what was in it and what is out of it.

My concern, Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, and this rule concerns me and I risen this is that what we have is a mishmash that includes a number of addendums that have nothing to do with the appropriation processes.

The satellite issue is an important issue that I would argue that we needed to support. The State Department authorization is likewise very important, and I have fought long and hard for Medicare help for our hospitals and health providers and will continue to fight for that. But we do not have a Patient Protection Package. And we do not have the protection of seniors for prescription drugs, and we have two inserts on the family planning issue typified up that deny family planning for women around the world.

The ones that are concerned about those who have a different view from me, I am likewise concerned about developing nations where women will be violated, intimidated, forgetting family planning because of this legislation.

I can say that I am gratified that my office worked to increase the amount of money for mental health services in the Community Mental Health Program, but I do say we are doing a tragic injustice to have Members be responsible for voting for a bill whose paper work has yet to come to the floor and who has given us the responsibility of reading this within the few hours that we have.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bad rule, this is a bad process, and I am sorely disappointed that this is what we have come to. We need to go back to work and present to the American people the kind of legislative initiative that will be warranted of this country and this Congress.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and support of the bill. First of all, I want to say how much I appreciate the work of the appropriators. The new chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), has done a tremendous job at a time when we are really laying out some new rules for appropriations, and all the members of appropriations on both sides of the aisle have worked hard to try to redefine this culture of what we are trying to achieve: A balanced budget, without spending Social Security.

We have heard a lot of debate about whose numbers may be right, whose predictions may be right. We really did not debate those things. Apparently the Congress did not debate them for 40 years, because we did not have a balanced budget without spending Social Security and nobody seemed to care. It is very great that we are now how to debating whose projections about income may be the closest to accurate next September, because that is really the projection date that counts. I am convinced we are not going to spend for the second year in a row a penny of Social Security increase.

I like the way the committee put this package together. It is a big package, but it is a package of individual bills. You can go to each of those bills and see exactly what was in them, and what is in them are the items that should be in them. This is not a package that people have put things in that should not be there or are not understood to be there.

Social Security was not spent. That gives us a chance to really look at the future of Social Security. We cannot really talk about Social Security reform if we cannot stop spending the trust fund.

Somebody said the problem with the Social Security trust fund has been there was no trust and there is no fund. Well, this restores both of those concepts.

The balanced budget adjusters do tremendous things for home health care, and home health care is a good bill; this is a good rule. I urge my colleagues to support both.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY).

Mr. FOLEY. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, for my colleagues who insist they do not know what is in this bill, they have not been paying attention during regular order, because all of this bill are the multitude of bills that have been discussed in committees, discussed on this floor, and now rolled into one bill as we leave this process.

The others that suggest somehow we are dipping into the Social Security trust fund, the only reason we are here still is because the President keeps asking for more money, more spending, more funds for programs that he needs. Now, some have suggested somehow we have been held hostage on international family planning. The President of the United States agreed to that provision in the bill.

Now, let us talk about why some people will vote against the fine bill here today. I challenge them to vote against increasing funding to Medicare choice. Organ transplant patients will have an extended coverage on anti-rejection drugs. Vote no to that today. I urge you to today.

Rehabilitation services, increasing therapy caps, something we have heard complaint after complaint from our citizens about, the need to increase physical therapy and rehabilitation.
This bill includes an increase in hospital coverage. Tell your hospice friends that you rejected this bill today because, I do not know why, but increased funding for them.

Far better, I urge that the Members from New York and other places who have been bellyaching about not enough money for teaching hospitals. Thanks to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the Committee on Ways and Means, we have increased money for teaching hospitals. Durable equipment, increased senior access to durable equipment. Rural health care. On and on goes the list. For my Floridians who say they are going to vote against the bill, they are going to be voting against $42 million for Everglades restoration. Back and tell that to the Floridians who depend on the Everglades for water. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and go home and explain that.

Indian programs. You name the list of things that are accomplished in this bill through the hard work of the committee in order to make this a better country. Money for national forests, bettering education, continuing our commitment to block grants. On and on goes the list of fine things in this bill.

Those that live in rural farming areas, please pay special attention, because in this bill is a $178 million loan authorization for disaster relief, okay? My colleagues can go home and face their farmers this weekend and explain to them that they voted against this very important provision, if they have experienced a drought. Anyone from North, one from Florida, I urge you to go home and tell your farmers you had a chance to help them today and you chose not to from a partisan perspective. I urge you to support the rule, so support the bill. It is a good bill.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield my time to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Obey), the ranking member on the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANSEN). The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Obey) is recognized for 3½ minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, let me simply address two points, since other Members have also addressed the dairy issue.

I believe that in this House a handshake is as good as a contract, and I believe that the day that one's word ceases to be one's bond is the day that we lose something very precious in this democratic society.

I was told in August and again in September, and this was confirmed by one of the two Members of the Republican leadership 3 days ago in a conversation with me, I was told that if I would cooperate procedurally on appropriating bills with the majority, they would assure me that no extraneous dairy provision would be attached to any appropriation vehicle. The three key words were "any appropriation vehicle." That promise has now been violated. I think that says more about the people who violated it than it says about anybody else in this institution. I deeply regret it.

I find it incredible that at a time when people are cheering with great huzzahs over the World Trade Organization-China deal, when they are earnestly pushing for free trade internationally, they are supporting interregional trade barriers to the free flow of dairy products in the United States. That is absurdly old-fashioned, and no self-respecting free marketeer should be supporting it.

There are a million stories inside the Beltway, most of which the polls don't want you to know. But we thought you might be amused by the one about Trent Lott, dairy queen.

As Public Works Chair . . . sorry, Senate Majority Leader, Mr. Lott has already built himself a pork-barrel legacy for the Mississippi Delta. The Senator thought that his largess was big enough for all New England? There's apparently nothing the guy won't do to re-elect a fellow "singing senator," in this case the liberal James J. Jeffords of Vermont.

Vermont has lots of dairy farmers, most of whom are much less efficient than those in the Upper Midwest. Worse yet, Congressional authorization for an income-insurance program to allow farmers to transport milk long distances in refrigerated trucks, is a routine apostate, agreeing with Ted Kennedy on demand, while Mr. Grams is a reliable conservative. It's nice to know how much Mr. Lott values ideological loyalty when he's doing out both a generous campaign donor around the country. Mr. Lott wants to ram this into the end-of-session budget bill too.

Beyond the muscle politics, all of this is one more embarrassment for Republican leaders to have kicked over the reform stool. They're mainly into incumbent protection these days, Mr. Blunt's attempt to gut the free market reforms that Congress urged on a reluctantly Clinton Administration as recently as 1996. Mr. Blunt's affidavit would add another 16 cents or so to a gallon of milk, half the price that goes to consumers throughout the country. Mr. Lott wants to ram this into the end-of-session budget bill too.

As of this writing, Mr. Grams and Wisconsin Democrat Herb Kohl were promising to filibuster the Lott-Jeffords-Blunt cartel of the pork they just voted to deliver. Cowabunga, Trent.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 17, 1999]

GOP CHIEFS SOUR ON MILK REFORM--WHITE HOUSE, WISCONSIN'S KOHL BALK AT LOTT-HASTERT AGREEMENT

(By Michael Grunwald)

Three years after Congress ordered the Agriculture Department to revamp the nation's convoluted system for setting milk prices, Republicans in both chambers agreed yesterday to send a new message to the department: Never mind.

Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott (R-Miss.) and House Speaker J. Dennis Hastert (R-Ill.) settled on language undoing the department's modest market-oriented dairy reforms and largely preserving the depression-era "Eau Claire system" that sets milk prices according to distance from Eau Claire, Wis. They also agreed to a two-year extension of the controversial Northeast Dairy Compact, a regional price-setting plan that sets prices even higher in New England.

But the last minute maneuvering faced stiff opposition from the White House, which warned that plans to attach the dairy provisions to a giant year-end spending bill could jeopardize the entire budget deal. "It would create all sorts of obstacles," said presidential spokesman Jake Siewert, who noted that Clinton had promised to veto other spending bills including the milk language.

The upshot of the proposal—which Lott pushed on behalf of Sen. James J. Jeffords (R-Vt.), who is up for reelection in 2000—would be a bitter defeat for dairy farmers in the Upper Midwest, a huge victory for dairy farmers in the Northeast, and a status-quo solution to a battle that could have resulted in lower prices for consumers. Sen. Herb Kohl (D-Wis.) yesterday vowed a last-ditch effort to hold up congressional business to block the deal, and he could have assistance from the administration.

This is a very big thing for us, and I'm going to do whatever I need to do to try to make sure this doesn't happen," said Kohl, who noted that his state has 25,000 dairy farmers, compared with 3,000 in New England.

The Byzantine Eau Claire system was designed to ensure that every region of the country maintained a local supply of fresh milk. It was an outmoded time when it was not possible to transport milk long distances in refrigerated trucks. The 1996 farm bill, touted as an effort
to introduce free-market principles to America's farm economy, required the Clinton administration to propose a replacement for the Eau Claire regime. And while it authorized a North-South Compact, it set its expiration date for this year.

Now Congress appears set to change its mind.

The Agriculture Department plan, which was supposed to go into effect last month before it was held up by a lawsuit in Vermont, would have smoothed out the formulas that favor farmers farther away from Eau Claire. Consumer advocates estimated that it would have cut milk prices by at least 2 cents a gallon for consumers $285 million to $3 billion a year and saving taxpayers $42 million to $349 million on food programs. But the House passed a bill last month to suspend, and then later to rescind, the plan. Congressional leaders have agreed to include a version of that bill in the overall budget agreement. And yesterday's deal will extend the compact up to February 2001.

Kohl complained that maintaining the status quo would mean maintaining an unfair playing field, providing government protection to dairies connecting with midwestern farmers. John Czwartacki, a spokesman for Lott, cautioned that no deal is final until the budget agreement is complete. But he also noted that midwesterners--such as Kohl and Rod Grams (R-Minn.), who also are up for reelection, will be unable to stop it.

"It's all done but the fireworks," Czwartacki said. "I'm sure people will voice their unhappiness in tried and true ways. But on this issue, you can't make everyone happy.''

Not even the regional alliance of compact supporters--who include likely New York Senator Hillary Rodham Clinton, whose organization took no position, and Robert Dole, a moderate from Kansas and former Republican leader--are likely to be satisfied. But they have gotten worse.

"So it seems to me, as I said earlier, this would be laughable if it was not so corrosive of the public's ability to believe what we are doing.

LIST OF GIMMICKS IN APPROPRIATIONS BILLS (in millions of dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>O</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spending Not Counted By Congress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directed CBO to reduce their spending estimates, but actually spends Social Security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All--Directly scoring (1.14% of BA)</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBO--Directly scoring (1.14% of BA)</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSE--Directly scoring (1.14% of BA)</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>10,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E &amp; W--Not included in scoring (1.14% of BA)</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO--Not included in scoring (1.14% of BA)</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT--Not included in scoring (1.14% of BA)</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L--Not included in scoring (1.14% of BA)</td>
<td>970</td>
<td>970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L--Not included in scoring (highway and transit firefighting)</td>
<td>1,341</td>
<td>1,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANS--Not included in scoring (1.14% of BA)</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP--Not included in scoring (1.14% of BA)</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA--Not included in scoring (1.14% of BA)</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSE--Not included in scoring (1.14% of BA)</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSE--Not included in scoring (1.14% of BA)</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>2,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSE--Not included in scoring (1.14% of BA)</td>
<td>-17,441</td>
<td>-17,441</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Declarations of emergencies for normal program spending

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>O</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decline Year 2000 Census an emergency</td>
<td>4,118</td>
<td>4,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decline part of Head Start an emergency</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L--Emergency declarations</td>
<td>2,113</td>
<td>2,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA--Emergency declarations</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public health emergency declarations</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>15,577</td>
<td>15,577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2000 Spending Counted Against 1999 or 2001</td>
<td>11,511</td>
<td>11,511</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legally delay spending until the final days of the fiscal year so it's counted next year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>O</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOD--Delay contractor payments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor HHS--Delay Obligations $5.0 B in BA delayed until 9/29/00</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA medical care obligations of $490 million</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO--Delay obligations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBO--Obligations of balances in Crime Victims Fund after FY 2000</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescind section 8 housing funds</td>
<td>-1,300</td>
<td>-1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, delayed obligations</td>
<td>3,751</td>
<td>3,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2000 Budget Counted Against 1999 or 2001</td>
<td>4,423</td>
<td>4,423</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Declarations of emergencies after the fiscal year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>O</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legally count spending against last fiscal year even though it wasn't</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOD--Advance Appropriations</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legally count spending against post-fiscal year even though it is for FY 2000:</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOE--Elkins School Lands Fund</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VA--Increases for FY 2001 (total FY 2001 advances are $1 billion)</td>
<td>10,100</td>
<td>10,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHS--section 8 advance appropriation for FY 2001 (37% of program total)</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>4,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>18,236</td>
<td>18,236</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Miscellaneous Special Accounting Gimmicks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>BA</th>
<th>O</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Across the Board cut 0.38%</td>
<td>-2,110</td>
<td>-2,110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time of the minority has expired.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. LINDE.

Mr. LINDE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LINDE.

At the end of the first section of this resolution add the following:

The conference report shall be debateable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. The previous question shall be ordered on the conference report to final adoption without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. LINDE. Mr. Speaker, at this time I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the amendment to the rule, and I move the previous question on the amendment and on the resolution.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin will state it.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I am trying to understand what the import of the previous question was. I understand that this is the method which will gag us and prevent any further motions being offered in protest to the rule that is brought before us. That is the effect of the gentleman's motion. It is, in fact, a parliamentary inquiry which will prevent us from doing anything except obediently moving toward passage of the bill. I am not going to contest it, but I think people need to know what it is. It is another symptom of how this House is run.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is not a parliamentary inquiry. The gentleman from Georgia managing the rule is offering an amendment to the rule.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the amendment and on the resolution.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as amended.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.
The vote was taken by electronic de-

Messrs. BONIOR, DICKEY, MATSUI, FLETCHER, BALDACCI, HINCHEY, WEYGAND, MS. MALONEY OF New York and Mrs. McCARTHY OF New York changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

The result of the vote was announced

A motion to reconsider was laid on the

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimi-

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

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 3194,

Mr. YOUNG OF Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 386, I call up

Mr. YOUNG OF Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report to accompany H.R. 3194, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

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

There was no objection.

Yo

Mr. YOUNG OF Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we are coming to the successful conclusion of a long road to-

The Speaker, the bills that are included in this conference report today, all of these bills have gone before the House in one form or another. They have also gone before the House as part of a conference report. Most of those bills have not even been changed to

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1598

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimi-

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

There was no objection.
any great extent from their previous forms.

The District of Columbia bill, which is the main vehicle for this conference report, has only one minor change that was acceptable to all parties involved. The bill on Foreign Operations is basically the same as passed the House, except for a minor change that was agreed to by all the parties. As for the other three bills remaining, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations, will make some comments on that as we go through the debate.

The chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Appropriations, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), will have some comments on that portion of the bill. And the chairman of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State and Judiciary Appropriations, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), will have some comments on that bill.

During the various discussions that have led up to the point where we are about to conclude consideration of our appropriations responsibilities, one of the complaints has been the size of the bill. And it is true that a number of nonappropriations issues have been added by virtue of reference to their bill number. But the fact is that the administration, the President’s team, was here until nearly 3 o’clock this morning reading all of those pages, and they did read them all and gave us a sign-off to go ahead and file the bill. Not that we needed that, but it was a courtesy that we extended to the administration.

Mr. Speaker, of course, the staff representatives of the majority leadership and the minority leadership had access not only to this process last night and early this morning, but there has been ample opportunity for those who wanted to read the agreement and spend the hours late last night and early this morning to do so. They had that opportunity.

We have spent a considerable amount of time, long days and long nights, in negotiation with the representatives of the President. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and I have spent a lot of time together in that room where we did the negotiating. But it is important to note, Members ought to know this, the negotiations were basically managed by the leadership of the subcommittees involved. This was not done at some high level with someone who was not involved in the day-to-day activities relative to these bills.

So, this is a real product of the Committee on Appropriations and the appropriations process. I can give at least 237 reasons to vote against this bill. But also I could give hundreds of reasons why this is a good bill. Throughout the debate we will do that, Mr. Speaker. I hope that we can get a good bipartisan vote for a good bipartisan bill that is even agreed to by the administration.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask that all of our colleagues on our side of the aisle show the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) the courtesy of listening to what he has to say. There are some very strong differences here, and I would hope that the House would remain in order so that we could all hear what each of our speakers has to say.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD I would like to insert tables showing the details of the District of Columbia Appropriations, Foreign Operation, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations, and Miscellaneous Appropriations.
### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000

*(Amounts in thousands)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 1999 Enacted</th>
<th>FY 2000 Request</th>
<th>H.R. 2567</th>
<th>H.R. 3064</th>
<th>H.R. 3194 vs. enacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEDERAL FUNDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia Resident Tuition Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>17,000 + 17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentives for Adoption of Foster Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>5,000 + 5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens Complaint Review Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500 + 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Payment for Human Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>250 + 250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Improvements and Expansion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000 + 25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal payment for management reform</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18,778</td>
<td>18,778</td>
<td>18,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal payment for Boys Town USA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,100</td>
<td>7,100</td>
<td>7,100 + 7,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nation's Capital Infrastructure Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000 + 7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Study and Related Activities at Lorton Correctional Complex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>184,800</td>
<td>201,000</td>
<td>184,800 - 8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Study and Related Activities at Lorton Correctional Complex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>128,000</td>
<td>137,440</td>
<td>128,000 - 9,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Services in D.C. Courts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33,336</td>
<td>33,336</td>
<td>33,336 + 33,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal payment to the Court Services and Defender Supervision Agency of the District of Columbia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>59,400</td>
<td>80,200</td>
<td>59,400 + 34,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal payment for Children's National Medical Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>1,000 + 1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal payment for Metropolitan Police Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,200 - 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal payment to General Services Administration - Lorton Correctional Complex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,700</td>
<td>6,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal payment for Fire Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,040</td>
<td>3,040</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal payment to the Georgetown Waterfront Park Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescission (sec. 178)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal payment to Historical Society for City Museum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal payment to the National Museum of American Music and Downtown Revitalization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Park Police</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal payment for waterfront improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal payment for mentoring services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal payment for hotline services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal payment for public charter schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15,622</td>
<td>15,622</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare Coordinated Care Demonstration Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Revitalization Financing: Economic Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2000 Information Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure and Economic Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2K conversion emergency funding [courts]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,249</td>
<td>2,249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2K conversion [emergency funding]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>61,900</td>
<td>61,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Federal funds to the District of Columbia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>683,639</td>
<td>833,769</td>
<td>429,100 + 429,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FUNDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governmental direction and support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(164,144)</td>
<td>(164,144)</td>
<td>(167,356) - 3,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic development and regulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(159,039)</td>
<td>(159,039)</td>
<td>(190,335) + 31,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public safety and justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(755,786)</td>
<td>(778,770)</td>
<td>(778,770) - 22,984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public education system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(798,411)</td>
<td>(857,411)</td>
<td>(857,411) - 5,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human support services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1,514,751)</td>
<td>(1,525,995)</td>
<td>(1,526,361) + 4,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public works</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(266,912)</td>
<td>(271,395)</td>
<td>(271,395) - 4,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receivership Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(318,979)</td>
<td>(342,077)</td>
<td>(342,077) - 23,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce Investments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5,500)</td>
<td>(5,500)</td>
<td>(5,500) + 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buysouts and Management Reforms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1,000)</td>
<td>(1,000)</td>
<td>(1,000) - 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(150,000)</td>
<td>(150,000)</td>
<td>(150,000) + 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(7,840)</td>
<td>(7,840)</td>
<td>(7,840) + 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing and other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(364,948)</td>
<td>(364,948)</td>
<td>(364,948) - 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Convention Center Transfer Payment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5,400)</td>
<td>(5,400)</td>
<td>(5,400) + 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repayment of Loans and Interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(352,417)</td>
<td>(352,417)</td>
<td>(352,417) - 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repayment of General Fund Recovery Debt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(36,286)</td>
<td>(36,286)</td>
<td>(36,286) + 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment of Interest on Short-Term Borrowing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(9,000)</td>
<td>(9,000)</td>
<td>(9,000) + 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificates of Participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(7,950)</td>
<td>(7,950)</td>
<td>(7,950) + 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(6,974)</td>
<td>(6,974)</td>
<td>(6,974) + 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optical and Dental Insurance payments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1,250)</td>
<td>(1,250)</td>
<td>(1,250) + 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity Bank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(20,000)</td>
<td>(20,000)</td>
<td>(20,000) - 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity Savings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1,000)</td>
<td>(1,000)</td>
<td>(1,000) - 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement and Management Savings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1,000)</td>
<td>(1,000)</td>
<td>(1,000) + 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, operating expenses, general fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4,418,030)</td>
<td>(4,653,662)</td>
<td>(4,686,836) - 266,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enterprise Funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water and Sewer Authority and the Washington Aqueduct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(273,314)</td>
<td>(279,608)</td>
<td>(279,608) - 6,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lottery and Beverage Control Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(225,200)</td>
<td>(234,400)</td>
<td>(234,400) - 9,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Cable Television</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2,108)</td>
<td>(2,108)</td>
<td>(2,108) + 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Service Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5,009)</td>
<td>(5,009)</td>
<td>(5,009) + 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of People's Counsel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2,501)</td>
<td>(2,501)</td>
<td>(2,501) + 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Insurers and Securities Regulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(7,001)</td>
<td>(7,001)</td>
<td>(7,001) + 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Banking and Financial Institutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(86,754)</td>
<td>(86,754)</td>
<td>(86,754) - 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports and Entertainment Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(10,846)</td>
<td>(10,846)</td>
<td>(10,846) + 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Benefit Corporation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(10,846)</td>
<td>(10,846)</td>
<td>(10,846) + 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(460,636)</td>
<td>(460,636)</td>
<td>(460,636) + 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 — continued  
(Amounts in thousands)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 1999</th>
<th>FY 2000</th>
<th>H.R. 2567</th>
<th>H.R. 3064</th>
<th>H.R. 3194</th>
<th>vs. enacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D.C. Retirement Board</td>
<td>[10,202]</td>
<td>[9,692]</td>
<td>[9,892]</td>
<td>[9,892]</td>
<td>[9,892]</td>
<td>[8,310]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correctional Industries Fund</td>
<td>[3,332]</td>
<td>[1,810]</td>
<td>[1,810]</td>
<td>[1,810]</td>
<td>[1,810]</td>
<td>[1,522]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Convention Center</td>
<td>[48,139]</td>
<td>[50,226]</td>
<td>[50,226]</td>
<td>[50,226]</td>
<td>[50,226]</td>
<td>[1,057]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Enterprise Funds</td>
<td>[660,978]</td>
<td>[675,790]</td>
<td>[675,790]</td>
<td>[675,790]</td>
<td>[675,790]</td>
<td>[14,812]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, operating expenses</td>
<td>[5,079,009]</td>
<td>[5,329,472]</td>
<td>[5,362,626]</td>
<td>[5,362,626]</td>
<td>[5,362,626]</td>
<td>[283,618]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Capital Outlay**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 1999</th>
<th>FY 2000</th>
<th>H.R. 2567</th>
<th>H.R. 3064</th>
<th>H.R. 3194</th>
<th>vs. enacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>[1,711,161]</td>
<td>[1,218,636]</td>
<td>[1,218,636]</td>
<td>[1,218,636]</td>
<td>[1,218,636]</td>
<td>[-492,523]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water and Sewer Fund</td>
<td>[197,169]</td>
<td>[197,169]</td>
<td>[197,169]</td>
<td>[197,169]</td>
<td>[197,169]</td>
<td>[-197,169]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Capital Outlay</td>
<td>[1,711,161]</td>
<td>[1,415,807]</td>
<td>[1,415,807]</td>
<td>[1,415,807]</td>
<td>[1,415,807]</td>
<td>[-295,354]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, District of Columbia funds</td>
<td>[6,790,169]</td>
<td>[6,745,275]</td>
<td>[8,778,433]</td>
<td>[8,778,433]</td>
<td>[8,778,433]</td>
<td>[-11,736]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Funds to the District of Columbia</td>
<td>683,639</td>
<td>393,740</td>
<td>429,100</td>
<td>429,100</td>
<td>436,930</td>
<td>-246,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia funds</td>
<td>[6,790,169]</td>
<td>[6,745,275]</td>
<td>[8,778,433]</td>
<td>[8,778,433]</td>
<td>[8,778,433]</td>
<td>[-11,736]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS

**APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000**  
(Amounts in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 1999 Enacted</th>
<th>FY 2000 Request</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference</th>
<th>Conference vs. enacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TITLE I - EXPORT AND INVESTMENT ASSISTANCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Export-Import Bank of the United States</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidy appropriation</td>
<td>765,000</td>
<td>839,000</td>
<td>750,000</td>
<td>785,000</td>
<td>759,000</td>
<td>-6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy funding (by transfer)</td>
<td>(10,000)</td>
<td>(10,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Direct loan authorization)</td>
<td>(1,330,000)</td>
<td>(1,330,000)</td>
<td>(1,350,000)</td>
<td>(1,330,000)</td>
<td>(1,350,000)</td>
<td>(1,350,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Guaranteed loan authorization)</td>
<td>(12,702,000)</td>
<td>(12,825,000)</td>
<td>(12,800,000)</td>
<td>(10,500,000)</td>
<td>(10,400,000)</td>
<td>(2,300,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative expenses</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>57,000</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>+5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2K conversion (emergency funding)</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative subsidy</td>
<td>-25,000</td>
<td>-15,000</td>
<td>-10,000</td>
<td>-15,000</td>
<td>-15,000</td>
<td>+10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Export-Import Bank of the United States</strong></td>
<td>790,400</td>
<td>881,000</td>
<td>796,000</td>
<td>825,000</td>
<td>799,000</td>
<td>+8,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncredit account:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative expenses</td>
<td>32,500</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>31,500</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>+2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2K conversion (emergency funding)</td>
<td>640</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance fees and other offsetting collections</td>
<td>-260,000</td>
<td>-303,000</td>
<td>-303,000</td>
<td>-303,000</td>
<td>-303,000</td>
<td>-43,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct loans:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan subsidy</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>+10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Loan authorization)</td>
<td>(136,000)</td>
<td>(130,000)</td>
<td>(65,000)</td>
<td>(100,000)</td>
<td>(130,000)</td>
<td>(6,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guaranteed loans:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan subsidy</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>-36,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Loan authorization)</td>
<td>(1,750,000)</td>
<td>(1,000,000)</td>
<td>(650,000)</td>
<td>(1,000,000)</td>
<td>(1,000,000)</td>
<td>(750,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2K conversion (emergency funding)</td>
<td>1,280</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Overseas Private Investment Corporation</strong></td>
<td>-175,400</td>
<td>-244,000</td>
<td>-247,500</td>
<td>-247,500</td>
<td>-244,000</td>
<td>-68,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT AGENCY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade and development agency</td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td>43,000</td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, title I, Export and investment assistance</strong></td>
<td>659,000</td>
<td>685,000</td>
<td>595,500</td>
<td>620,500</td>
<td>599,000</td>
<td>-60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Loan authorizations)</td>
<td>(15,921,000)</td>
<td>(16,642,000)</td>
<td>(12,685,000)</td>
<td>(12,933,000)</td>
<td>(12,880,000)</td>
<td>(-3,041,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TITLE II - BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funds Appropriated to the President</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency for International Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child survival and disease programs fund</td>
<td>850,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>665,000</td>
<td>715,000</td>
<td>+65,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency funding</td>
<td>1,225,000</td>
<td>770,440</td>
<td>1,201,000</td>
<td>1,028,500</td>
<td>1,228,000</td>
<td>+3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central America and the Caribbean Emergency Disaster Recovery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund (Emergency Funding)</td>
<td>821,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-821,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency funding (transfer out)</td>
<td>(-17,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Fund for Africa</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>220,000</td>
<td>200,800</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>202,800</td>
<td>+2,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International disaster assistance</td>
<td>188,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-188,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro &amp; Small Enterprise Development program account:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidy appropriation</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Direct loan authorization)</td>
<td>(1,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Guaranteed loan authorization)</td>
<td>(40,000)</td>
<td>(30,000)</td>
<td>(30,000)</td>
<td>(40,000)</td>
<td>(30,000)</td>
<td>-10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative expenses</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban and environmental credit program account:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidy appropriation (Title VI Funding)</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Guaranteed loan authorization)</td>
<td>(14,000)</td>
<td>(26,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(14,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development credit authority program account:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(By transfer)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Guaranteed loan authorization)</td>
<td>(260,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-260,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, development assistance</td>
<td>2,942,500</td>
<td>2,113,000</td>
<td>2,093,800</td>
<td>2,111,000</td>
<td>2,154,300</td>
<td>-78,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment to the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund</td>
<td>44,552</td>
<td>43,837</td>
<td>43,837</td>
<td>43,837</td>
<td>43,837</td>
<td>-715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating expenses of the Agency for International Development</td>
<td>479,950</td>
<td>522,736</td>
<td>479,950</td>
<td>495,000</td>
<td>520,000</td>
<td>-40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency funding (by transfer)</td>
<td>(8,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2K conversion (emergency funding)</td>
<td>10,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-10,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating expenses of the Agency for International Development</td>
<td>30,750</td>
<td>25,261</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>-5,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency funding (by transfer)</td>
<td>(1,900)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Agency for International Development</strong></td>
<td>3,507,952</td>
<td>2,704,637</td>
<td>2,642,067</td>
<td>2,674,637</td>
<td>2,743,217</td>
<td>-764,735</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS

APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 — continued

(Amounts in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 1999 Enacted</th>
<th>FY 2000 Request</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference</th>
<th>Conference vs. enacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Other Bilateral Economic Assistance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY 1999 Enacted</th>
<th>FY 2000 Request</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference</th>
<th>Conference vs. enacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic support fund</td>
<td>2,362,000</td>
<td>2,543,000</td>
<td>2,227,000</td>
<td>2,195,000</td>
<td>2,345,500</td>
<td>-16,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency funding</td>
<td>211,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>450,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>+238,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency funding (transfer out)</td>
<td>-3,770</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Fund for Ireland</td>
<td>19,600</td>
<td></td>
<td>15,600</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance for Eastern Europe and the Baltic States</td>
<td>430,000</td>
<td>363,000</td>
<td>363,000</td>
<td>535,000</td>
<td>535,000</td>
<td>+105,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency funding</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance for the Independent States of the former Soviet Union</td>
<td>831,000</td>
<td>1,022,000</td>
<td>725,000</td>
<td>780,000</td>
<td>836,000</td>
<td>+36,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency funding</td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Other Bilateral Economic Assistance</strong></td>
<td>3,990,100</td>
<td>3,968,500</td>
<td>3,364,500</td>
<td>3,510,000</td>
<td>4,169,100</td>
<td>+199,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INDEPENDENT AGENCIES**

**Inter-American Foundation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY 1999 Enacted</th>
<th>FY 2000 Request</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference</th>
<th>Conference vs. enacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriation</td>
<td>22,300</td>
<td>(5,000)</td>
<td>(18,000)</td>
<td>(5,000)</td>
<td>(15,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(By transfer)</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>22,300</td>
<td>(5,000)</td>
<td>(18,000)</td>
<td>(5,000)</td>
<td>(15,000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**African Development Foundation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY 1999 Enacted</th>
<th>FY 2000 Request</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference</th>
<th>Conference vs. enacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriation</td>
<td>14,400</td>
<td>(14,400)</td>
<td>(12,500)</td>
<td>(14,400)</td>
<td>(14,400)</td>
<td>(-3,263)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(By transfer)</td>
<td>11,137</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2K conversion (emergency funding)</td>
<td>137</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>11,137</td>
<td>(14,400)</td>
<td>(12,500)</td>
<td>(14,400)</td>
<td>(14,400)</td>
<td>(-3,263)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Peace Corps**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY 1999 Enacted</th>
<th>FY 2000 Request</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference</th>
<th>Conference vs. enacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriation</td>
<td>240,000</td>
<td>270,000</td>
<td>240,000</td>
<td>220,000</td>
<td>245,000</td>
<td>(-5,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency funding (by transfer)</td>
<td>1,768</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(-1,768)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Department of State**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY 1999 Enacted</th>
<th>FY 2000 Request</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference</th>
<th>Conference vs. enacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International narcotics control and law enforcement</td>
<td>261,000</td>
<td>266,000</td>
<td>265,000</td>
<td>215,000</td>
<td>305,000</td>
<td>+44,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency funding</td>
<td>255,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration and refugee assistance</td>
<td>640,000</td>
<td>660,000</td>
<td>640,000</td>
<td>610,000</td>
<td>625,000</td>
<td>-15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency funding</td>
<td>266,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance Fund</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>-17,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonproliferation, anti-terrorism, demining and related programs</td>
<td>198,000</td>
<td>231,000</td>
<td>181,630</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>216,620</td>
<td>+18,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency funding</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Commission on Terrorism</td>
<td>840</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Department of State</strong></td>
<td>1,839,440</td>
<td>1,216,000</td>
<td>1,136,600</td>
<td>1,020,000</td>
<td>1,159,100</td>
<td>(-680,340)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Department of the Treasury**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY 1999 Enacted</th>
<th>FY 2000 Request</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference</th>
<th>Conference vs. enacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>International affairs technical assistance</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>-1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt restructuring</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>370,000</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>43,000</td>
<td>123,000</td>
<td>(+90,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency funding</td>
<td>41,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States community adjustment and investment program (Title VI Funding)</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, Department of the Treasury</strong></td>
<td>87,000</td>
<td>395,500</td>
<td>34,500</td>
<td>44,500</td>
<td>134,500</td>
<td>(+47,500)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total, Title I, Bilateral economic assistance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY 1999 Enacted</th>
<th>FY 2000 Request</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference</th>
<th>Conference vs. enacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriations</td>
<td>9,664,629</td>
<td>8,591,037</td>
<td>7,418,367</td>
<td>7,469,337</td>
<td>8,470,917</td>
<td>(-1,163,712)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency funding</td>
<td>(7,675,192)</td>
<td>(8,591,037)</td>
<td>(7,418,367)</td>
<td>(7,469,337)</td>
<td>(8,020,917)</td>
<td>(+5,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recission</td>
<td>(1,994,437)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States community adjustment and investment program (Loan authorizations)</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>(19,400)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(36,000)</td>
<td>(22,400)</td>
<td>(+12,170)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(By transfer) (emergency appropriations)</td>
<td>(11,269)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(By transfer)</td>
<td>(55,000)</td>
<td>(256,000)</td>
<td>(30,000)</td>
<td>(54,000)</td>
<td>(84,000)</td>
<td>(+29,000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY 1999 Enacted</th>
<th>FY 2000 Request</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference</th>
<th>Conference vs. enacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriations</td>
<td>9,664,629</td>
<td>8,591,037</td>
<td>7,418,367</td>
<td>7,469,337</td>
<td>8,470,917</td>
<td>(-1,163,712)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency funding</td>
<td>(7,675,192)</td>
<td>(8,591,037)</td>
<td>(7,418,367)</td>
<td>(7,469,337)</td>
<td>(8,020,917)</td>
<td>(+5,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recission</td>
<td>(1,994,437)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States community adjustment and investment program (Loan authorizations)</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>(19,400)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(36,000)</td>
<td>(22,400)</td>
<td>(+12,170)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(By transfer) (emergency appropriations)</td>
<td>(11,269)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(By transfer)</td>
<td>(55,000)</td>
<td>(256,000)</td>
<td>(30,000)</td>
<td>(54,000)</td>
<td>(84,000)</td>
<td>(+29,000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS
#### APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 — continued

(Amounts in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUND</th>
<th>FY 1999 Enacted</th>
<th>FY 2000 Request</th>
<th>House Senate</th>
<th>Conference Conference vs. enacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TITLE III - MILITARY ASSISTANCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funds Appropriated to the President</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Military Education and Training</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>52,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Military Financing Program:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>3,330,000</td>
<td>3,780,000</td>
<td>3,470,000</td>
<td>3,410,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Limitation on administrative expenses)</td>
<td>(29,910)</td>
<td>(30,000)</td>
<td>(30,495)</td>
<td>(30,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct loans:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidy appropriation</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Loan authorization)</td>
<td>(597,000)</td>
<td>(600,000)</td>
<td>(600,000)</td>
<td>(600,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMF program level</td>
<td>(3,497,000)</td>
<td>(3,780,000)</td>
<td>(3,470,000)</td>
<td>(3,410,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Foreign Military Financing</td>
<td>3,500,000</td>
<td>3,780,000</td>
<td>3,470,000</td>
<td>3,410,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Funding (Title VI)</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Defense Acquisition Fund:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offsetting collections</td>
<td>-19,000</td>
<td>-6,000</td>
<td>-6,000</td>
<td>-6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peacekeeping operations</td>
<td>76,500</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>78,500</td>
<td>80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Title III, Military Assistance</td>
<td>3,507,500</td>
<td>3,966,000</td>
<td>3,565,500</td>
<td>3,534,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Limitation on administrative expenses)</td>
<td>(29,910)</td>
<td>(30,000)</td>
<td>(30,495)</td>
<td>(30,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Loan authorization)</td>
<td>(167,000)</td>
<td>(167,000)</td>
<td>(167,000)</td>
<td>(167,000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TITLE IV - MULTILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE
#### FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

**World Bank Group**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>FY 1999 Enacted</th>
<th>FY 2000 Request</th>
<th>House Senate</th>
<th>Conference Conference vs. enacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Environment Facility</td>
<td>192,500</td>
<td>143,333</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescission</td>
<td>-25,000</td>
<td>-25,000</td>
<td>-25,000</td>
<td>-25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, Global Environment Facility</td>
<td>167,500</td>
<td>118,333</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to the International Development Association:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title VI Funding</td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td>566,600</td>
<td>776,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Limitation on callable capital subscriptions)</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Loan authorization)</td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, World Bank Group</td>
<td>967,500</td>
<td>958,333</td>
<td>616,600</td>
<td>816,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to the Inter-American Development Bank:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid-in capital</td>
<td>25,611</td>
<td>25,611</td>
<td>25,611</td>
<td>25,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Limitation on callable capital subscriptions)</td>
<td>(1,503,719)</td>
<td>(1,503,719)</td>
<td>(1,503,719)</td>
<td>(1,503,719)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund for special operations</td>
<td>21,152</td>
<td>21,152</td>
<td>21,152</td>
<td>21,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to the Inter-American Investment Corporation (Title VI Funding)</td>
<td>21,152</td>
<td>21,152</td>
<td>21,152</td>
<td>21,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to the Enterprise for the Americas Multilateral Investment Fund</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>28,500</td>
<td>28,500</td>
<td>28,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, contribution to the Inter-American Development Bank</td>
<td>96,763</td>
<td>79,111</td>
<td>79,111</td>
<td>79,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to the Asian Development Bank:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid-in capital</td>
<td>13,222</td>
<td>13,222</td>
<td>13,222</td>
<td>13,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Limitation on callable capital subscriptions)</td>
<td>(647,815)</td>
<td>(672,740)</td>
<td>(672,740)</td>
<td>(672,740)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to the Asian Development Fund</td>
<td>210,000</td>
<td>177,017</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, contribution to the Asian Development Bank</td>
<td>223,222</td>
<td>190,340</td>
<td>113,232</td>
<td>63,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to the African Development Bank:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid-in capital</td>
<td>5,100</td>
<td>5,100</td>
<td>5,100</td>
<td>5,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Limitation on callable capital subscriptions)</td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to the African Development Fund</td>
<td>126,000</td>
<td>126,000</td>
<td>126,000</td>
<td>126,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, contribution to the African Development Bank</td>
<td>136,222</td>
<td>131,120</td>
<td>121,132</td>
<td>68,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Limitation on callable capital subscriptions)</td>
<td>(123,238)</td>
<td>(123,238)</td>
<td>(123,238)</td>
<td>(123,238)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, International Financial Institutions</td>
<td>1,451,264</td>
<td>1,384,498</td>
<td>901,718</td>
<td>941,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Limitation on callable capital subscriptions)</td>
<td>(2,274,815)</td>
<td>(2,469,752)</td>
<td>(2,269,702)</td>
<td>(2,349,702)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS

### APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 — continued

(Amounts in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 1999 Enacted</th>
<th>FY 2000 Request</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference</th>
<th>Conference vs. enacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>International Organizations and Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriation</td>
<td>167,000</td>
<td>293,000</td>
<td>167,000</td>
<td>170,000</td>
<td>183,000</td>
<td>-4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(By transfer)</td>
<td>(2,500)</td>
<td>(2,500)</td>
<td>(2,500)</td>
<td>(2,500)</td>
<td>(2,500)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, title IV, Multilateral economic assistance</td>
<td>1,638,264</td>
<td>1,587,486</td>
<td>1,068,718</td>
<td>1,111,818</td>
<td>1,298,018</td>
<td>-340,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriations</td>
<td>(1,663,264)</td>
<td>(1,687,486)</td>
<td>(1,068,718)</td>
<td>(1,111,818)</td>
<td>(1,298,018)</td>
<td>(-365,246)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescission</td>
<td>(25,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(+25,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(By transfer)</td>
<td>(2,500)</td>
<td>(2,500)</td>
<td>(2,500)</td>
<td>(2,500)</td>
<td>(2,500)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TITLE VI</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funds Appropriated to the President</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Monetary Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans to International Monetary Fund</td>
<td>3,361,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(-3,361,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Share, International Monetary Fund</td>
<td>14,500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(-14,500,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, International Monetary Programs</td>
<td>17,861,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(-17,861,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriations</td>
<td>33,330,393</td>
<td>14,919,535</td>
<td>12,666,115</td>
<td>12,735,655</td>
<td>15,355,625</td>
<td>(-17,970,456)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency appropriations</td>
<td>(2,046,937)</td>
<td>(14,919,535)</td>
<td>(12,666,115)</td>
<td>(12,735,655)</td>
<td>(13,534,535)</td>
<td>(-17,778,591)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescission</td>
<td>(30,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(+30,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(By transfer)</td>
<td>(12,730)</td>
<td>(17,500)</td>
<td>(21,900)</td>
<td>(40,500)</td>
<td>(24,900)</td>
<td>(+12,170)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(By transfer) (emergency appropriations)</td>
<td>(21,259)</td>
<td>(30,000)</td>
<td>(30,495)</td>
<td>(30,000)</td>
<td>(30,495)</td>
<td>(+585)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan authorizations</td>
<td>(16,143,000)</td>
<td>(16,588,000)</td>
<td>(12,715,000)</td>
<td>(12,987,000)</td>
<td>(12,964,000)</td>
<td>(-3,179,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET RECAP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total mandatory and discretionary</td>
<td>31,248,456</td>
<td>14,919,535</td>
<td>12,666,115</td>
<td>12,735,655</td>
<td>13,524,935</td>
<td>(-17,711,521)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandatory</td>
<td>44,552</td>
<td>43,837</td>
<td>43,837</td>
<td>43,837</td>
<td>43,837</td>
<td>-715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary</td>
<td>31,201,904</td>
<td>14,875,696</td>
<td>12,624,278</td>
<td>12,691,818</td>
<td>13,491,098</td>
<td>(-17,710,806)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS (H.R.3425)
(Amounts in thousands)

**Conference**

## TITLE I - EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS

### CHAPTER 1

#### DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Farm Service Agency:</th>
<th>Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund Program Account:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Loan authorizations:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm ownership loans:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>(91,651)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guaranteed</td>
<td>(568,627)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal:</strong></td>
<td>(590,578)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm operating loans:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>(400,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guaranteed unsubsidized</td>
<td>(302,158)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guaranteed subsidized</td>
<td>(700,556)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal:</strong></td>
<td>(1,404,718)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency disaster loans:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(547,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Loan authorizations:</strong></td>
<td>(2,542,294)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Loan subsidies:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farm ownership loans:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>(828)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guaranteed</td>
<td>(3,184)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal:</strong></td>
<td>(4,012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm operating loans:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>(23,441)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guaranteed unsubsidized</td>
<td>(4,260)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guaranteed subsidized</td>
<td>(61,885)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal:</strong></td>
<td>(89,596)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency disaster loans (contingent emergency appropriations)</td>
<td>(84,949)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund Program Account:</strong></td>
<td>(178,545)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency conservation program (contingent emergency appropriations)</td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Farm Service Agency:</strong></td>
<td>(228,557)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commodity Credit Corporation Fund:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crop loss assistance (contingent emergency appropriations)</td>
<td>(186,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty crop assistance (contingent emergency appropriations)</td>
<td>(2,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock assistance (contingent emergency appropriations)</td>
<td>(10,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Commodity Credit Corporation Fund:</strong></td>
<td>(198,800)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Natural Resources Conservation Service:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Watershed and flood prevention operations (contingent emergency appropriations)</td>
<td>(80,000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rural Housing Service:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan authorizations:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single family (sec. 502)</td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing repair (sec. 504)</td>
<td>(15,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm labor (sec. 514)</td>
<td>(8,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal:</strong></td>
<td>(70,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan subsidies:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single family (sec. 502) (contingent emergency appropriations)</td>
<td>(4,265)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm labor (sec. 514) (contingent emergency appropriations)</td>
<td>(4,584)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account:</strong></td>
<td>(11,059)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural housing assistance grants (contingent emergency appropriations)</td>
<td>(14,500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Rural Housing Service:</strong></td>
<td>(25,559)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Provisions</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noninsured crop disaster assistance program (contingent emergency appropriations) (sec. 101)</td>
<td>(20,000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total, title I:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New budget (obligational) authority</td>
<td>(552,956)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Loan authorization)</td>
<td>(2,612,254)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### MISCELLANEOUS APPROPRIATIONS (H.R. 3425) — continued
(Amounts in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205,477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(90,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21,500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2,512,254)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>728,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(552,656)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(90,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21,500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2,512,254)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Department of Agriculture:
- Citrus carrier/free replacement (sec. 204)
- Crop insurance pilot programs (sec. 205)
- Harney County losses (sec. 207)
- Tillamook Railroad disaster repairs (sec. 208)

Department of Defense:
- Operation and Maintenance, Army: Army readiness enhancements (sec. 218)
- Operation and Maintenance, Defense-wide: Washington Square project (by transfer) (sec. 219)

Department of the Interior:
- United States Fish and Wildlife Service: Land and water conservation fund (sec. 222)

Legislative Branch:
- Payments to Widows and Heirs of Deceased Members of Congress: Gratuities, deceased Members (sec. 223)

Department of Transportation:
- Federal Transit Administration: Capital investment grants (highway Trust Fund, Mass Transit Account):
- Federal Railroad Administration: Pennsylvania Station redevelopment project (advance appropriations) (sec. 233)

General Services Administration:
- Extension of no-cost land conveyances (sec. 233)

Executive Office of the President:
- Office of National Drug Control Policy (sec. 237)

Department of the Treasury:
- United States Secret Service: Salaries and expenses (sec. 240) (By transfer) (sec. 240)

Total, title II:
- New budget (obligational) authority
- Appropriations
- Advance appropriations (By transfer)
- (Loan authorization)

Grand total, all titles:
- New budget (obligational) authority
- Appropriations
- Contingent emergency appropriations
- Advance appropriations (By transfer)
- (Loan authorization)
Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the honorable minority leader.

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Members of the Committee on Appropriations on both sides of the aisle for their hard work and hard work. I want to thank all of the Members of the President’s staff for the work that they did in trying to bring this to a successful conclusion.

Mr. Speaker, this has been an imperfect process, and this is an imperfect bill. But on balance, it has more to recommend it than not, and I will support its final passage. Procedurally, this bill repeats many of the same mistakes that were made last fall by the leadership. Despite the promises of the Speaker last January, once again we have a bill that was not done on time and was not done in regular order. We have an omnibus bill that reflects a “kitchen sink” approach to governing and, once again, Members did not have adequate time to read the bill to understand all of its provisions.

On the substance of the bill, I am disappointed over the family planning provision that was contained and attached to the U.N. treaty. I think it is the right thing to do. And I am upset that we failed to include a hate crimes provision in this bill, and I think we had a chance to do that.

But on balance, this budget is an overall victory for our priorities. The President and Democrats in Congress hung together in support of an agreement that has made a real commitment to the priorities that we feel are critical to the continued health and well-being of America’s families. Once again, the Democrats stood firm in opposition to the two-track strategy that the Republicans tried to use to split the country over the most desperate of economic circumstances in their families who find themselves with the most desperate of situations in their schools, to actually have the opportunity now in this bill for public school choice is a wonderful new break, through reinforcing the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. I am very glad for that, and I thank our colleagues for that.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very, very proud moment for this Congress, and I believe this is a very, very proud moment for this Congress. But I say this, Mr. Speaker, to our colleagues, we saw the opportunity that was presented to us to stop the raid and to write good into this bill. We have not done enough on the agenda of the American people. And instead of doing the people’s business, we squandered at least 2 months debating a failed trillion dollar tax cut for the wealthy and special interests.

Despite the chest beating, the button wearing and the commercial airy of the Republicans, this Congress failed to extend the life of Social Security, extend it by 1 day. We have done nothing to provide a prescription drug benefit for seniors to modernize Medicare to meet their current needs. We failed to enact key bipartisan reform efforts, the Patients’ Bill of Rights, and the Shays-Meehan campaign reform bill into law.

We dropped the ball, and we lost a real opportunity to modernize our health care system once and for all. And we did not help low-income families get a step up into the middle-class by providing an across-the-board spending reduction. We did not strike a blow against violence in our schools and our playgrounds by passing common sense gun safety legislation.

Our work, in short, is not finished. In many ways, it has not even yet begun. We intend to be back here in January ready and prepared to fight for the priorities and the agenda of the American people. And I simply say to our friends on the other side of the aisle, we have a chance to be able to work together next year. Let us get something done on gun safety. Let us pass a minimum wage increase. Let us get Medicare reform. Let us extend the solvency of Social Security. Let us get a prescription drug benefit for our senior citizens. If we could do this, we can do that, and the American people would be very happy for it.

Mr. Speaker, in that same spirit of can-do, I say to our friends in the Republican Party today: let us continue to work together next year. Let us get a Patients’ Bill of Rights that really gets the job done. Let us get campaign reform. Let us get something done on the minimum wage increase. Let us get Medicare reform. Let us extend the solvency of Social Security. Let us get a prescription drug benefit for our senior citizens. If we could do this, we can do that, and the American people would be very happy for it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the majority leader.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) for yielding me this time. Let me just say, Mr. Speaker, I believe this is a very, very proud moment for this body. To think that we could in just these few short years move ourselves from where we had been in 1994, perpetual debt as much as $250 billion a year for as long as anybody could see to the point where with this budget deal we will consume and finalize forever an end to the raid on Social Security.

Beginning in 1998, fiscal year 1999, and now with this budget agreement in fiscal year 2000, we will have retired a third of a trillion dollars’ worth of debt for our American people. We will have stopped the raid on Social Security forever. We will have enforced this with an across-the-board spending reduction that acknowledges truly it is time now to be disciplined to eliminate waste, inefficiency, fraud in the use of the taxpayers’ dollars. A new commitment of good government in government.

Then when we start looking at the details, some of the things we did in education to bring a real opportunity for the schools that serve the children better, and for those children in the most desperate of economic circumstances in their families who find themselves with the most desperate of situations in their schools, to actually have the opportunity now in this bill for public school choice is a wonderful new break, through reinforcing the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. I am very glad for that, and I thank our colleagues for that.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), the distinguished minority whip.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I share the views of the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), my leader, with respect to the process in which we have been engaged. Seven weeks late on a budget that is missing many important issues that he enumerated: Nothing for Social Security solvency, nothing on Medicare reform, nothing on prescription drugs,
nothing on Patients' Bill of Rights, nothing on the minimum wage.

We, indeed, have not done the people's work, and we have squandered a good deal of our time debating a tax bill that did not meet the approval of the American people. But the bill that we have before us today does have some good features in it. It is with that in mind that I rise in support of it. It is a victory, first of all, for our children because it provides funding to hire and train 10,000 new police officers to patrol our streets and neighborhoods and keep our children safe in school.

Third, this budget is a victory for the environment because it increases funding to protect our clean water, to preserve community parks and forests and history, through the Land and Water Legacy Program, and to fight the congestion and pollution that threaten our quality of life as our constituents.

The fourth issue that I would mention here this afternoon is in the foreign policy area. This provides the resources to move the Mideast peace process forward, providing resources for the Israelis, the Palestinians, and the Jordanians. I think that moves on for the Israelis, the Palestinians, and the Jordanians.

I rise in support of this bill, but more importantly, I rise to set the record straight. The Republican majority in Congress has defined the way that budgets are crafted. In so doing, we have set the Nation down the path to fiscal responsibility. When I ran for office the first time, I did not know that I would be standing before my colleagues today very, very thought that I would be standing before my colleagues today very, very proud of the work of this House over the last 5 years. At this time, it is important for everyone to reflect on how far we have come.

When Republicans took control 5 years ago, we pledged that we would change the scope of government, and we are delivering on that promise, going down the line of issues that are important in this country. The fact is unavoidable that this Congress has an across-the-board spending cut. Congress has redefined the way that budgets are crafted. In so doing, we can spend the money on big government programs. The hard work has paid off. Vote for this bill.

I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the majority whip.
Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), chairman of the Subcommittee on the Interior.

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

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, Webster defines “perfect” as being without fault or flawless. He defines “good” as being praiseworthy, useful, or beneficial.

Well, the document before us is not perfect under Webster's definition. It abundantly does fit Webster's definition of good. It is praiseworthy. It is useful. It is beneficial.

In the conference report, we have modified a number of the riders. I believe many of my colleagues will be pleased with our changes. Most importantly they are fair. I am especially pleased with this report as it continues our commitment to the American people in protecting the environment, in providing for our national parks, forests, wildlife refuges and public lands, as well as our cultural resources.

As the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR) said, this bill is a victory for the environment. It is a bill that will provide pride in America’s heritage, not only now, but far into the future.

I urge each of my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Idaho (Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE) to ask the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA), chairman of the Subcommittee on Interior, to clarify some matters concerning the President’s so-called American Heritage Rivers initiative that concerns the Interior and related agencies portion of the appropriations act.

Is it the understanding of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) that there is nothing in his bill that authorizes the American Heritage Rivers initiative?

Mr. REGULA. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to clarify that matter. There is no language whatsoever in the Interior portion that provides an authorization for the American Heritage Rivers initiative.

Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE. Mr. Speaker, in addition, is it true that there is no separate appropriation for the American Heritage Rivers initiative in the Interior portion of the bill?

Mr. REGULA. Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is true there is no appropriation for the American Heritage Rivers initiative in the appropriations act.

Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE. Mr. Speaker, it is clear that there is no appropriations, nor authorization, but on their insistence on spending money on this unauthorized and unappropriated initiative, how have you instructed the Forest Service managers in this?

Mr. REGULA. There is no such authorization or appropriation, Mr. Speaker. The statement of the managers provides a limitation on spending for the Forest Service for purposes related to designated American Heritage Rivers.

This is not an appropriation, but provides the maximum that may be spent. It is language of limitation on what can be spent from existing funds.

Mr. Speaker, Webster defines “perfect” as being without fault, or flawless. He defines “good” as praiseworthy, useful or beneficial. While the document before you is not perfect under Webster’s definition, it abundantly does fit Webster’s definition of good.

In this new conference report we have modified a number of the riders and I believe that many of you will be pleased with our changes. Most importantly they are fair.

I am especially pleased with this conference report, as it continues our commitment to the American people in protecting the environment and in providing for our national parks, forests, wildlife refuges and public lands, as well as our cultural resources. As the gentleman from Michigan said, “This bill is a victory for the environment to the State of Florida.” I urge you to support this new bill.

At this point Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the Record a table detailing the various accounts in the bill. It is a bill that will provide pride in America’s heritage not only now but far into the future.
### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000
(Amounts in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 1999</th>
<th>FY 2000</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference</th>
<th>Conference vs. enacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of Land Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of lands and resources</td>
<td>812,211</td>
<td>641,100</td>
<td>631,038</td>
<td>634,321</td>
<td>646,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildland fire management</td>
<td>268,680</td>
<td>305,850</td>
<td>292,969</td>
<td>283,406</td>
<td>262,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central hazardous materials fund</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>11,350</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>10,987</td>
<td>8,350</td>
<td>11,100</td>
<td>12,418</td>
<td>11,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments in lieu of taxes</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>145,000</td>
<td>135,000</td>
<td>135,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land acquisition</td>
<td>14,600</td>
<td>46,800</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>17,400</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon and California grant lands</td>
<td>97,037</td>
<td>101,850</td>
<td>99,225</td>
<td>99,225</td>
<td>99,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range improvements (indefinite)</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service charges, deposits, and forfeitures (indefinite)</td>
<td>8,055</td>
<td>8,800</td>
<td>8,800</td>
<td>8,800</td>
<td>8,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous trust funds (indefinite)</td>
<td>8,800</td>
<td>7,700</td>
<td>7,700</td>
<td>7,700</td>
<td>7,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Bureau of Land Management</strong></td>
<td>1,183,885</td>
<td>1,268,700</td>
<td>1,230,282</td>
<td>1,218,569</td>
<td>1,238,150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| United States Fish and Wildlife Service | | | | | |
| Resource management | 961,130 | 724,000 | 710,700 | 684,569 | 718,046 | +54,110 |
| Construction | 50,450 | 43,569 | 43,933 | 40,434 | 54,583 | +1,430 |
| Emergency appropriations | 37,612 | 48,824 | 73,632 | 62,000 | 56,444 | -7,513 |
| Cooperative endangered species conservation fund | 14,000 | 80,000 | 15,000 | 21,480 | 23,000 | +8,990 |
| National wildlife refuge fund | 10,779 | 10,000 | 10,779 | 10,000 | 10,779 | +779 |
| North American wetlands conservation fund | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 15,000 | +000 |
| Wildlife and fishery conservation fund | 800 | 800 | 800 | 800 | 800 | +000 |
| Multinational species conservation fund | 2,000 | 3,000 | 2,000 | 2,400 | 2,400 | +400 |
| Commerical salmon fishery capacity reduction | | | | | | |
| **Total, United States Fish and Wildlife Service** | 839,604 | 950,001 | 840,212 | 831,127 | 878,121 | +38,317 |

| National Park Service | | | | | |
| Operation of the national park system | 1,285,604 | 1,266,627 | 1,347,307 | 1,355,176 | 1,365,059 | +79,455 |
| Emergency appropriations | 2,320 | | | | | -2,320 |
| National recreation and preservation | 46,225 | 48,336 | 48,449 | 51,451 | 53,599 | +7,047 |
| Historic preservation fund | 72,412 | 60,512 | 46,712 | 42,412 | 75,212 | +12,700 |
| Construction | 226,058 | 154,000 | 169,856 | 223,153 | 225,493 | -565 |
| Emergency appropriations | 13,680 | | | | | -13,680 |
| Land and water conservation fund (reduction of contract authority) | -30,000 | -20,000 | -30,000 | -30,000 | -30,000 | -30,000 |
| Land acquisition and state assistance | 147,925 | 172,468 | 132,000 | 107,755 | 130,700 | -27,255 |
| Conservation grants and planning assistance | 200,000 | | | | | -200,000 |
| Urban park and recreation fund | 4,000 | | | | | -4,000 |
| **Total, National Park Service (net)** | 1,754,224 | 2,056,943 | 1,755,204 | 1,749,617 | 1,810,363 | +46,319 |

| United States Geological Survey | | | | | |
| Surveys, investigations, and research | 797,896 | 838,468 | 820,444 | 813,063 | 823,533 | +25,490 |
| Emergency appropriations | 1,000 | | | | | -1,000 |

| Minerals Management Service | | | | | |
| Royalty and offshore minerals management | 217,902 | 234,062 | 234,082 | 234,882 | 234,882 | +6,999 |
| Additions to receipts | -130,000 | -124,000 | -124,000 | -124,000 | -124,000 | -30,000 |
| Oil spill research | 6,118 | 6,118 | 6,118 | 6,118 | 6,118 | +000 |
| **Total, Minerals Management Service** | 124,024 | 116,200 | 116,200 | 116,200 | 116,800 | -6,076 |

| Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement | | | | | |
| Regulation and technology | 93,078 | 94,391 | 95,693 | 95,693 | 95,693 | +2,613 |
| Receipts from performance bond forfeitures (indefinite) | 275 | 275 | 275 | 275 | 275 | - |
| **Subtotal** | 93,353 | 94,666 | 95,968 | 96,968 | 96,968 | +2,613 |
| Abandoned mine reclamation fund (definite, trust fund) | 185,416 | 211,158 | 196,458 | 185,858 | 196,208 | +1,050 |
| **Total, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement** | 278,769 | 305,824 | 292,426 | 281,242 | 292,374 | +13,050 |

| Bureau of Indian Affairs | | | | | |
| Operation of Indian programs | 1,584,124 | 1,684,387 | 1,631,050 | 1,633,296 | 1,670,444 | +47,047 |
| Construction | 123,421 | 174,258 | 126,023 | 148,884 | 189,864 | +46,463 |
| Indian land and water claim settlements and miscellaneous payments to Indians | 28,882 | 28,401 | 25,901 | 27,131 | 27,256 | -1,198 |
| Indian guaranteed loan program account | 5,001 | 5,008 | 5,008 | 5,004 | 5,004 | +004 |
| [Limitation on guaranteed loans] | (59,662) | (59,662) | (59,662) | (59,662) | (59,662) | - |
| [Indian land consolidation pilot program] | 5,000 | | | | | -5,000 |
| **Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs** | 1,746,426 | 1,902,054 | 1,787,862 | 1,812,315 | 1,872,592 | +12,164 |
### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES

**APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000—continued**

(Amounts in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 1999</th>
<th>FY 2000</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference</th>
<th>Conference vs. enacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enacted</td>
<td>Request</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Insular Affairs:
- Assistance to Territories: 38,455
- Northern Marianas Islands Covenant: 27,720
- Subtotal, Assistance to Territories: 66,175
- Compact of Free Association: 8,930
- Mandatory payments: 12,000
- Subtotal, Compact of Free Association: 20,930
- Total, Insular Affairs: 87,105

#### Departmental management:
- Y2K conversion (emergency appropriations): 80,347
- Office of the Solicitor: 36,784
- Office of Inspector General: 25,486
- Office of the Special Trustee for American Indians: 61,269
- Indian land consolidation pilot: 10,000
- Natural resource damage assessment fund: 4,492
- Glacier Bay fishing (emergency appropriations): 26,000
- Total, Departmental Offices: 394,199

#### Total, Title I, Department of the Interior:
- New budget (obligational) authority (net): 7,130,235
- Appropriations: (6,999,276)
- Emergency appropriations: (180,959)
- Recissions: (30,000)
- Limitation on guaranteed loans: (50,662)
- Total, Title I: 52,912

#### TITLE II - RELATED AGENCIES

### DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

#### Forest Service:
- Forest and rangeland research: 197,444
- State and private forestry: 170,722
- National forest system: 1,266,570
- Wildland fire management: 560,176
- Emergency appropriations: 102,000
- Land acquisition: 117,918
- Acquisition of lands for national forests special acts: 1,069
- Acquisition of lands to complete land exchanges (indefinite): 210
- Range betterment fund: 3,200
- Gifts, donations and requests for forest and rangeland research: 92
- Total, Forest Service: 2,757,464

#### DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

- Clean coal technology:
  - Deferral: 40,000
  - Biomass energy development (by transfer): 348,065
  - Alternative fuels production (indefinite): 1,300
  - Naval petroleum and oil shale reserves: 14,000
  - Energy conservation: 681,701
  - Biomass energy development (by transfer): 1,801
  - Strategic petroleum reserve: 190,120
  - Energy Information Administration: 70,500
  - Total, Department of Energy: 1,316,878

#### Total, Appropriations (net):
- FY 1999: 1,316,878
- FY 2000: 1,247,967
### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES

#### APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000—continued

(Amounts in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department of Health and Human Services</th>
<th>FY 1999 Enacted</th>
<th>FY 2000 Request</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference</th>
<th>Conference vs enacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indian Health Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Health Services</td>
<td>1,950,322</td>
<td>2,084,822</td>
<td>2,085,407</td>
<td>2,138,001</td>
<td>2,075,967</td>
<td>+128,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian health facilities</td>
<td>291,366</td>
<td>317,465</td>
<td>312,476</td>
<td>198,252</td>
<td>318,580</td>
<td>+26,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Indian Health Service</td>
<td>2,241,688</td>
<td>2,402,287</td>
<td>2,397,885</td>
<td>2,336,253</td>
<td>2,394,547</td>
<td>+155,260</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### OTHER RELATED AGENCIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of American Indian and Alaska</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Culture and Arts Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment to the Institute</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Smithsonian Institution

| Construction and Improvements, National Zoological Park | 4,400           | 4,400           | 4,400   | 4,400   | 4,400   | -4,400               |
| Repair and restoration of buildings       | 40,000          | 47,900          | 47,900  | 35,000  | 47,900  | +7,000               |
| Construction                               | 10,000          | 10,000          | 10,000  | 10,000  | 10,000  | -3,000               |
| Y2K conversion (emergency appropriations) | 4,700           |                |        |        |        | -4,700               |
| Total, Smithsonian Institution            | 412,254         | 447,401         | 438,401 | 425,462 | 438,801 | +27,547              |

#### National Gallery of Art

| Salaries and expenses                     | 57,936          | 61,436          | 61,538  | 61,436  | 61,538  | +3,600               |
| Repair, restoration and renovation of buildings | 6,311           | 6,311           | 6,311   | 6,311   | 6,311   |                      |
| Y2K conversion (emergency appropriations) | 101             |                |        |        |        | -101                |
| Total, National Gallery of Art            | 64,350          | 67,749          | 67,849  | 67,749  | 67,849  | +3,496               |

#### John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts

| Operations and maintenance                | 12,157          | 14,000          | 12,441  | 14,000  | 14,000  | +1,813               |
| Construction                               | 20,000          | 20,000          | 20,000  | 20,000  | 20,000  |                      |
| Total, John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts | 32,157          | 34,000          | 32,441  | 34,000  | 34,000  | +1,813               |

#### Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars

| Salaries and expenses                     | 5,840           | 6,040           | 7,040   | 6,040   | 6,790   | +950                 |

#### National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities

| National Endowment for the Arts          |
| Grants and administration                | 83,500          | 137,000         | 83,500  | 90,000  | 85,000  | +1,500               |
| Matching grants                          | 14,500          | 13,000          | 14,500  | 13,000  | 13,000  | -1,500               |
| Total, National Endowment for the Arts   | 98,000          | 150,000         | 98,000  | 103,000 | 98,000  |                     |

#### National Endowment for the Humanities

| Grants and administration                | 96,800          | 129,600         | 96,800  | 101,000 | 101,000 | +4,200               |
| Matching grants                          | 13,500          | 13,500          | 13,500  | 14,700  | 14,700  | +300                 |
| Total, National Endowment for the Humanities | 110,300         | 150,000         | 110,300 | 115,700 | 115,700 | +5,500               |

#### Institute of Museum and Library Services/Office of Museum Services

| Grants and administration                | 23,405          | 34,000          | 24,400  | 23,905  | 24,400  | +905                 |
| Total, National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities | 232,105         | 334,000         | 233,100 | 242,605 | 238,100 | +5,995               |

#### Commission of Fine Arts

| Salaries and expenses                     | 988             | 1,078           | 935     | 1,078   | 1,005   | +107                 |

#### National Capital Arts and Cultural Affairs

| Grants                                    | 7,000           | 6,000           | 7,000   | 7,000   | 7,000   |                     |
| Advisory Council on Historic Preservation | 2,000           | 3,000           | 3,000   | 2,906   | 3,000   | +200                 |

#### National Capital Planning Commission

| Salaries and expenses                     | 5,954           | 6,312           | 6,312   | 6,312   | 6,312   | +358                 |
| Y2K conversion (emergency appropriations) | 381             |                |        |        |        | -381                 |
### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES

**APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 — continued**

(Amounts in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 1999</th>
<th>FY 2000</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference</th>
<th>Conference vs. enacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>United States Holocaust Memorial Council</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holocaust Memorial Council</td>
<td>30,107</td>
<td>33,788</td>
<td>33,286</td>
<td>33,286</td>
<td>33,286</td>
<td>+1,179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y2K conversion (emergency appropriations)</td>
<td>900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency appropriations</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, United States Holocaust Memorial Council</strong></td>
<td>35,007</td>
<td>33,788</td>
<td>33,286</td>
<td>33,286</td>
<td>33,286</td>
<td>-1,721</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Presidio Trust**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 1999</th>
<th>FY 2000</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference</th>
<th>Conference vs. enacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presidio trust fund</td>
<td>34,913</td>
<td>44,400</td>
<td>44,400</td>
<td>44,400</td>
<td>44,400</td>
<td>+9,487</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total, title II, related agencies**

| New budget (obligational) authority (net) | 7,167,566 | 7,497,207 | 6,851,705 | 6,993,037 | 7,312,391 | +144,823 |
| Appropriations | (7,091,875) | (7,063,207) | (7,107,705) | (7,049,037) | (7,376,391) | (-296,516) |
| Emergency appropriations | (115,693) | (90,000) | (90,000) | (90,000) | (90,000) | (-25,683) |
| Deferral | (40,000) | (20,000) | (20,000) | (20,000) | (20,000) | (-10,000) |
| By transfer | (40,000) | (40,000) | (40,000) | (40,000) | (40,000) | (-10,000) |
| **TITLE III** | | | | | | |
| Across-the-board cut in Floor action | -69,000 | -45,000 | |

**United Mine Workers of America combined benefit fund (emergency appropriations)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 1999</th>
<th>FY 2000</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference</th>
<th>Conference vs. enacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68,000</td>
<td>68,000</td>
<td>68,000</td>
<td>68,000</td>
<td>68,000</td>
<td>+68,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TITLE VI**

**Priority land acquisitions and exchanges**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 1999</th>
<th>FY 2000</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference</th>
<th>Conference vs. enacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>197,500</td>
<td>197,500</td>
<td>197,500</td>
<td>197,500</td>
<td>197,500</td>
<td>+197,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TITLE VII**

**DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**

| Bureau of Land Management | 1,183,895 | 1,268,700 | 1,230,262 | 1,218,699 | 1,236,150 | +52,255 |
| United States Fish and Wildlife Service | 836,804 | 950,001 | 840,212 | 831,197 | 878,121 | +38,317 |
| National Park Service | 1,764,224 | 2,058,493 | 1,756,324 | 1,740,917 | 1,810,363 | +45,433 |
| United States Geological Survey | 798,996 | 936,485 | 820,444 | 813,093 | 825,833 | +23,583 |
| Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement | 278,768 | 305,824 | 284,262 | 281,824 | 292,374 | +13,500 |
| Bureau of Indian Affairs | 1,746,426 | 1,902,054 | 1,797,982 | 1,812,315 | 1,872,892 | +120,494 |
| Departmental Offices | 394,199 | 326,723 | 306,024 | 296,928 | 320,287 | -73,912 |
| **Total, Title I - Department of the Interior** | 7,130,235 | 7,786,930 | 7,151,904 | 7,120,573 | 7,350,520 | +220,265 |

**TITLE VIII**

**RELATED AGENCIES**

| Forest Service | 2,757,464 | 2,912,645 | 2,603,868 | 2,671,404 | 2,831,265 | +73,801 |
| Department of Energy | 1,216,876 | 1,170,159 | 982,758 | 1,011,292 | 1,191,511 | +124,967 |
| Indian Health Service | 2,242,287 | 2,412,367 | 2,397,695 | 2,321,253 | 2,397,547 | +85,290 |
| Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation | 13,000 | 14,000 | 13,400 | 8,000 | 8,000 | -6,000 |
| Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development | 4,250 | 4,250 | 4,250 | 2,125 | 2,125 | -2,125 |
| Smithsonian Institution | 412,254 | 447,401 | 436,401 | 425,462 | 439,801 | +24,347 |
| National Gallery of Art | 64,350 | 67,749 | 67,649 | 67,649 | 67,649 | +3,499 |
| John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts | 32,187 | 34,000 | 36,411 | 34,000 | 34,000 | +1,813 |
| Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars | 5,840 | 6,040 | 7,040 | 5,040 | 7,900 | +2,900 |
| National Endowment for the Arts | 90,000 | 150,000 | 90,000 | 103,000 | 98,000 | -5,000 |
| National Endowment for the Humanities | 110,700 | 150,000 | 115,700 | 115,700 | 115,700 | +5,000 |
| Institute of Museum and Library Services | 23,405 | 34,000 | 24,400 | 23,905 | 24,400 | +905 |
| Commission of Fine Arts | 686 | 1,078 | 923 | 1,078 | 1,025 | +107 |
| National Capital Arts and Cultural Affairs | 7,000 | 6,000 | 7,000 | 7,000 | 7,000 | +100 |
| Advisory Council on Historic Preservation | 2,800 | 3,000 | 3,000 | 2,906 | 3,000 | +94 |
| National Capital Planning Commission | 6,339 | 6,312 | 5,312 | 5,312 | 6,312 | -23 |
| Holocaust Memorial Council | 7,957 | 33,798 | 33,286 | 33,296 | 33,296 | -1,712 |
| Presidio Trust | 34,913 | 44,400 | 44,400 | 44,400 | 44,400 | +9,487 |
| **Total, Title II - Related Agencies** | 7,167,566 | 7,497,207 | 6,851,705 | 6,993,037 | 7,312,391 | +144,823 |

**TITLE III**

Across-the-board cut in Floor action | -69,000 | -45,000 | |

**TITLE V**

**United Mine Workers of America combined benefit fund (emergency appropriations)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 1999</th>
<th>FY 2000</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference</th>
<th>Conference vs. enacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>68,000</td>
<td>68,000</td>
<td>68,000</td>
<td>68,000</td>
<td>68,000</td>
<td>+68,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES
#### Appropriations Bill, 2000—continued

(Amounts in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE VI</th>
<th>FY 1999 Enacted</th>
<th>FY 2000 Request</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference</th>
<th>Conference vs. enacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority land acquisitions and exchanges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>197,500</td>
<td>+197,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand total</td>
<td>14,297,803</td>
<td>15,266,137</td>
<td>13,934,609</td>
<td>14,055,710</td>
<td>14,928,411</td>
<td>+630,808</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), a member of the committee.

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

Yes, my colleagues, there is good news in this bill; but there is a strong commitment to the education of our young people, there is a significant increase to Title X, America's family planning program, and there is desperately needed relief for hospitals, which have been struggling with budget cuts.

The bill demonstrates our ongoing support for a secure and lasting peace in the Middle East. The Wye River package will help bolster Israel's security and provide the momentum needed to carry both parties through this delicate period in the peace process.

The bill also fulfills our obligation to pay our U.N. arrears. I have fought hard with my colleagues to make this a reality, but my enthusiasm has been dampened by the dangerous family planning restrictions that have rolled out by the majority in return for these critical dues. The restrictions are unreasonable and irresponsible, and my colleagues can be sure I will fight to ensure that they are never again codified in U.S. law.

I am also very disturbed that Federal employees' access to contraceptive coverage has been damaged in this bill. The majority has modified the provisions which the President just signed into law only 2 months ago to dramatically expand the number of individuals who can opt out of providing contraceptives. My colleagues, this is sneaky politics, and it is bad policy.

I want to make it clear today that I will not rest in my efforts to ensure that Americans have true access to family planning services. We cannot continue to let a few extremists hold good public policy hostage to their narrow agenda.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to engage the majority leader in a colloquy regarding the satellite legislation which has been added to this omnibus bill.

As the majority leader is aware, I have been working for some time with my colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BOUCHER), and many others, to pass legislation that will reauthorize the compulsory license for satellite broadcasts and encourage the development of technology that will deliver local network signals to satellite owners.

We passed the Satellite Home Viewer Act reauthorization earlier this year with overwhelming bipartisan support and engaged the other body in a lengthy and difficult conference. The conference report was filed and passed last week in the House by a vote of 412 to 8. Few bills of this magnitude have passed by such a wide margin. Included in this conference report was important language supported unanimously by the conferees to ensure that rural Americans are not left behind as this new local-into-local technology is rolled out by the satellite companies.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill.

Today, America's seniors will be able to breathe easier and worry less about their health care. Why? Because with the passage of the Medicare Balanced Budget Refinement Act of 1999, health care providers who have been struggling under the burden of money-saving regulations imposed in 1997 will now be getting some much-needed relief.

For several years Medicare Providers have been caring for Medicare patients day in and day out of pocket payments that are not adequate to cover their costs. In my district, for example, the Sylvester Cancer Hospital was losing approximately $700,000 a year caring for Medicare cancer patients. Until now, this bill will give cancer hospitals the opportunity to break even. Hospices, which care for the most vulnerable Medicare patients will also benefit. They will get the help they need to provide the newest medications to comfort their patients.

In the last year I have worked with Chairman Thomas Davis, who I want to thank for his efforts in addressing the many concerns that have been brought to my attention by Medicare providers and beneficiaries in my district. The result of that work is this bill. While it doesn't provide all the Medicare fixes that are needed—it does address the most urgent needs immediately.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. BOUCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) so that the gentlemen might continue their colloquy.

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

Mr. BOUCHER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the supporters of this legislation understand that along with this agreement comes a commitment from our leadership to work to pass this legislation early next year, and if the gentleman will yield to him, the majority leader will clarify the details of this commitment.

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

Mr. BOUCHER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARMEEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to congratulate the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) on his hard work on this important issue. I share the gentleman's commitment to ensuring that rural Americans can receive their network signals over satellite.

The Satellite Home Viewer Act conference report, which included the loan guarantee language, was supported by myself and the majority of both parties in the House. I share the gentleman's concern that time constraints prevented the conference report from being enacted as it passed the House; however, I appreciate the gentleman's willingness to reach an agreement that will ensure passage of the rest of this satellite legislation that is so important to satellite subscribers.
To address my good friend’s concern, I commit to the gentleman from Virginia that we will move rural satellite loan guarantee legislation through the House early next year. It is my hope that the relevant committees of jurisdiction will engage in a full debate and discussion of the merits of this loan guarantee package and move appropriate legislation forward expeditiously.

However, if for whatever reason such legislation is not ready for floor consideration in the House under regular order by early spring, I further commit that I will allow the gentleman from Virginia an opportunity to have an up or down floor vote by March 31, 2000, on the rural loan guarantee program, similar to that which appeared in the Satellite Home Viewer Act conference report which passed in the House.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. BOUCHER, yield?

Mr. BOUCHER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished majority leader for his support and commitment to scheduling floor time for this important legislation by April of next year.

Am I to understand that the legislation to be scheduled for a vote will authorize a level of appropriations that is both sufficient to accomplish such a program and at least $1.2 billion?

Mr. ARMED. If the gentleman will continue to yield, it is my understanding that is consistent with the language in the Satellite Home Viewer Act conference report; that is correct.

Mr. GOODLATTE. It is also my understanding that the Senate leadership has made a similar commitment to floor consideration by a time certain next year.

Mr. ARMED. That is also my understanding, yes.

In addition, I will commit to placing time limits on the referral of the legislation to committees in such a way that causes the legislation to be discharged by all relevant committees by the March 31 deadline, and I will work with the Speaker on committee referrals and understand that he shares my commitment to this timetable.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his courtesy.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, this bill contains a victory for the American agenda. In my portion of the bill there is extra money for disasters through the disaster loan program in SBA. We fully fund the year 2000 census, every penny that is needed; we increase the drug and crime funding, FBI, DEA and local law enforcement block grants, as well as the COPS program of the President, which is fully funded at less than half of what he requested; and there is embassy security money here to beef up the security for our personnel serving overseas in our embassies.

But most importantly to me is a final vindication in this bill of an effort started by this subcommittee many years ago to reform the U.N. Along with the monies in the bill to fully pay the U.N. arrears payments of the U.S., there are conditions which the U.N. must agree to. This subcommittee several years ago began what now has become a full-blown U.N. reform agenda which now requires the U.N. to consider our payments of arrearages to be payment in full, reduces the rate of U.S. contributions to the U.N. from 25 to 22 percent for the annual assessment, plus a reduction from 31 to 25 percent for the peacekeeping rate of contributions, requires the U.N. to live with a zero-growth budget, requires personnel reforms at the U.N., opens their books to GAO scrutiny, requires IGs, inspectors general, in the affiliated organizations of the U.N., like the ILO, the WHO, and the FAO, and gives the U.S. a voice on the budget committee of the U.N., among other reforms. This is an effort that now is vindicated.

This subcommittee led the way many years ago. It gained a head of steam, and it has been a rough and rocky road; but now we can say that with these payments of the arrearages to the U.N. comes the conditions of reform in the U.N. that will make the U.N. a better agency for all of us.

I would like, at this point, to insert into the Record a table detailing the funding for the Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary section of the bill.
## DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES

### APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000

(Amounts in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 1999</th>
<th>FY 2000</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference</th>
<th>vs. enacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enacted</td>
<td>Request</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

#### General Administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>FY 1999</th>
<th>FY 2000</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enacted</td>
<td>Request</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>75,328</td>
<td>87,534</td>
<td>79,328</td>
<td>82,485</td>
<td>79,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint automated booking system</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>+1,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrowband communications</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>10,925</td>
<td>+10,925</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By transfer</td>
<td>101,434</td>
<td>(92,545)</td>
<td>-92,545</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counterterrorism fund</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>+17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st Responder grants</td>
<td>135,000</td>
<td>135,000</td>
<td>135,000</td>
<td>135,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunications carrier compliance fund</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>+2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense function</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>+8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative review and appeals</td>
<td>75,312</td>
<td>89,901</td>
<td>64,200</td>
<td>30,727</td>
<td>98,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct appropriation</td>
<td>59,251</td>
<td>59,251</td>
<td>50,963</td>
<td>59,251</td>
<td>50,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime trust fund</td>
<td>34,175</td>
<td>45,021</td>
<td>42,475</td>
<td>32,049</td>
<td>40,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Administrative review and appeals</td>
<td>134,563</td>
<td>149,152</td>
<td>134,563</td>
<td>89,978</td>
<td>146,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Inspector General</td>
<td>393,066</td>
<td>403,707</td>
<td>281,366</td>
<td>272,512</td>
<td>305,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriations</td>
<td>(333,815)</td>
<td>(344,456)</td>
<td>(231,003)</td>
<td>(213,291)</td>
<td>(255,164)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime trust fund</td>
<td>(59,251)</td>
<td>(59,251)</td>
<td>(50,963)</td>
<td>(59,251)</td>
<td>(50,363)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Parole Commission</td>
<td>7,380</td>
<td>8,527</td>
<td>7,380</td>
<td>7,176</td>
<td>8,527</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Legal Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>FY 1999</th>
<th>FY 2000</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enacted</td>
<td>Request</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General legal activities</td>
<td>466,540</td>
<td>566,316</td>
<td>355,691</td>
<td>299,250</td>
<td>357,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct appropriation</td>
<td>8,180</td>
<td>8,556</td>
<td>147,929</td>
<td>185,740</td>
<td>147,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime trust fund</td>
<td>4,028</td>
<td>4,242</td>
<td>3,424</td>
<td>4,028</td>
<td>4,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, General legal activities</td>
<td>474,700</td>
<td>576,871</td>
<td>503,620</td>
<td>485,000</td>
<td>504,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaccine injury compensation trust fund (permanent)</td>
<td>58,267</td>
<td>114,373</td>
<td>105,167</td>
<td>112,318</td>
<td>110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antitrust Division</td>
<td>-30,000</td>
<td>-47,759</td>
<td>-47,759</td>
<td>-28,150</td>
<td>+1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offsetting fee collections - carryover</td>
<td>-66,275</td>
<td>-56,574</td>
<td>-57,366</td>
<td>-112,318</td>
<td>-81,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Attorneys</td>
<td>1,009,253</td>
<td>1,217,788</td>
<td>1,161,957</td>
<td>589,476</td>
<td>1,161,957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct appropriation</td>
<td>60,998</td>
<td>57,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>-60,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime trust fund</td>
<td>1,089,951</td>
<td>1,274,788</td>
<td>1,161,957</td>
<td>1,089,476</td>
<td>1,161,957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current year fee funding</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>-6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, United States Attorneys</td>
<td>114,248</td>
<td>181,329</td>
<td>114,248</td>
<td>112,775</td>
<td>112,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offsetting fee collections - legislative proposal</td>
<td>-32,000</td>
<td>-6,000</td>
<td>-6,000</td>
<td>-6,000</td>
<td>-6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, US trustee offsetting fee collections</td>
<td>-114,248</td>
<td>-161,239</td>
<td>-114,248</td>
<td>-112,775</td>
<td>-112,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Claims Settlement Commission</td>
<td>1,227</td>
<td>1,175</td>
<td>1,175</td>
<td>1,175</td>
<td>1,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Marshals Service</td>
<td>476,356</td>
<td>543,380</td>
<td>326,289</td>
<td>409,253</td>
<td>333,745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct appropriation</td>
<td>25,553</td>
<td>26,210</td>
<td>209,620</td>
<td>138,000</td>
<td>209,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime trust fund</td>
<td>-4,000</td>
<td>-8,932</td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>9,632</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, United States Marshals Service</td>
<td>456,590</td>
<td>572,422</td>
<td>543,509</td>
<td>565,885</td>
<td>549,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal prisoner detention</td>
<td>425,000</td>
<td>550,292</td>
<td>525,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>525,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees and expenses of witnesses</td>
<td>95,000</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>95,000</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>95,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations Service</td>
<td>7,199</td>
<td>10,344</td>
<td>7,199</td>
<td>7,199</td>
<td>7,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assets forfeiture fund</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Legal activities</td>
<td>2,626,806</td>
<td>3,128,860</td>
<td>2,840,844</td>
<td>2,785,765</td>
<td>2,871,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriations</td>
<td>(2,512,195)</td>
<td>(2,037,095)</td>
<td>(2,463,335)</td>
<td>(1,962,025)</td>
<td>(2,514,120)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime trust fund</td>
<td>(114,411)</td>
<td>(91,795)</td>
<td>(57,549)</td>
<td>(823,740)</td>
<td>(557,549)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Radiation Exposure Compensation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>FY 1999</th>
<th>FY 2000</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enacted</td>
<td>Request</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative expenses</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment to radiation exposure compensation trust fund</td>
<td>21,714</td>
<td>20,300</td>
<td>2,260</td>
<td>3,260</td>
<td>+3,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>23,714</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>22,300</td>
<td>5,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 1999</td>
<td>FY 2000</td>
<td>House</td>
<td>Senate</td>
<td>Conference vs. enacted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interagency Law Enforcement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interagency crime and drug enforcement</td>
<td>304,014</td>
<td>316,792</td>
<td>304,014</td>
<td>316,792 + 12,778</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High intensity inter-state gang activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Interagency Law Enforcement</td>
<td>304,014</td>
<td>316,792</td>
<td>324,014</td>
<td>316,792 + 12,778</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal Bureau of Investigation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>2,386,230</td>
<td>2,742,676</td>
<td>2,044,542</td>
<td>2,432,781</td>
<td>2,044,542 -351,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counterintelligence and national security</td>
<td>262,473</td>
<td>260,000</td>
<td>202,473</td>
<td>260,000</td>
<td>262,473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBI Fingerprint identification</td>
<td>47,800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct appropriation</td>
<td>2,736,512</td>
<td>3,002,676</td>
<td>2,337,015</td>
<td>2,882,791</td>
<td>2,337,015 -396,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime trust fund</td>
<td>223,356</td>
<td>260,501</td>
<td>752,853</td>
<td>290,501</td>
<td>752,853 +529,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>2,959,868</td>
<td>3,283,377</td>
<td>3,089,686</td>
<td>2,973,292</td>
<td>3,089,686 +130,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>1,287</td>
<td>10,287</td>
<td>1,287</td>
<td>10,287</td>
<td>1,287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Federal Bureau of Investigation</td>
<td>2,981,115</td>
<td>3,293,664</td>
<td>3,091,155</td>
<td>2,983,579</td>
<td>3,091,155 +130,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriations</td>
<td>(2,737,799)</td>
<td>(3,013,163)</td>
<td>(2,336,302)</td>
<td>(2,703,079)</td>
<td>(2,336,302)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drug Enforcement Administration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>875,523</td>
<td>1,055,572</td>
<td>1,012,330</td>
<td>878,517</td>
<td>1,012,330 +137,607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversion control fund</td>
<td>-76,710</td>
<td>-80,300</td>
<td>-80,300</td>
<td>-80,300</td>
<td>-80,300 -3,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct appropriation</td>
<td>798,813</td>
<td>975,242</td>
<td>932,000</td>
<td>798,187</td>
<td>932,000 +134,187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime trust fund</td>
<td>405,000</td>
<td>405,000</td>
<td>344,250</td>
<td>419,459</td>
<td>343,250 -61,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>1,203,813</td>
<td>1,380,242</td>
<td>1,276,250</td>
<td>1,217,646</td>
<td>1,276,250 +72,473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>8,500 -2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Drug Enforcement Administration</td>
<td>1,211,813</td>
<td>1,388,242</td>
<td>1,284,250</td>
<td>1,223,146</td>
<td>1,281,750 +69,937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriations</td>
<td>(806,813)</td>
<td>(863,242)</td>
<td>(840,000)</td>
<td>(803,087)</td>
<td>(836,500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime trust fund</td>
<td>(405,000)</td>
<td>(405,000)</td>
<td>(344,250)</td>
<td>(419,459)</td>
<td>(343,250)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Imigration and Naturalization Service</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>1,617,269</td>
<td>2,435,628</td>
<td>1,621,041</td>
<td>1,697,164</td>
<td>1,642,440 +25,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement and border affairs</td>
<td>(1,068,754)</td>
<td>(1,900,627)</td>
<td>(1,086,030)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1,107,428)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship and benefits, immigration support and program direction</td>
<td>(547,515)</td>
<td>(535,011)</td>
<td>(535,011)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(535,011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime trust fund</td>
<td>842,490</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>1,311,225</td>
<td>873,000</td>
<td>1,267,225 +424,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, Direct and crime trust fund</td>
<td>2,456,759</td>
<td>2,935,638</td>
<td>2,932,266</td>
<td>2,570,184</td>
<td>2,909,665 +449,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee accounts:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration user fee</td>
<td>(485,071)</td>
<td>(517,800)</td>
<td>(448,151)</td>
<td>(448,151)</td>
<td>(448,151)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land border inspection fund</td>
<td>(3,273)</td>
<td>(3,273)</td>
<td>(3,273)</td>
<td>(3,273)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration examinations fund</td>
<td>(635,700)</td>
<td>(636,526)</td>
<td>(712,806)</td>
<td>(708,500)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration enforcement fines</td>
<td>(4,050)</td>
<td>(3,600)</td>
<td>(1,303)</td>
<td>(1,303)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-1b Visa fees</td>
<td>(1,125)</td>
<td>(1,125)</td>
<td>(1,125)</td>
<td>(1,125)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, Fee accounts</td>
<td>(1,306,046)</td>
<td>(1,334,799)</td>
<td>(1,285,475)</td>
<td>(1,290,165)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>99,994</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>136,900</td>
<td>99,994 +9,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriations</td>
<td>(1,707,269)</td>
<td>(2,525,302)</td>
<td>(1,711,041)</td>
<td>(1,836,128)</td>
<td>(1,742,104)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime trust fund</td>
<td>(642,490)</td>
<td>(500,000)</td>
<td>(1,311,225)</td>
<td>(873,000)</td>
<td>(1,267,225)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fee accounts</td>
<td>(1,306,046)</td>
<td>(1,334,799)</td>
<td>(1,285,475)</td>
<td>(1,290,165)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal Prison System</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>2,052,154</td>
<td>3,161,928</td>
<td>3,140,004</td>
<td>3,166,774</td>
<td>3,179,110 +226,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior year carryover</td>
<td>-90,000</td>
<td>-70,000</td>
<td>-90,000</td>
<td>-50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct appropriation</td>
<td>2,885,154</td>
<td>3,121,928</td>
<td>3,050,004</td>
<td>3,181,774</td>
<td>3,089,110 +226,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime trust fund</td>
<td>26,499</td>
<td>26,499</td>
<td>22,524</td>
<td>46,599</td>
<td>22,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal, Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>2,886,653</td>
<td>3,148,427</td>
<td>3,072,528</td>
<td>3,163,373</td>
<td>3,111,634 +222,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings and facilities</td>
<td>410,976</td>
<td>556,791</td>
<td>556,791</td>
<td>549,791</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Prison Industries, Incorporated (limitation on administrative expenses)</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,429</td>
<td>2,480</td>
<td>3,429</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Federal Prison System</td>
<td>3,302,650</td>
<td>3,710,647</td>
<td>3,631,069</td>
<td>3,716,563</td>
<td>3,671,564 +366,204</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES

#### APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 – continued

(Amounts in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 1999 Enacted</th>
<th>FY 2000 Request</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference</th>
<th>Conference vs. enacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office of Justice Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice assistance</td>
<td>147,151</td>
<td>338,648</td>
<td>217,436</td>
<td>373,092</td>
<td>307,611</td>
<td>+160,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(By transfer)</td>
<td>(7,000)</td>
<td>(7,000)</td>
<td>(7,000)</td>
<td>(7,000)</td>
<td>(7,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State and local law enforcement assistance:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct appropriations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrne grants (discretionary)</td>
<td>47,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>52,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-47,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrne grants (formula)</td>
<td>505,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local law enforcement block grants</td>
<td>525,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>525,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+525,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys and Girls clubs (earmark)</td>
<td>(40,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State prison grants</td>
<td>686,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>686,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+686,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State criminal alien assistance program</td>
<td>420,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>420,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+420,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian tribal courts grant</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, Direct appropriations</strong></td>
<td>552,000</td>
<td>1,629,500</td>
<td>552,100</td>
<td>1,834,500</td>
<td>1,082,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crime trust fund:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrne grants (formula)</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byrne grants (discretionary)</td>
<td>47,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>52,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-47,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local law enforcement block grant</td>
<td>523,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>523,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys and Girls clubs (earmark)</td>
<td>(40,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State prison grants</td>
<td>686,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>686,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+686,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State criminal alien assistance program</td>
<td>420,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>420,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+420,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian tribal courts grant</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, Crime trust fund</strong></td>
<td>2,369,950</td>
<td>1,578,500</td>
<td>1,193,450</td>
<td>1,407,450</td>
<td>1,194,450</td>
<td>-1,175,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Welfare and seed program fund</strong></td>
<td>33,500</td>
<td>33,500</td>
<td>33,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime trust fund:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community oriented policing services:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime analysis technology</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School violence</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime identification technology</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe schools initiative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upgrade criminal history records</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global criminal justice information network</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State prison grants</td>
<td>620,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>620,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State criminal alien assistance program</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, Direct appropriations</strong></td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>223,000</td>
<td>165,000</td>
<td>550,000</td>
<td>+550,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crime trust fund:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring program 3)</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
<td>1,400,000</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>+1,355,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police corps 3)</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community prosecutors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal, Crime trust fund</strong></td>
<td>1,430,000</td>
<td>1,175,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>+1,385,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Community oriented policing services:</strong></td>
<td>1,430,000</td>
<td>1,275,000</td>
<td>268,000</td>
<td>335,000</td>
<td>595,000</td>
<td>-635,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile justice programs</td>
<td>284,597</td>
<td>284,597</td>
<td>286,597</td>
<td>302,597</td>
<td>287,097</td>
<td>+2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe school initiative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES
#### APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 — continued

(Amounts in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>FY 1999 Enacted</th>
<th>FY 2000 Request</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference vs. enacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public safety officers benefits program:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death benefits</td>
<td>31,609</td>
<td>32,541</td>
<td>32,541</td>
<td>32,541</td>
<td>+732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability benefits</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Public safety officers benefits program</td>
<td>31,609</td>
<td>36,041</td>
<td>32,541</td>
<td>36,041</td>
<td>32,541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Office of Justice Programs</strong></td>
<td>4,849,007</td>
<td>3,550,286</td>
<td>3,661,024</td>
<td>3,056,280</td>
<td>3,084,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriations</td>
<td>(1,049,057)</td>
<td>(763,286)</td>
<td>(2,422,574)</td>
<td>(1,508,830)</td>
<td>(2,845,249)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime trust fund</td>
<td>(3,799,950)</td>
<td>(2,787,000)</td>
<td>(1,238,450)</td>
<td>(1,547,450)</td>
<td>(1,239,450)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Provisions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Pricing level adjustments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-2,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title II: DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRADE AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the United States Trade Representative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>24,200</td>
<td>26,501</td>
<td>25,205</td>
<td>26,067</td>
<td>25,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 106-31)</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>International Trade Commission</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>44,465</td>
<td>47,300</td>
<td>44,495</td>
<td>45,700</td>
<td>44,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Related agencies</strong></td>
<td>69,995</td>
<td>73,701</td>
<td>69,700</td>
<td>71,767</td>
<td>70,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>International Trade Administration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations and administration</td>
<td>284,664</td>
<td>305,431</td>
<td>295,236</td>
<td>308,344</td>
<td>308,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offsetting fee collections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct appropriation</strong></td>
<td>284,664</td>
<td>305,431</td>
<td>295,236</td>
<td>308,344</td>
<td>308,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Export Administration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations and administration</td>
<td>50,454</td>
<td>58,758</td>
<td>47,650</td>
<td>54,054</td>
<td>52,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIN enforcement</td>
<td>1,877</td>
<td>1,877</td>
<td>1,877</td>
<td>1,877</td>
<td>1,877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Export Administration</strong></td>
<td>52,331</td>
<td>60,635</td>
<td>49,527</td>
<td>55,931</td>
<td>54,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Development Administration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic development assistance programs</td>
<td>368,379</td>
<td>364,379</td>
<td>364,379</td>
<td>203,379</td>
<td>361,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salaries and expenses</strong></td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>28,971</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>24,937</td>
<td>26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Economic Development Administration</strong></td>
<td>392,379</td>
<td>393,350</td>
<td>388,379</td>
<td>228,316</td>
<td>386,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Minority Business Development Agency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority business development</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>27,827</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>27,827</td>
<td>27,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Trade and Infrastructure Development</strong></td>
<td>826,369</td>
<td>860,564</td>
<td>829,452</td>
<td>691,385</td>
<td>848,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ECONOMIC AND INFORMATION INFRASTRUCTURE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic and Statistical Analysis</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>55,158</td>
<td>48,499</td>
<td>51,158</td>
<td>48,499</td>
<td>+1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bureau of the Census</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>136,147</td>
<td>150,944</td>
<td>136,147</td>
<td>150,944</td>
<td>140,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodic censuses and programs</td>
<td>1,186,902</td>
<td>4,637,754</td>
<td>142,350</td>
<td>2,914,754</td>
<td>142,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 106-31)</td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-44,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emergency appropriations</strong></td>
<td>4,476,253</td>
<td>4,476,253</td>
<td>4,476,253</td>
<td>4,476,253</td>
<td>4,476,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Bureau of the Census</strong></td>
<td>1,367,949</td>
<td>4,764,698</td>
<td>4,754,720</td>
<td>3,071,698</td>
<td>4,758,573</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES
APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000—continued
(Amounts in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Telecommunications and Information Administration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses........................................... 10,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public telecommunications facilities, planning and construction... 21,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance appropriations, FY 2001 - 2003............................ 299,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information infrastructure grants................................. 18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, National Telecommunications and Information Administration... 49,940</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patent and Trademark Office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current year fee funding.......................................... 643,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior year fee funding............................................... 71,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal.............................................................. 663,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative proposal fees........................................... 102,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Patent and Trademark Office................................ (765,928)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total, Economic and Information Infrastructure.............................. 1,466,378 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technology Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Secretary for Technology/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Technology Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses............................................... 9,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Institute of Standards and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific and technical research and services......................... 280,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial technology services....................................... 310,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTIS revolving fund.................................................. 2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, National Institute of Standards and Technology.................. 647,150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operations, research, and facilities............... 1,581,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct appropriation.............................................. 1,581,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(By transfer from Coastal zone management)............. 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Operations, research and facilities............. 1,581,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement, acquisition and construction.............. 564,877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific coastal salmon recovery.............................. 4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal zone management fund................................. 4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishermen's contingency fund................................. 953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign fishing observer fund......................... 189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisheries finance program account....................... 336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration .... 2,167,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriations...................................................... 2,167,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance appropriations............................................. (2,167,881)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Science and Technology................................. 2,824,526</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES

#### APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000—continued

(Amounts in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 1999 Enacted</th>
<th>FY 2000 Request</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference</th>
<th>Conference vs. enacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>34,046</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>34,046</td>
<td>31,500</td>
<td>+1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21,000</td>
<td>23,454</td>
<td>22,000</td>
<td>17,900</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>-1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51,000</td>
<td>57,500</td>
<td>52,000</td>
<td>51,048</td>
<td>51,500</td>
<td>+500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,098,279</td>
<td>14,860,528</td>
<td>8,007,153</td>
<td>7,160,943</td>
<td>8,499,308</td>
<td>+3,551,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5,199,279)</td>
<td>(8,019,370)</td>
<td>(3,532,097)</td>
<td>(7,160,943)</td>
<td>(4,174,242)</td>
<td>(-495,237)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recissions</td>
<td>(-71,000)</td>
<td>(-1,187)</td>
<td>(-1,187)</td>
<td>(-1,187)</td>
<td>(-1,187)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,188,274</td>
<td>14,754,229</td>
<td>8,076,863</td>
<td>7,232,710</td>
<td>8,719,438</td>
<td>+3,551,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5,293,274)</td>
<td>(9,093,071)</td>
<td>(3,201,797)</td>
<td>(7,232,710)</td>
<td>(4,244,372)</td>
<td>(-684,905)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recissions</td>
<td>(-71,000)</td>
<td>(-1,187)</td>
<td>(-1,187)</td>
<td>(-1,187)</td>
<td>(-1,187)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By transfer</td>
<td>(83,361)</td>
<td>(64,926)</td>
<td>(67,228)</td>
<td>(86,426)</td>
<td>(88,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4,618)</td>
<td>(4,618)</td>
<td>(4,618)</td>
<td>(4,618)</td>
<td>(4,618)</td>
<td>(4,618)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### TITLE II - THE JUDICIARY

**Supreme Court of the United States**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salaries and expenses:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries of justices:</td>
<td>1,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other salaries and expenses:</td>
<td>29,369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplemental appropriations (P.L. 106-31):</td>
<td>921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Salaries and expenses:</td>
<td>31,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care of the building and grounds:</td>
<td>5,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Supreme Court of the United States:</td>
<td>37,280</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salaries and expenses:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries of judges:</td>
<td>1,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other salaries and expenses:</td>
<td>14,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Salaries and expenses:</td>
<td>16,101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**United States Court of International Trade**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salaries and expenses:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries of judges:</td>
<td>1,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other salaries and expenses:</td>
<td>10,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Salaries and expenses:</td>
<td>11,804</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salaries and expenses:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries of judges and bankruptcy judges:</td>
<td>238,329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other salaries and expenses:</td>
<td>2,563,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct appropriation:</td>
<td>2,821,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime trust fund:</td>
<td>10,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Salaries and expenses:</td>
<td>2,831,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaccine Injury Compensation Trust Fund:</td>
<td>2,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defender services:</td>
<td>360,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime trust fund:</td>
<td>30,879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees of jurors and commissioners:</td>
<td>66,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court security:</td>
<td>174,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Courts of Appeals, District Courts, and Other Judicial Services:</td>
<td>3,467,781</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Administrative Office of the United States Courts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Salaries and expenses:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal Judicial Center:</td>
<td>17,716</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
## DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES
### APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 – continued

**(Amounts in thousands)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 1999 Enacted</th>
<th>FY 2000 Request</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference</th>
<th>Conference vs. enacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Judicial Retirement Funds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment to Judiciary Trust Funds</td>
<td>37,300</td>
<td>39,700</td>
<td>39,700</td>
<td>39,700</td>
<td>39,700</td>
<td>+2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Sentencing Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>9,487</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>9,743</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>-987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Provisions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges pay/raise (sec. 304)</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>9,811</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,611</td>
<td>+9,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, title III, the Judiciary</strong></td>
<td>3,852,040</td>
<td>4,163,972</td>
<td>3,900,273</td>
<td>3,813,885</td>
<td>3,959,292</td>
<td>+307,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriations</td>
<td>(3,611,006)</td>
<td>(4,067,972)</td>
<td>(3,711,467)</td>
<td>(3,713,885)</td>
<td>(3,776,506)</td>
<td>(+168,500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime trust fund</td>
<td>(41,043)</td>
<td>(66,000)</td>
<td>(182,796)</td>
<td>(100,000)</td>
<td>(182,796)</td>
<td>(+1,141,743)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Administration of Foreign Affairs</strong></td>
<td>1,644,300</td>
<td>2,836,934</td>
<td>2,472,825</td>
<td>2,671,429</td>
<td>2,569,825</td>
<td>+1,178,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worldwide security upgrade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>254,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>254,000</td>
<td>+254,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Diplomatic and consular programs</strong></td>
<td>1,644,300</td>
<td>2,836,934</td>
<td>2,726,825</td>
<td>2,671,429</td>
<td>2,569,825</td>
<td>+1,178,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>356,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>-356,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Inspector General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27,495</td>
<td></td>
<td>30,054</td>
<td>-2,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational and cultural exchange programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>210,329</td>
<td></td>
<td>176,000</td>
<td>+34,329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation allowances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,250</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,850</td>
<td>-1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection of foreign missions and officials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,100</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,490</td>
<td>-3,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and maintenance of United States missions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>403,561</td>
<td></td>
<td>747,683</td>
<td>-344,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,800,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,800,000</td>
<td>+1,178,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(By transfer)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>+11,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission: on Holocaust Assets in U.S. (by transfer)</td>
<td>(4,000)</td>
<td>(4,000)</td>
<td>(4,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(4,000)</td>
<td>(-8,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repatriation Loans Program Account:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>593</td>
<td></td>
<td>593</td>
<td>593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct loans subsidy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>607</td>
<td></td>
<td>607</td>
<td>607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1,000)</td>
<td>(-1,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Repatriation loans program account</strong></td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment to the American Institute in Taiwan</td>
<td></td>
<td>14,750</td>
<td>15,750</td>
<td></td>
<td>14,750</td>
<td>+15,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment to the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund</td>
<td>132,500</td>
<td>128,541</td>
<td>128,541</td>
<td></td>
<td>128,541</td>
<td>-3,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Administration of Foreign Affairs</strong></td>
<td>2,676,756</td>
<td>7,664,814</td>
<td>3,886,939</td>
<td>3,714,587</td>
<td>4,043,064</td>
<td>+1,366,308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriations</td>
<td>(2,676,756)</td>
<td>(4,094,841)</td>
<td>(3,886,939)</td>
<td>(3,714,587)</td>
<td>(4,043,064)</td>
<td>(+1,366,308)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance appropriations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5,000,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(5,000,000)</td>
<td>-5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>International Organizations and Conferences</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions to international organizations, current year assessment</td>
<td>922,000</td>
<td>963,308</td>
<td>842,937</td>
<td></td>
<td>943,308</td>
<td>+85,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions for International peacekeeping activities, current year</td>
<td>231,000</td>
<td>485,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>387,925</td>
<td>+266,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrears payments</td>
<td>475,000</td>
<td>486,000</td>
<td>351,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>351,000</td>
<td>+124,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International conferences and contingencies (by transfer)</td>
<td>(16,223)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(-16,223)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, International Organizations and Conferences</strong></td>
<td>1,628,000</td>
<td>1,894,308</td>
<td>1,393,937</td>
<td>1,331,233</td>
<td>1,736,203</td>
<td>+106,203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>International Commissions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19,551</td>
<td></td>
<td>19,551</td>
<td>19,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,839</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,839</td>
<td>5,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American commissions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,733</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,733</td>
<td>5,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International fisheries commissions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14,549</td>
<td></td>
<td>15,494</td>
<td>+1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, International commissions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45,772</td>
<td></td>
<td>52,043</td>
<td>45,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment to the Asia Foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,250</td>
<td></td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>-8,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eisenhower Exchange Fellowship Program, trust fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>465</td>
<td></td>
<td>350</td>
<td>+265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel-Arabian scholarship program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>+12,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East-West Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>+1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North/South Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Endowment for Democracy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Department of State</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,356,776</td>
<td>9,704,067</td>
<td>5,369,334</td>
<td>5,135,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriations</td>
<td>(4,356,776)</td>
<td>(6,104,067)</td>
<td>(5,369,334)</td>
<td>(5,135,897)</td>
<td>(5,880,344)</td>
<td>(+1,521,566)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance appropriations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5,000,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(5,000,000)</td>
<td>-5,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES
### APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 — continued
(Amounts in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELATED AGENCIES</th>
<th>FY 1999 Enacted</th>
<th>FY 2000 Request</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference</th>
<th>Conference vs. enacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arms Control and Disarmament Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arms control and disarmament activities</td>
<td>41,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-41,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Information Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Information programs</td>
<td>455,246</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-455,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology fund (by transfer)</td>
<td>(2,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational and cultural exchange programs</td>
<td>202,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-202,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eisenhower Exchange Fellowship Program, trust fund</td>
<td>525</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israeli Arab scholarship program</td>
<td>350</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Broadcasting Operations</td>
<td>362,365</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-362,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcasting to Cuba (direct)</td>
<td>22,095</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-22,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio construction</td>
<td>13,245</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-13,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East-West Center</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-12,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North/South Center</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Endowment for Democracy</td>
<td>31,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-31,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, United States Information Agency</strong></td>
<td>1,101,576</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1,101,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcasting Board of Governors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Broadcasting Operations</td>
<td></td>
<td>431,722</td>
<td>410,404</td>
<td></td>
<td>362,365</td>
<td>388,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcasting to Cuba</td>
<td></td>
<td>23,864</td>
<td>22,095</td>
<td></td>
<td>22,095</td>
<td>22,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcasting capital improvements</td>
<td></td>
<td>13,245</td>
<td>11,258</td>
<td></td>
<td>11,258</td>
<td>11,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Broadcasting Board of Governors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>452,560</td>
<td>421,662</td>
<td></td>
<td>399,274</td>
<td>421,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, related agencies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,143,076</td>
<td>452,560</td>
<td></td>
<td>421,662</td>
<td>421,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, title IV, Department of State</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,501,854</td>
<td>10,156,857</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,790,998</td>
<td>5,535,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance appropriations (By transfer)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(25,223)</td>
<td>(6,162)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(6,162)</td>
<td>(6,162)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Maritime Administration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>168,678</td>
<td>180,757</td>
<td></td>
<td>179,128</td>
<td>186,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title V - RELATED AGENCIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maritime Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maritime Security Program</td>
<td>89,650</td>
<td>56,700</td>
<td>96,700</td>
<td>98,700</td>
<td>96,200</td>
<td>+6,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations and training</td>
<td>69,303</td>
<td>72,164</td>
<td>71,303</td>
<td>72,664</td>
<td>72,073</td>
<td>+2,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maritime Guaranteed Loan (Title X) Program Account:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guaranteed loans subsidy</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>-9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative expenses</td>
<td>3,725</td>
<td>3,872</td>
<td>3,725</td>
<td>3,872</td>
<td>3,809</td>
<td>+44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Maritime guaranteed loan program account</strong></td>
<td>9,725</td>
<td>9,893</td>
<td>9,125</td>
<td>14,893</td>
<td>9,893</td>
<td>+84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Maritime Administration</strong></td>
<td>168,678</td>
<td>180,757</td>
<td>179,128</td>
<td>186,257</td>
<td>178,082</td>
<td>+9,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census Monitoring Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission for the Preservation of America's Heritage Abroad</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>+225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission on Civil Rights</td>
<td>8,900</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>8,900</td>
<td>8,900</td>
<td>8,900</td>
<td>-1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission on Electronic Commerce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe</td>
<td>1,170</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>1,170</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>1,182</td>
<td>+12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe</td>
<td>1,170</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>1,170</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>1,182</td>
<td>+12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Employment Opportunity Commission</td>
<td>279,000</td>
<td>312,000</td>
<td>279,000</td>
<td>279,000</td>
<td>282,000</td>
<td>+3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Communications Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>192,000</td>
<td>230,887</td>
<td>192,000</td>
<td>232,805</td>
<td>210,000</td>
<td>+18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offsetting fee collections - current year</td>
<td>-172,533</td>
<td>-185,754</td>
<td>-185,754</td>
<td>-185,754</td>
<td>-185,754</td>
<td>-13,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct appropriation</strong></td>
<td>19,477</td>
<td>45,133</td>
<td>6,246</td>
<td>47,051</td>
<td>42,424</td>
<td>+4,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Maritime Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>14,150</td>
<td>15,300</td>
<td>14,150</td>
<td>14,150</td>
<td>14,150</td>
<td>-1,150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES

**APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000—continued**

(Amounts in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 1999 Enacted</th>
<th>FY 2000 Request</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference vs. enacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal Trade Commission</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>116,679</td>
<td>133,368</td>
<td>116,879</td>
<td>133,368</td>
<td>125,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offseting fee collections - carryover</td>
<td>-30,000</td>
<td>-30,000</td>
<td>-30,000</td>
<td>-30,000</td>
<td>-30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offseting fee collections - current year</td>
<td>-76,500</td>
<td>-93,896</td>
<td>-77,207</td>
<td>-114,059</td>
<td>-104,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct appropriation</td>
<td>10,179</td>
<td></td>
<td>-10,179</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legal Services Corporation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment to the Legal Services Corporation</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>340,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>305,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marine Mammal Commission</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>1,240</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>1,240</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>1,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ocean Policy Commission</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>-3,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Securities and Exchange Commission</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>-23,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current year fees</td>
<td>214,000</td>
<td>230,000</td>
<td>192,200</td>
<td>240,000</td>
<td>173,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998 fees</td>
<td>87,000</td>
<td>130,500</td>
<td>130,500</td>
<td>130,500</td>
<td>194,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct appropriation</td>
<td>324,000</td>
<td>360,800</td>
<td>324,000</td>
<td>370,800</td>
<td>367,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Small Business Administration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>286,300</td>
<td>263,500</td>
<td>245,500</td>
<td>246,300</td>
<td>322,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Inspector General</td>
<td>10,800</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>10,800</td>
<td>13,250</td>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business Loans Program Account:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct loans subsidy</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>-2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guaranteed loans subsidy</td>
<td>128,000</td>
<td>148,368</td>
<td>128,000</td>
<td>149,368</td>
<td>137,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative expenses</td>
<td>94,000</td>
<td>121,368</td>
<td>129,000</td>
<td>129,000</td>
<td>129,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Business loans program account</td>
<td>224,230</td>
<td>279,368</td>
<td>222,762</td>
<td>297,368</td>
<td>266,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disaster Loans Program Account:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct loans subsidy</td>
<td>76,329</td>
<td>39,400</td>
<td>130,400</td>
<td>77,700</td>
<td>140,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent emergency appropriations</td>
<td>116,000</td>
<td>86,000</td>
<td>116,000</td>
<td>88,000</td>
<td>136,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative expenses</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>-75,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Disaster loans program account</td>
<td>192,329</td>
<td>255,400</td>
<td>183,700</td>
<td>276,400</td>
<td>184,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surety bond guarantees revolving fund</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td></td>
<td>-3,300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Small Business Administration</td>
<td>718,959</td>
<td>911,768</td>
<td>734,492</td>
<td>720,618</td>
<td>877,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Justice Institute</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses 5/</td>
<td>6,850</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>6,850</td>
<td>6,850</td>
<td>6,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, title V, Related agencies</td>
<td>1,856,366</td>
<td>2,196,573</td>
<td>1,796,591</td>
<td>1,940,666</td>
<td>2,066,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriations</td>
<td>(1,856,366)</td>
<td>(1,656,573)</td>
<td>(1,796,591)</td>
<td>(1,940,666)</td>
<td>(2,066,370)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent emergency appropriations</td>
<td>(233,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-233,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### TITLE VII - RESCISSIONS

**DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE**

**General Administration**

- Working capital fund (rescission): -99,000

**Legal Activities**

- Assets forfeiture fund (rescission): -2,000

**Federal Bureau of Investigation**

- FY 1996 FBI salaries and expenses (rescission): -4,000
- No Year FBI salaries and expenses (rescission): -6,400
- FY 1996 VCRP (rescission): -2,000
- FY 1997 VCRP (rescission): -300

- Total, Federal Bureau of Investigation: -12,700

**Drug Enforcement Administration**

- Drug diversion fund (rescission): -35,000

**Immigration and Naturalization Service**

- Immigration emergency fund (rescission): -5,000

- **Total: -35,000**
### DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES

**APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000 — continued**

(Amounts in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department and Related Agencies</th>
<th>FY 1999 Enacted</th>
<th>FY 2000 Request</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference</th>
<th>Conference vs. enacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 1998 Commerce (rescission)</td>
<td>-2,090</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-2,090</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Institute of Standards and Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial technology services (rescission)</td>
<td>-6,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations, research and facilities (rescission of emergency appropriations)</td>
<td>-3,400</td>
<td>-3,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEPARTMENT OF STATE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration of Foreign Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and maintenance of United States Missions (rescission)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-98,436</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Information Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buying power maintenance (rescission)</td>
<td>-20,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcasting Board of Governors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International broadcasting operations (rescission)</td>
<td>-14,829</td>
<td>-15,516</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RELATED AGENCY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maritime Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ship construction fund (rescission)</td>
<td>-17,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Business Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Loans Program Account:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guaranteed loans subsidy (rescission)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-12,400</td>
<td></td>
<td>-13,100</td>
<td>-13,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General reduction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-92,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, title VII, Rescissions</strong></td>
<td>-163,790</td>
<td>-3,400</td>
<td>-26,368</td>
<td>-235,583</td>
<td>-64,753</td>
<td>+99,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescissions</td>
<td>(-163,790)</td>
<td>(-3,400)</td>
<td>(-26,368)</td>
<td>(-235,583)</td>
<td>(-64,753)</td>
<td>(+99,037)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recission of emergency appropriations</td>
<td>(-3,400)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TITLE VIII - OTHER APPROPRIATIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Bureau of Investigation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>21,660</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-21,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Enforcement Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>10,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-10,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration and Naturalization Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Border affairs</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Justice (Y2K conversion)</td>
<td>84,396</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-84,396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Department of Justice</strong></td>
<td>206,276</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-206,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE AND RELATED AGENCIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations, research, and facilities</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Commerce (Y2K conversion)</td>
<td>57,920</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-57,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Department of Commerce</strong></td>
<td>62,920</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-62,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THE JUDICIARY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial information technology fund (Y2K conversion)</td>
<td>13,044</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-13,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEPARTMENT OF STATE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration of Foreign Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diplomatic and consular programs</td>
<td>790,771</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-790,771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and expenses</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Inspector General</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security and maintenance of United States missions</td>
<td>677,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-677,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergencies in the diplomatic and consular service</td>
<td>12,929</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-12,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of State (Y2K conversion)</td>
<td>64,916</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-64,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Department of State</strong></td>
<td>1,559,116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1,559,116</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES
### APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000—continued

(Amounts in thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 1999 Enacted</th>
<th>FY 2000 Request</th>
<th>House</th>
<th>Senate</th>
<th>Conference</th>
<th>Conference vs. enacted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RELATED AGENCIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Small Business Administration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster Loans Program Account:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct loan subsidy</td>
<td>71,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-71,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative expenses</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Disaster loans program account</td>
<td>101,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-101,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Small Business Administration (Y2K conversion)</strong></td>
<td>4,840</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Small Business Administration</strong></td>
<td>105,840</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-105,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maritime Administration (Y2K conversion)</td>
<td>530</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Communications Commission (Y2K conversion)</td>
<td>8,518</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-8,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Trade Commission (Y2K conversion)</td>
<td>550</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine Mammal Commission (Y2K conversion)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the US Trade Representative (Y2K conversion)</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Securities and Exchange Commission (Y2K conversion)</td>
<td>8,175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-8,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Information Agency (Y2K conversion)</td>
<td>9,562</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-9,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Title VIII, emergency appropriations</strong></td>
<td>1,975,067</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1,975,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand total:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New budget (obligational) authority</td>
<td>36,197,272</td>
<td>49,812,660</td>
<td>37,677,265</td>
<td>35,384,564</td>
<td>39,630,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriations (28,944,965)</td>
<td>(28,970,563)</td>
<td>(31,378,257)</td>
<td>(31,004,654)</td>
<td>(+2,059,656)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency appropriations</td>
<td>(1,975,067)</td>
<td>(4,476,253)</td>
<td>(4,476,253)</td>
<td>(+2,501,186)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingent emergency appropriations</td>
<td>(233,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance appropriations</td>
<td>(9,262,345)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescissions</td>
<td>(-234,790)</td>
<td>(-1,187)</td>
<td>(-29,553)</td>
<td>(-40,293)</td>
<td>(-65,840)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescission of emergency appropriations</td>
<td>(-3,400)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime trust fund (5,512,000)</td>
<td>(4,216,016)</td>
<td>(4,260,000)</td>
<td>(4,150,000)</td>
<td>(4,216,000)</td>
<td>(1,266,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(By transfer)</td>
<td>(88,004)</td>
<td>(75,088)</td>
<td>(161,022)</td>
<td>(71,426)</td>
<td>(173,707)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1/ The Administration's request proposes to eliminate this account and distribute the funding to OLA, US Attorneys, US Marshals, FBI, DEA and INS.

2/ The Administration's June 8, 1999 budget amendment proposes to reinstate the 2400(3) adjustment of status fee, which would increase receipts in the Breached Bond Fund by $110 million.

3/ The President's request includes $30 million for the Police Corps within the hiring program.

4/ As a result of the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998 and other changes, the amounts requested and recommended in FY 2000 include amounts appropriated separately in previous fiscal years for State Department, USA and ACDX salaries and expenses.

5/ The President's budget proposed $5 million for State Justice Institute.
Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the Chair advise how much time is remaining on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANSEN). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) has 15 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Obey) has 15 minutes remaining.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and for his leadership in bringing this bill to final passage.

Mr. Speaker, compromise is the nature of our process under the Constitution, and the American people are the winners with this legislation.

In the Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education portion of the bill we have plussed up Job Corps, consolidated health centers, and Ryan White AIDS they are at the highest priority. I am particularly proud that we have funded biomedical research through the National Institutes of Health, with a 15 percent increase, or $2.2 billion. This is the second 15 percent increase in a row toward our goal of doubling funding for biomedical research over 5 years. This is the best spent money in all of government and lengthens and protects the lives of every American.

In education, we increased the overall account by $2.2 billion over FY 1999 and included large increases for impact aid, for Pell Grants, for the TRIO program, and a very large increase for special education, allowing our local school districts a great deal more flexibility with their own money.

Now, Mr. Speaker, for the record, I want to ensure that our intent on section 210, the provision concerning the Secretary of Labor's transplant rule, is totally clear. Section 210 delays for 42 days publication of the organ transplant rule to allow the Secretary to consult with the transplant community. The provision is the result of difficult negotiations between Members of both bodies and the administration.

Under the proposed rule. The compromise assures that those with an interest in this issue will have one more chance to comment and have these comments reviewed. As a result, our agreement includes language in the Statement of the Managers that there will be no further delay following the 42-day period.

Mr. Speaker, this was a difficult negotiation. However, I believe that the provisions of this bill represent the true compromise between all parties, and not a provision placed in the work or delay the Secretary's rule-making on safety and health programs while developing this information?

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

Mr. OBIEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PORTER).

Mr. Speaker, the conference agreement encourages the Secretary of Labor to spend up to $2 million to answer several questions relating to the costs and benefits of safety and health programs. But am I correct in stating that the conferences do not intend in any way to delay her rule-making on safety and health programs while developing this information?

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the conference agreement encourages the Secretary of Labor to spend up to $2 million to answer several questions relating to the costs and benefits of safety and health programs. But am I correct in stating that the conferences do not intend in any way to delay her rule-making on safety and health programs while developing this information?

Mr. OBIEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we have come a long way from where we started in this session.

Originally, the Republican budget resolution that was presented in this House maintained the fiction that we could afford a huge tax cut with 70 percent of the benefit going to persons earning over $100,000 a year and still not do damage to the rest of our national priorities.

That tax cut would have used every single dollar that could have been used to extend the life of Social Security and Medicare. And the public understands that; and in the end they, I think, by their actions in the polls, convinced our friends on the Republican side to begin to walk away from that issue.

In September, we were given a different problem because the majority established a budget allocation for the bill containing Education and Health and Labor programs which would have resulted in cutting education by almost one-third in real terms. We said no to that. The President said no to that. And the shape of these appropriations bills today is far different as a result.

I want to publicly thank the President. I want to publicly thank the Vice President. I want to thank the President’s Chief of Staff, John Podesta; and the leader of his principal negotiator; and all the others who stood with us fighting for smaller class sizes, fighting for quality teachers, fighting for more cops on the beat, fighting against legislation that threatened environmental cleanup, fighting against cuts in health care, fighting for funds for those who are in the national leadership responsibilities abroad.

I am also proud of the fact that we have in the area of education provided for additional support for comprehensive school reform, for additional support for teacher training, additional support for smaller class size, and additional support to assist local school districts to reduce high school size in order to get a better handle on student attendance, reference and juvenile adolescent behavior.

But I am still going to oppose this bill despite all of those features because someone, I believe, has to stand for the institutional need to present budgets in a forthright way.

Three years ago, when the executive and legislative branches of Government agreed on a budget deal, I called it a public lie. I said, if it was not a public lie, it was at least a giant public fib, because it was promising that Congress would live up to its own promises that, in fact, it would never live by. And history has demonstrated that to be correct.

Last year, Congress spent $35 billion more than that budget agreement provided; and this year it is spending much more than that before the limits. Some of that spending is outrageous, and some of it is perfectly defensible.

I do not so much object to some of that spending as I object to the fact that the Congress, in my view, is simply lying about it and pretending that it is not taking place. That, I think, is an even more fundamental problem.

It is clear to me that, in the end, after all of their initial efforts to cut all of the priorities that the President has been fighting for, it is clear that the Republican majority in this House, in order to get out of town, was willing to give the President virtually everything he asked for in spending so long as we would adopt accounting fictions that would hide what, in fact, we were doing. And that is the honest truth.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will vote against this. I understand there are many good
things in the bill, and I am proud to have helped negotiate some of them. But, in the end, I believe that next year we are going to come back here with the budget problem being fundamentally worse because of the fiscal relationship we have now.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY), the chairman of our Committee on Commerce.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this bill. There are a few items in particular that I would like to highlight from the Medicare provisions of this bill.

First, it directs a significant amount of new monies toward hospital care. This includes more funds for small, rural hospitals and for patients who receive cancer treatments, those most in need of assistance. Congress cannot allow these hospitals, which serve an important role in our communities, to close their doors.

Additionally, we provide new monies for the Medicare+Choice program. This vital program gives seniors the option of remaining in the traditional Medicare program.

I am also proud to have strengthened this bill by including $50 million to pay for immunosuppressive drugs for transplant patients. Medicare currently only covers these drugs for 36 months. Through our work in the Conference Committee, however, we have ensured that organ transplants will have greater access to these life-saving drugs for a longer period of time. Access of these drugs to patients could literally mean the difference between life and death.

Finally, this bill dedicates more funding for community health centers and rural health clinics, for S-CHIP, and also for State outreach efforts for former welfare recipients.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the “Medicare, Medicaid and S-CHIP Balance Budget Refinement Act of 1999.” This bill restores needed funds to hospitals, nursing homes, managed care providers, and home health agencies most seriously impacted by changes made in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997.

The Conference Report, included in this omnibus bill, reflects the House and Senate Committees in both chambers put into this bill. The legislative vehicle by which this important legislation became law was the Balanced Budget Act, which passed the Balanced Budget Act.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that we were able to come together and craft this bill—there is much to be proud of in the legislation.

Congress made some very important changes to the Medicare and Medicaid programs when it passed the Balanced Budget Act. Congress was facing bankruptcy and seniors’ choice of private health plans and providers was limited. The Balanced Budget Act changed that and helped ensure the vitality of this program for years into the future.

In that legislation, the Commerce Committee also helped create the State Children’s Health Insurance Program, known as S-CHIP—to provide health coverage for millions of low-income uninsured children. It was historic legislation and I am very proud of it. But in some areas we all went a little too far. Now we are doing the right thing by going back and refining some of the policies put into effect by the BBA to avoid some of the unintended consequences of that legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the work the Committees in both chambers put into this bill. I know it enjoys wide bipartisan support and deserves the support of all my colleagues.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS).

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding the 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I am here to point to that portion of the deal that deals with seniors and the disabled in the Medicare section. This would not have happened without a bipartisan, cooperative effort.

I especially want to thank the staff: Ann Marie Lynch and the majority committee, Bill Vaughn, for his willingness to maintain confidentiality as we worked on this; the commerce staff, especially the members of the Subcommittee on Ways and Means and Commerce; chairmen of the full committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY), who just spoke; my friends and colleagues, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) and the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. McCReery), without which the congressional portion would not have been put together.

I want to thank Chris Jennings from the White House, Nancy Gunderson, and Susan Hirschman for their diligent efforts on our behalf.

Republicans brought prevention in Medicare in 1997. We brought refinement this year. And working in a cooperative way, as evidenced by my friend Mr. Ryan from Wisconsin (Mr. KLEczka), and other Democrats, we can move forward in modernizing Medicare next year as well.

I want to thank them all. There is no reason in the world why my colleagues should not vote yes on this measure.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Wisconsin for yielding 1 minute to me.

The previous speaker said there should be no reason to vote against this bill. I will give my colleagues one darn good reason why we should not vote for this bill, because this bill contains within it anti-dairy provisions which go right to the bottom line of the dairy farmers in the upper Midwest.

I really do applaud this Medicare provision. I would like to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Health, for including very important Medicare language which helps southern Wisconsin Medicare beneficiaries.

But what this legislation is that we have in this bill at the moment is legislation that has not even passed through the House of Representatives or through the United States Senate which goes right to the bottom line of the dairy farmers in the upper Midwest.

Mr. Speaker, I implore my colleagues, let us bring this legislation down the pike on regular order, not tack it on this ugly Christmas tree as a big ugly ornament.

This legislation is not fair for our dairy farmers. This legislation takes them and puts them at a competitive disadvantage against all other farmers in the country. And it revokes the free market principles that we were elected to protect.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 1/2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of this omnibus bill. I commend the House leadership, the majority leader, the majority whip, in addition to the Committee on Appropriations chairman, the distinguished gentleman, for their unflagging efforts to finalize this report on the H.R. 3194 and for their willingness to include in certain authorizations measures. I also extend thanks to House staffers Bill Inglee, Brian Gunderson, and Susan Hirschman for their diligent efforts on our behalf.

In particular, this package includes the authorization for the important U.N. reform and arrears payment package as well as other significant programs, such as the 5-year authorization for a greatly enhanced embassy security program to protect American personnel and facilities abroad and a 12-month authorization for Radio Free Asia.

The legislative vehicle by which this is accomplished is the inclusion of H.R. 3427, introduced by the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. Solomon), the ranking Democrat on the Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights; the gentleman from Georgia (Ms. MCKINNEY), the ranking Democrat on that subcommittee; and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GE DENSER), the committee's ranking member; and myself.

H.R. 3427 reflects the House and Senate agreements that were reached on
H.R. 2415 and S. 896, the Senate amendments to H.R. 2415. This compromise measure also accommodates numerous requests of the administration. The House Committee on International Relations worked diligently to produce a bipartisan bill in concert with our colleagues on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

I thank the leadership of the Committee on Appropriations, and I urge my colleagues to fully support this omnibus measure.

Mr. OBERRY, Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN). Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time and for his leadership on the issue that he and I are joined together on, and that is dairy.

I must reluctantly urge my colleagues to vote against this bill today because of the dairy provisions that it contains.

It is real important to understand what has not happened today with the inclusion of these provisions. We have not done one thing to help dairy farmers in this Nation. We have not addressed the fact that most of the dairy farmers that we are losing in this Nation are losing in the upper Midwest. In my home State, we are losing five each and every single day.

We have not addressed the fact that many of the Nation’s largest co-ops are gouging our dairy farmers, underpaying them. And we have not taken one step away from the Soviet style dairy system that has ruled this country since 1937.

Because of what this bill does not do in dairy, I must reluctantly urge no vote.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), the very distinguished chairman of our Subcommittee on VA, HUD and Independent Agencies.

Mr. WALSH, Mr. Speaker, congratulations to the chairman. We did it. We balanced the budget, as we said we would. We cut the national debt by over $100 billion with this budget, as we said we would. And we did it without touching the Social Security trust fund for the first time in this half century.

Remember back in his State of the Union address, the President promised to spend 38 percent of the Social Security trust fund for the surplus for Social Security. We said, no, Mr. President, we want 100 percent of that surplus. And that is what we did. We gave our troops in the field a good solid pay raise, and they deserve it.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, on dairy, it would be terribly wrong for us to harm 75 percent of the farmers, the dairy farmers in this country by supporting the Glickman-Clinton dairy proposal. It is wrong for the country. The Congress is on record opposing that legislation.

What is in this bill was supported by 380 Members of the Congress. This is good legislation. I urge my colleagues to support it.

NOTICE
Incomplete record of House proceedings. Except for concluding business which follows, today’s House proceedings will be continued in the next issue of the Record.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE
By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:
Mrs. CAPPS (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and the balance of the week on account of family illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED
By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:
Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. UDALL of Colorado, for 5 minutes, today.
Mrs. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.
Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. LEACH, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. BARTON of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.
Mrs. MYRICK, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED
The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:
S. 278. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands to the county of Rio Arriba, New Mexico.
S. 382. An act to establish the Minuteman Missile National Historic Site in the State of South Dakota for other purposes.
S. 1398. An act to clarify certain boundaries on maps relating to the Coastal Barrier Resources System.

J OINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT
Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:
H.J. Res. 83. A joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2000, and for other purposes.

A D JOURNMENT
Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, November 19, 1999, at noon.

OATH OF OFFICE OF MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES
The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

"I, A.B., do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Members of the 106th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

J. O. BACA, Forty-second, California.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.
Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker’s table and referred as follows:

S. 5439. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Dairy Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Service’s

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. LEACH: Committee on Banking and Financial Services. H.R. 1095. A bill to require the United States to take action to provide bilateral debt relief, and improve the provision of multilateral debt relief, in order to give a fresh start to poor countries; with an amendment (Rept. 106-483 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 728. A bill to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide cost share assistance for the rehabilitation of structural measures constructed as part of water resource projects previously funded by the Secretary under such Act or related laws, with amendments (Rept. 106-484 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 2665. A bill to reauthorize the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 106-485). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

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

H. 1838. Referral to the Committee on Armed Services extended for a period ending not later than November 19, 1999.

H. 1839. Referral to the Committee on Education and the Workforce extended for a period ending not later than November 19, 1999.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mrs. J. JOHNSON of Connecticut (for Mr. CANDID): H.R. 3443. A bill to amend part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to provide States with more funding and greater flexibility in carrying out programs designed to help children make the transition from foster care to self-sufficiency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. WASHINGTON, Mr. CANNON, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. SKEE, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. HILL of Montana, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, and Mr. WICKER: H.R. 3444. A bill to repeal section 658 of Public Law 104-208, commonly referred to as the LAUTENBERG amendment; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. FOWLER: H.R. 3445. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to allow the Secretary of the military departments to authorize civilian special agents of their respective military criminal investigative organizations to execute warrants and make arrests; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. OBERSTAR: H.R. 3446. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Surface Transportation Board, to enhance railroad competition, to protect collective bargaining agreements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington (for himself and Mr. WALDEN of Oregon): H.R. 3447. A bill to amend the Pacific Northwest Electric Power Planning and Conservation Act to provide for sales of electricity by the Bonneville Power Authority to joint operating entities; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GREENWOOD (for himself, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. BOEHLERT, and Mr. TAUSIN): H.R. 3448. A bill to improve the management of environmental information and to encourage the adoption of the practice of enhanced environmental quality, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. JOHNSON-LEE of Texas (for herself and Mr. CARDIN): H.R. 3449. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to provide for a State waiver of the requirement that emissions contain no more than ten percent of gasoline; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. EHLERS: H.R. 3450. A bill to direct the Archivist of the United States to transfer to the National Archives and Records Administration the portfolio of the Gerald R. Ford Foundation in trust, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. ABERCROMBIE: H.R. 3451. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the unused portion of the low-income housing credit for buildings financed with tax exempt State bonds to be used for the construction of military housing in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BAKER (for himself, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. STUMP, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. WAMP, Mrs. BOND, Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE, Mr. BACHUS, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. DIAMOND, Mr. TAUSIN, and Mr. TANCREDO): H.R. 3452. A bill to establish conditions on the payment of certain balances under the Panama Canal Act of 1970 to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GOODE: H.R. 3453. A bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1977 to allow, among other things, the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase additional commodities for distribution under section 234 of the Emergency Food Assistance Act of 1983 for fiscal years 2001 and 2002; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. H. C. MABILL: H.R. 3460. A bill to designate the United States post office located at 451 College Street in Macon, Georgia, as the “Henry McNeal Turner Post Office”; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Ms. J. JOHNSON of Texas (for herself, Ms. MILLER-MCDONALD, Mr. KULA, Mr. SHELLEY of California, Mrs. HENDERSON, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. KUCINICH, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. MEEEK of Florida, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. TOWNES, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. FORD, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. FORBES, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. JEFFERS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. LARSON, Mr. OWENS, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. PASCENKO, Mr. BACA, Mr. MEETS of New York, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. STRICKLAND, and Mr. LAMPSION): H.R. 3461. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to mental health services for children, adolescents and their families; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. COBLE: H.R. 3462. A bill to amend statutory damages provisions of title 17, United States Code, to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UPTON (for himself, Mr. STUPAK, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. INFIELD, and Mr. ROEMER): H.R. 3463. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to direct the emergency scheduling of gamma hydroxybutyric acid, to provide for a national awareness campaign, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. PRYCE of Ohio: H.R. 3464. A bill to reduce the incidence of child abuse and neglect, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DICKEY: H.R. 3465. A bill to reduce the incidence of child abuse and neglect, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAMBLISS: H.R. 3466. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish additional provisions to combat fraud and abuse within the Medicare Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and
H.R. 3463. A bill to amend title 36, United States Code, to grant a Federal charter to the Ukrainian American Veterans, Incorporated, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3464. A bill to establish a cooperative program of the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Energy, and the Environmental Protection Agency to evaluate the feasibility of using only fuel blended with ethanol to power municipal vehicles; to the Committee on Agriculture and the Workforce.

H.R. 3465. A bill to provide safer schools and a healthier, more energy efficient environment to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

H.R. 3466. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the credit for electricity produced from certain renewable resources, defined to be produced from landfill gas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3467. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to restitute the Secretary of Defense to establish procedures for ensuring that persons reporting instances of suspected child abuse occurring on military installations are directed to report such reports anonymously; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3468. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to certain water rights to Duchesne City, Utah; to the Committee on Resources.

H.R. 3469. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the coverage and treatment of overhead costs of United States factories and arsenals when not making supplies for the Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3470. A bill to provide for the appointment of 1 additional Federal district judge for the eastern district of Wisconsin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3471. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to carry out demonstration programs to increase the performance of organs donated for human transplantation; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. HOUSTON: H.R. 3472. A bill to provide for mandatory licensing and registration of handgun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3473. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to restrict the transfer by local law enforcement agencies of firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3474. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Fungafior 500 EC; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3475. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on NORLOC 1980; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3476. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to require credit card statements to include the date by which a consumer’s payment by mail is postmarked in order to avoid the late fee and to prohibit a late fee for a consumer’s payment by mail which is postmarked by such date, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

H.R. 3477. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the credit for energy produced from landfill gas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3478. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Imazalil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3479. A bill to authorize the Small Business Administration to extend, 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.

H.R. 3480. A bill to amend title XIX and title XXI of the Social Security Act to expand enrollment of children under the Medicaid and State children’s health insurance program (SCHIP) through the expanded use of presumptive eligibility; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 3481. A bill to impose a 2-year moratorium on the issuance of new Federal licenses to deal in firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3482. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to authorize, 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.

H.R. 3483. A bill to amend the Federal securities laws to enhance oversight over certain derivative securities funds, reduce the potential for such entities to increase systemic risk in the financial markets, enhance investor protections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 3484. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide that certain sexual crimes against children are predicate crimes for the interception of communications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3485. A bill to prohibit the enforcement of certain anti-terrorism judgments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3486. A bill to protect previously approved state Medicaid plans from changes in Federal payment for school-based health services for Medicaid-eligible children with individualized education programs; to the Committee on Government Reform.

H.R. 3487. A bill to provide consumers in multitenant buildings with the benefits of competition among providers of telecommunications services by ensuring reasonable and nondiscriminatory access to rooftops of multitenant buildings by competitive telecommunications carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

H.R. 3488. A bill to designate the United States Post Office located at 60 Third Avenue in Long Branch, New Jersey, as the "Pat King Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Government Reform.

H.R. 3489. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to regulate interstate commerce in the use of mobile telephones and to strengthen and clarify prohibitions on electronic eavesdropping, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

H.R. 3490. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the benefits of competition among providers of telecommunications services by ensuring reasonable and nondiscriminatory access to rooftops of multitenant buildings by competitive telecommunications carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

H.R. 3491. A bill to amend the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act to exempt mortgage servicers from certain requirements of the Act with respect to federally related mortgages secured by real property; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

H.R. 3492. A bill to amend the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act to exempt mortgage servicers from certain requirements of the Act with respect to federally related mortgages secured by real property; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.
By Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin:
H.R. 3493. A bill to promote international monetary stability and to share seigniorage with officially dollarized countries; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. WATERS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. EVANS):
H.R. 3494. A bill to clarify that no provisions of title LXII of the Revised Statutes of the United States, the Home Owners’ Loan Act, or any other Federal law have ever been intended, and may not be construed, to supersede nondiscriminatory State or local laws that regulate fees and surcharges imposed by operators of automated teller machines for use of such machines; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. STRICKLAND (for himself, Mr. GORDON, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. WHITEFIELD, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. FORBES, Mr. PALLONE, and Ms. KAPTRU):
H.R. 3495. A bill to establish a compensa-
tion program for Federal energy em-
ployees injured in Federal nuclear activities; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently deter-
mimed by the Speaker, in each case for con-
sideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi (for himself, Mr. SHOWS, and Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi):
H.R. 3496. A bill to amend the Internal Re-
venue Code of 1862 to provide that certain uses of a facility owned by a tax-exempt organiza-
tion shall not be treated as private business
income Code of 1986 to provide that certain uses
of the United States, the Community
Reinvestment Act of 1977, and the Gramm-
Leach-Bliley Act with regard to community
services.

By Ms. WATERS (for herself, Mr. CLY-
burn, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MARDER, Mr. CONY-
er, Mrs. MECK of Florida, Mr. FRANK of
Florida, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. LEE, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CAPUANO, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MILLER of New York, Ms. JACKSON of Texas, Mr. MECKS of New York, and Mrs. JONES of Ohio):
H.R. 3504. A bill to amend the Bank Hold-
ing Company Act of 1966 to authorize a bank fee survey conducted by the Board of Governors of the Federal Re-
serve System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Serv-
ices.

By Mr. WATKINS:
H.R. 3505. A bill to amend the Internal Re-
venue Code of 1986 to provide for a medical re-
search tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WELDON of Florida:
H.R. 3506. A bill to amend the Service Con-
tract Act of 1965 to provide for the responsi-
bility in certain cases of a parent corpora-
tion of a Federal contractor to provide health care benefits to retired employees of the contractor if the contractor fails to pro-
vide such benefits; to the Committee on Edu-
cation and the Workforce.

By Mr. WISE (for himself, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. OXLEY):
H.R. 3507. A bill to establish a program of supplemental unemployment benefits for un-
employed coal miners who have exhausted their rights to regular unemployment benef-
fits, and whose separation from employment is due to environmental laws or court orders directly related with mining of coal; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WU (for himself, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, and Mr. STARK):
H.R. 3508. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide status in each of fiscal years 2000 through 2002 for 65,000 H-1B nonimmigrants who have a mas-
ter’s or Ph. D. degree and meet the require-
ments for such status and whose employers make scholarship payments to institutions of higher education for undergraduate and post-
graduate education; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of Florida:
H.J. Res. 84. A joint resolution making fur-
ther continuing appropriations for the fiscal
year 2000, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. YOUNG of Florida:
H.J. Res. 85. A joint resolution appointing the day for the convening of the second ses-
sion of the One Hundred Sixth Congress; con-
sidered and agreed to.

H. Con. Res. 234. Concurrent resolution rat-
ing the bill (H.R. 2966) making appropria-
tions for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes; considered and agreed to.

H. Con. Res. 235. Concurrent resolution providing for the sine die adjournment of the first session of the One Hundred Sixth Congress; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. ROGERS:
H. Con. Res. 236. Concurrent resolution cor-
tecting the enrollment of H.R. 1180, consid-
ered and agreed to.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KEN-
ney of Rhode Island, Mr. VENTO, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. INGLE, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. ESHOO, and Ms. WATERS):
H. Con. Res. 237. Concurrent resolution ex-
pressing the sense of the Congress that a por-
tion of the budget surplus should be used to fulfill moral and legal responsibilities of the United States by ensuring proper payment and management of all federally held tribal trust fund accounts and individual Indian trust fund accounts; to the Committee on Re-
sources.

By Ms. PELOSI (for herself, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. PORTER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. HOLT, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. KAPTRU, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. STARK, Mr. MOAKLEY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. KIND, Mr. FROST, Mr. HINCHEN, Mr. LA-
FALCE, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. WA-
TERS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BERNAM, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. McGOVERN, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. OLVER):
H. Con. Res. 238. Concurrent resolution ex-
pressing the sense of Congress regarding a peaceable resolution of the conflict in the state of Chiapas, Mexico, and for other pur-
purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. FROST:
H. Res. 391. A resolution designating mi-
nority membership on certain standing com-
mmittees of the House; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. WELLER:
H. Res. 392. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regard-
ing National Pearl Harbor Remembrance Day; to the Committee on Government Re-
form.

H. Res. 393. A resolution returning to the Senate the bill S. 4; considered and agreed to.

H. Res. 394. A resolution returning to the Senate the bill S. 1232; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. ARMEY:
H. Res. 395. A resolution providing for a committee of two Members to be appointed by the House to inform the President; consid-
considered and agreed to.

By Mr. DREIER (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. BASS, Mr. WHITEFIELD, Mr. JONES of North Caro-
olina, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. DUNN, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. REG-
ula, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. GOODE, Mr. THOMAS of Kentucky, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. HASTINGS of Wash-
ington, Mr. BAKER, Mr. VITTER, Mr.
MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

285. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Michigan, relative to Senate Resolution No. 68 to memorialize the Congress of the United States to accelerate the transfer of the United States Navy ships and to redirect this support to food-processing agricultural activities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

286. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of New Jersey, relative to Senate Resolution No. 113 memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide federal assistance to cost covered by the State in providing health care for New Jersey's flood victims; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

287. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of New Jersey, relative to Senate Resolution No. 97 memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide federal assistance to enable the State to prepare for the Port Newark-Elizabeth dredging project; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BONIOR:

H.R. 3509. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth M. Henry Padgett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 3510. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to transfer to the National Defense Reserve Fleet vessel S.S. Guam to American Trade Fair Ship, Inc.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 72. Mr. FOSSELLA and Mrs. McCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 73. Mr. GOODLATE.

H.R. 133. Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 288. Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. NALETSKY, Mr. ROTHENBERG, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. MOORE, Mr. ALLEN of Mississippi, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. HERMAN.

H.R. 290. Mr. SPLINTER.

H.R. 360. Mrs. CLAYTON and Mrs. McCARTHY of New Jersey.

H.R. 407. Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 443. Mr. BECERRA, Mr. STABENOW, Mr. LALобще, Mr. KLEIN, Mr. BERKLEY, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. GREENWOOD.

BACHUS, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. WAMP, Mr. METCALF, Mr. LAFLAÇE, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. SHELTON, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. PLUMMER of Ohio, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. EVERT, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. STUMP, Mr. BERNAM, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. CALDER, Mr. ROGERS of Alaska, Mr. KOBLE, Mr. SALMON, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mrs. BONDI, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. DOUGLAS of Arizona, Mr. PELLETIER, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HORN, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. OSE, Mr. RUBENZALD, Mr. RADAPOVICH, Mr. ROGRO, Mr. RHOHRABACHER, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. HELFET, Mr. McINNIS, Mr. SCAFFER, Mr. TANCREDE, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. CANDY of Florida, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. FOLEY, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. HENRY of Florida, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. KING of Florida, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. FANNIN of Georgia, Mr. DAVALOS, Mr. SCHWEITZER, Mr. DOHERTY, Mr. DOUGLAS of Georgia, Mr. KING of Georgia, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MICHAELS of Alaska, Mr. MOORE of Arizona, Mr. ROMAN of Arizona, Mr. SPIEGEL, Mr. LEACH, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. TIHART, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mrs. WELLS of Kentucky, Mr. MCLAUGHLIN, Mr. KLACANIC of Montana, Mr. MCDOUGALD, Mr. SCHOFIELD, Mr. CRAWFORD of Montana, Mr. JULIEN of Montana, Mr. MITCHELL of Montana, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. HILL of New Jersey, Mr. DODD of Connecticut, Mr. DAVIS of New Jersey, Mr. KIMBALL of New Jersey, Mr. LEWIS of New Jersey, Mr. McCURDY, Mr. SPOOR, Mr. SCHAEFFER, Mr. KEATING of New Jersey, Mr. WINTER of New Jersey, Mr. BICKERSTAFF, Mr. WILSON of New Jersey, Mr. VERRIL of New York, Mr. CRADDOCK, Mr. DAIJO, Mr. GALVAN of New York, Mr. BUTLER of New York, Mr. CONNOLLY of New York, Mr. COHEN of New York, Mr. LEWIS of New York, Mr. STEINHORF, Mr. KERRY of New York, Mr. SCHWARTZ of New York, Mr. DICKBERG of New York, Mr. NESBITT of New York, Mr. STARK of New York, Mr. TAYLOR of New York, Mr. WRIGHT of New York, Mr. FRIENDLY, Mr. YOUNG of Utah, Mr. WILLIAMS of Utah, Mr. JERROLD, Mr. NORTON of Utah, Mr. LITTON of Utah, Mr. SHADAM of Utah, Mr. JENSEN of Utah, Mr. BRIDGES of Utah, Mr. HOBBS of Utah, Mr. NORMAN of Utah, Mr. ROBERTSON of Utah, Mr. SMITH of Utah, Mr. VANDERHYDEN of Utah, Mr. ANGELA of Wyoming, Mr. DEEMBER of Wyoming, Mr. CALVERT of Wyoming, Mr. CLARK of Wyoming, Mr. COWDEN of Wyoming, Mr. CRABTREE of Wyoming, Mr. DOWD of Wyoming, Mr. FEDERICO of Wyoming, Mr. FORD of Wyoming, Mr. FOSTER of Wyoming, Mr. FRANK of Wyoming, Mr. GOODRICH of Wyoming, Mr. HAWKINS of Wyoming, Mr. HENDRICKSON of Wyoming, Mr. HOWES of Wyoming, Mr. HUNTER of Wyoming, Mr. JENKINS of Wyoming, Mr. JOHNSON of Wyoming, Mr. KERN of Wyoming, Mr. KROL KEEL of Wyoming, Mr. LEE of Wyoming, Mr. LAKEY of Wyoming, Mr. LEWIS of Wyoming, Mr. LINDSAY of Wyoming, Mr. MACKIN of Wyoming, Mr. MANGAN of Wyoming, Mr. MARCH of Wyoming, Mr. MARGETT of Wyoming, Mr. McKENNA of Wyoming, Mr. MILLER of Wyoming, Mr. MOORE of Wyoming, Mr. NEAL of Wyoming, Mr. NIEHAUS of Wyoming, Mr. NICHOLS of Wyoming, Mr. ORR of Wyoming, Mr. PARKER of Wyoming, Mr. PERRY of Wyoming, Mr. PRICE of Wyoming, Mr. RICE of Wyoming, Mr. RUSSELL of Wyoming, Mr. RUSH of Wyoming, Mr. SCHRADER of Wyoming, Mr. SHAW of Wyoming, Mr. SMITH of Wyoming, Mr. SMITH of Wyoming, Mr. SNOW of Wyoming, Mr. STEWART of Wyoming, Mr. TAYLOR of Wyoming, Mr. THOMPSON of Wyoming, Mr. TRUMAN of Wyoming, Mr. WELLS of Wyoming, Mr. WOOD of Wyoming, Mr. WRIGHT of Wyoming, Mr. ZEIGLER of Wyoming.
PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

70. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Town Board of Southampton, relative to Resolution No. 1199 petitioning the Federal Government to permit the Suffolk County Department of Health to have access to and participate in monitoring health related activity at the Plum Island Disease Center; to the Committee on Agriculture.

71. Also, a petition of the Southern Governors' Association, relative to a resolution petitioning support for funding efforts for the National Guard Youth Challenge Program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

72. Also, a petition of the Southern Governors' Association, relative to a resolution petitioning for the reauthorization of the Older Americans Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

73. Also, a petition of the Southern Governors' Association, relative to a resolution petitioning the reauthorization of the Endangered Species Act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

74. Also, a petition of the Southern Governors' Association, relative to a resolution petitioning support for Outer Continental Shelf Coastal Impact Assistance; to the Committee on Resources.

75. Also, a petition of the Southern Governors' Association, relative to a resolution petitioning support for the reauthorization of the Airport Improvement Program; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

76. Also, a petition of the Southern Governors' Association, relative to a resolution petitioning the President to Negotiate International Trade Agreements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

77. Also, a petition of the Village of Hazel Crest, relative to Resolution 99-4 petitioning Congressional Representatives to support the Firefighter Investment and Reorganization Congressional Representatives to the Committee on Science and Transportation and Infrastructure.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bill Number</th>
<th>Sponsor Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 3219</td>
<td>Mr. Frost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 1958</td>
<td>Mr. Cook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 2422</td>
<td>Mr. Boehlert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.R. 2699</td>
<td>Mr. Chabot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.Con. Res. 175</td>
<td>Mrs. Tauscher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Senate met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].
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The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, the only source of lasting authentic courage, we thank You that You use ordinary people to do extraordinary things. This morning, we turn to the psalmist and to Jesus for the bracing truth about courage to see things through, not just to the end of the Senate session but to the accomplishment of Your ends. David reminds us: "Be of good courage, and He shall strengthen your heart, all you who hope in the Lord"—Psalm 31:24. And Jesus challenges us to take courage (John 16:33). We know that we can take courage to press on because You have chosen to get Your work done through us. So bless the Senators as they confront the issues of the budget, consider creative compromises, and seek to bring this Senate session to a conclusion. In this quiet moment, may they take courage and press on. Through our Lord and Savior. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable James Inhofe, a Senator from the State of Oklahoma, led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The Presiding Officer (Mr. Inhofe) The Senator from Ohio.

SCHEDULE

Mr. Voinovich. Mr. President, today the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 12 noon, with Senator Voinovich in control of the first 30 minutes and Senator Durbin in control of the second 30 minutes.

For the information of all Senators, the final appropriations items were filed last night and are expected to be considered in the House throughout the day. Therefore, following morning business, it is expected that the Senate will begin consideration of the final appropriations items as they are received. Members will be notified as the schedule for consideration becomes clearer.

The Senate may also consider any legislative or executive items cleared for action during today's session.

I thank my colleagues for their attention.

Mr. Reid addressed the Chair. The Presiding Officer. The assistant minority leader.

BANKRUPTCY REFORM

Mr. Reid. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator outlining for us what the intent is for the day. I hope that part of what we are going to do is to work on completing the bankruptcy bill. I say to my friends in the majority that we only have a few amendments remaining. I have spoken to Senator Leahy and his staff, and I am ready to offer any amendment request. I will not ask that the Senator accept this, recognizing that he must speak with the manager of the bill, Senator Grassley. But what I would like to do is ask unanimous consent that the following amendments numbered 2517, 2518, 2523, 2567, 2747, 2748, 2753, 2759, 2761, 2763, and 2670, and any amendment agreed upon by the two managers be the only amendments—those I have just read and those agreed to by the two managers—in order to S. 625, the bill to amend title 11, United States Code, and for other purposes, and that following the disposition of all the above-described amendments, the bill be immediately advanced to third reading; that the Senate then proceed to the House companion bill, H.R. 833; that all after the enacting clause be stricken, the text of the Senate bill, as amended, be inserted; that the bill be advanced to third reading; that a vote occur on passage of the bill without any intervening action, motion or debate; that the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House, and the Senate bill be placed back on the calendar.

Mr. President, that is the unanimous consent request that I spread across the Record of the Senate, recognizing that at this time there will not be an objection to it. We will make this unanimous-consent request at some later time. The Presiding Officer. Is there objection? The Presiding Officer. Mr. Reid, I am not asking. Mr. President, that there be objection. I am not asking unanimous consent at this time.

I say to the majority that we have enumerated 14 amendments. Seven of them have tentatively been agreed upon or they will be withdrawn. Only four remain, to be negotiated between completing the bankruptcy bill and not completing it this year. The only two amendments of the seven that I understand are causing any controversy are the ones dealing with gun manufacturers and clinic violence.

On the gun manufacturing amendment, the proponents have agreed to a 70-minute time agreement, and on the amendment relating to clinic violence, the proponents have agreed to 30 minutes. So there is really not much left to complete this bill. I hope that during the day there can be discussions ongoing to complete this bill. We would be willing at any time the majority wants to lock in these amendments; we would be willing to come back and finish them up. And I now proposes this unanimous consent request, or we could have the majority do so, so that this bill could be completed in a reasonably short period of time.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The Presiding Officer. Under the previous order, leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The Presiding Officer. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 12 noon, with Senators permitted to speak therein up to 5 minutes.

Under the previous order, the time until 11:30 shall be under the control of the Senator from Ohio, Mr. Voinovich, or his designee.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. Nickles. Mr. President, my colleague from Nevada spent several minutes outlining a unanimous consent. It was on the time of the Senator from Ohio. I wonder if we might accommodate that.

Mr. Reid. Absentee unanimous consent that the Senator from Ohio have charge of the time until 11:35 and then the remainder of the time under the charge of the designee of the minority leader.

The Presiding Officer. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Presiding Officer. The Senator from Ohio.

THE STATE OF AFFAIRS IN THE BALKANS

Mr. Voinovich. Mr. President, as the first session of the 106th Congress comes to a close, I want to remind my colleagues that the aftermath of our nation’s largest foreign policy initiative this year and a 78-day air war, will be our nation’s biggest foreign policy concern next year.

As my colleagues are aware, I opposed our nation’s “sign or we’ll bomb” diplomacy that ultimately led to the decision to conduct the air war over Kosovo and Serbia earlier this year. Instead, I believed that we should have done all that we could to negotiate a real diplomatic solution. Nevertheless, at the conclusion of the conflict, I came to the Senate floor and commented that “some good always blows in an ill wind.”

The “good” that I saw in the ill wind of the bombing campaign was the opportunity for NATO and the United States to provide the impetus for a lasting peace throughout Southeastern Europe. Since that time, my staff and I have spent hours working hard to ensure that some good does blow in and that we do not lose this opportunity to promote peace, stability and prosperity in that region of the world.

To imagine the future of Southeast Europe, it is important to understand its past. Every student of history is well aware that this century’s two
most horrific wars had deep roots in the Balkans, but few people are aware of the level of violence, bloodshed, hatred and destruction that has been commonplace in the region for centuries. Indeed, the Balkans have been the site of countless wars and countless battles, and have been fought over by every major regional power since the days of the Roman legions.

Over the last 10 years, regional ethnic tensions have resulted in yet another nightmare for the people of the Balkans. The third time in the last century, Europe, reluctantly, has turned its attention to their southern neighbors. Their concern can be attributed to self-interest; an attempt to get Southeast Europe to settle down so as to avoid any possible spillover that could bring unrest to their nations, and a genuine concern over the ethnic cleansing and human rights violations in the region. To do this, Europe has involved itself politically and militarily in the region.

Our willingness to get involved and lead comes from a recognition that when conflicts began in Bosnia in the early 1990's, it was reported that a key foreign policy official of the Bush Administration made the statement that "we have no dog in this fight." History recorded that nothing could have been further from the truth. According to Ambassador Richard Holbrooke in his book, "To End A War":

Europe believed it could solve Yugoslavia without the United States; Washington believed that, with the Cold War over, it could leave Yugoslavia to Europe. Europe's hour had not dawned in Yugoslavia; Washington had a dog in this particular fight.

The overconfidence of Europe and the disengagement of the United States contributed greatly to the tragedy of Slavonia, Krijna and Bosnia-Herzegovina. When we finally realized it was important for the U.S. to get involved, we dealt with, and thus, legitimized three war criminals—Slobodan Milosevic, Franco Tudjman and Alija Izetbegovic—at the Dayton Peace Accords.

Unfortunately, the legitimation of Milosevic caused us to continue to have a relationship with him at a time when we should have been working with opposition leaders to get rid of him. Then, when he showed his true colors, we were reluctant to be as aggressive as we should have been. We misjudged him, we underestimated him, and now we're paying the price for our mistake.

As a result, we have spent at least $18 billion in operations in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo, Serbia and elsewhere. We will, no doubt, spend billions more in addition. We have placed a tremendous drain on the equipment and personnel of our Armed Forces due to our past and present involvement in peacekeeping missions in Southeast Europe. Also, the State Department has paid an incredible amount of attention to the Balkans. And finally, we have complicated our relations with other nations on the international scene—primarily, Russia and China.

A recent Foreign Affairs article by Elizabith Sullivan, foreign-affairs correspondant for the Cleveland Plain Dealer, indicates that the Russians harbor resentment and incredulity towards the United States over our assuming an air of moral superiority regarding their actions in Chechnya. They see our attitude as a double standard, which affects our ability to appeal to their better instincts. She writes:

The Kremlin is resolutely turning a deaf ear to U.S. admonitions for restraint in Chechnya. The criticisms have inflamed anti-U.S. feelings in Russia where it's bitterly recalled that NATO's unpopular bombing killed hundreds of Yugoslav civilians. It is the first big display of lost U.S. influence after Kosovo.

It is not that instability in Southeast Europe has the potential to threaten America's overall interests throughout the rest of Europe. However, a full-fledged integration of Southeast Europe into the whole European community would remove the burden and expense of maintaining a constant peacekeeping force, end years of diplomatic wrangling and political posturing, and more important, end the death and destruction that has plagued the region.

Recently, I met with a number of Ambassadors from the Balkans region in the LBJ room here in the Capitol. They made it very clear to me that they are ready to work together. I was pleased that they realized they have a symbiotic relationship—a relationship that must be cultivated in order to bring about peace and implement a modern, free-market economy. The Holy Spirit was definitely present in that room. There was an aura of enlightenment among those leaders, and we must capitalize on the momentum of that cooperative spirit if we are to successfully bring the region into the broader European fold.

Consider that not so many years ago, no one would have thought that European political and economic cooperation, let alone union, was possible. After all, two world wars had been fought in the trenches and on the fields of Europe, fostering tremendous ill-will among many nationalities.

Today, those feelings have largely dissipated. Germans, French, Italians—all share the same currency. They cross national boundaries freely. They solve their economic problems because it is in their collective best interest. We are seeing that in terms of competition right now. The Ambassadors I met with see this cooperation and wish for it on their nations, but they also see a contradiction with the lack of speed by the international community in responding to the humanitarian and economic needs of the region.

The NATO air war triggered immense human suffering which has not yet been fully remedied. Here are some facts:

- The refugee exodus from Kosovo decimated the economies of surrounding nations, especially from Slovenia, Krijna, and Bosnia. Another 150,000 were displaced during the Kosovo bombing.
- Kosovo, the international community has had to deal with 700,000 refugees who have returned after the conflict. 500,000 of these refugees are still officially considered "internally displaced persons," without any place to call their own.
- Kosovo has turned into an armed camp where soldiers from numerous countries are forced to keep the peace and prevent further bloodshed.
- The lack of an effective international police force has led to virtual chaos, where organized crime and illegal drug trafficking is said to be rampant and a cause of great concern among its citizens.

On this last point, a senior official from the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, OSCE, told me that the reason there is no effective police force in Kosovo is because there are not enough qualified and interested individuals willing to join the force. The official told me that if the crime problem in Kosovo isn't checked, it will spread to the entire region and into the rest of Europe.

Indeed, this point was illustrated again in the November 1 Elizabeth Sullivan article for the Cleveland Plain Dealer. She wrote:

The scope of the gun, drug and prostitute trade fanned by the Kosovo conflict is also becoming clearer. Last week, Italian and Swiss police bust a ring that allegedly smuggled millions of dollars in Swiss weapons to Kosovo, and Albanian prostitutes out to Italy, using humanitarian aid as a cover.

The growing crime problem was definitively a topic of concern for the Ambassadors I met with. I was amazed that they considered organized crime and drugs their No. 1 or No. 2 concern to be addressed. Think of that, organized crime and drugs as their No. 1 or No. 2 concern in the region.

The fact of the matter is, the bombing has had a terribly destabilizing effect on the region, and a very real impact on the humanitarian situation and the sustainability of human existence as well, one that has not been widely reported to the American people. The T.V. cameras have gone now. You know how it is: out of sight, out of mind, and we have moved on to other issues.

I have discovered that it is not easy to grasp the extent of the problem, for the last several months, the U.S. has been working through the United Nations and the International Committee for the Red Cross and an independent German war crimes commission to collect data about the number of people who have died in Kosovo.

The death toll stands at 2,000 to 3,000, including civilians, military personnel, and UN personnel. It has been reported that 250,000 people have been injured, 7,000 of which are children under the age of 17, and 950 civilians have been killed by landmines, many of which were set off by the Serbs.

The UN official told me that Kosovo is the worst humanitarian disaster the UN has faced since World War II. I asked how many Egyptians lost their lives in the 1973 war. He answered, 40,000. That's twice as many as Kosovo has lost so far.

The scope of the gun, drug and prostitute trade fanned by the Kosovo conflict is also becoming clearer. Last week, Italian and Swiss police bust a ring that allegedly smuggled millions of dollars in Swiss weapons to Kosovo, and Albanian prostitutes out to Italy, using humanitarian aid as a cover.

The growing crime problem was definitively a topic of concern for the Ambassadors I met with. I was amazed that they considered organized crime and drugs their No. 1 or No. 2 concern to be addressed. Think of that, organized crime and drugs as their No. 1 or No. 2 concern in the region.

The fact of the matter is, the bombing has had a terribly destabilizing effect on the region, and a very real impact on the humanitarian situation and the sustainability of human existence as well, one that has not been widely reported to the American people. The T.V. cameras have gone now. You know how it is: out of sight, out of mind, and we have moved on to other issues. 
Cross to deal with the needs of the region. Both the UN and the Red Cross claim that they will be able to keep people fed, clothed and sheltered through the upcoming winter. Yet, I have received a number of credible reports in recent weeks which indicate that in fact the State Department witnessed a humanitarian catastrophe in the region in the months ahead because of a lack of shelter, heat, food and medical care.

I am aware that there are individuals in the foreign policy community who are opposed to providing significant assistance to the people of Serbia. They believe that humanitarian suffering will lead to political discontent which will, in turn, lead to a popular movement that will bring about the removal of Slobodan Milosevic. I disagree.

With the exception of South Africa, crippling sanctions have not successfully brought about a change in political leadership as of Russia. I just look at Saddam Hussein in Iraq. We don’t know what is going on in Russia anymore.

To emphasize this point, Professor Julie Mertus of the Ohio Northern University wrote an excellent piece which was recently published in the Washington Post. Professor Mertus specializes in international law. Here is what she has to say:

How does a freezing and hungry Yugoslavia advance U.S. policy goals? Certainly Milosevic will not be hungry this winter. The idea is that the pain and suffering among the lowest strata of society will “trickle up” to the higher echelons. Protests by discontented citizens will lead to policy changes and perhaps even the removal of Milosevic. The problem is that humans do not behave this way. Cold, dispirited citizens do not take to the streets. Rather, they draw up inside their own homes and try to survive. If the going gets tough, they try to exit, often leaving the country. Only the few with hope continue to fight, and even they cannot persist for long when they are isolated from support networks.

Our sanctions policy has allowed Milosevic to blame Serbia’s faltering economy, declining humanitarian situation and international isolation on the West. He has been able to deflect the ire of the Serbian people who have little access to independent media.

We must pursue specific courses of action that will help us get rid of Milosevic once and for all.

No. 1, we must continue to squeeze Milosevic so that his allies inside and outside the government will see that he is vulnerable and his hold on power is tenuous. Milosevic is an indicted war criminal, and we have to make his allies understand that his fate is their fate. In other words, leave now or pay later.

No. 2, we should work with our allies to announce a detailed humanitarian and economic aid package that would be available to the people of Serbia once Milosevic is removed. The importance of this kind of package to the success of democratization was underscored recently when several of us met with the leaders of the anti-Milosevic force right here in the Capitol.

They talked about how important it was we have a clear, defined package that says, if he goes, here is what we are willing to do.

No. 3, we should provide as much assistance as we can, including such things as oil, food and direct financial assistance, as soon as possible to the Serbian opposition groups, particularly the mayors, who are struggling to bring about democratic change.

No. 4, we should continue to support President Djukanovic of Montenegro with whom I met two weeks ago. He is a bright and energetic leader and a key ally for peace and prosperity in Southeast Europe.

No. 5, we must undertake a massive effort to overrun Milosevic’s monopoly on Serbia’s mass media. Milosevic’s distorted information must be countered with the truth; a commodity we must get to the Serb people whatever way possible.

As I mentioned earlier, I held a meeting recently with a number of ambassadors and senior embassy staff from the nations of Southeast Europe to get their reaction to the Stability Pact initiative. And they were honest; they said things were not going well. They were very clear that it was essential that the United States be at the table to provide leadership and contribute our fair share.

Without our presence, they are not confident that our NATO allies will make good on the promises they made at the end of the war. And, quite frankly, I think it is up to us to make it clear to our European allies that we expect them to adhere to their commitment.

We are going to be at the table. We are going to have leadership. We are ante ing up, and it is time for you to ante up and make good on your promises.

The best way I can summarize the attitude at the meeting I had with the ambassadors, and the meeting I had with the Serbian opposition leaders is a word in Serbo-Croatian—“redemo”—which means, “let’s get going!”

On balance, I believe there has been some real progress made on a number of fronts in our policy towards Southeast Europe in recent months. The Stability Pact is moving ahead—albeit slowly and indeed need of some additional leadership, particularly ours. The policy toward sanctions seems to be finessed a bit and real work finally is being done on the ground in the region to deal with humanitarian concerns.

I am pleased the administration is starting to soften up on this a little bit.

The administration is meeting with Serbian opposition leaders and financial support is beginning to trickle into the movement. Southeastern European nations are assisting the beginning. I think regionally with the understanding they have a symbiotic relationship in their efforts to promote and develop their economies. That is wonderful.

Although in many respects, things are much better off today than they were after the war, the momentum has to be increased significantly, and that is the challenge of this Congress and this administration.

The administration, working through the State Department, bears the responsibility of bringing about real change in Serbia and honoring the commitments the United States has made to friendly governments in Southeast Europe. Congress has an obligation to provide for and support to the administration’s policies towards the restoration of peace and stability in the region.

To that end, I look forward to working with my colleagues in the next session of Congress to loosen some of the restrictive language that was placed in the Foreign Operations appropriations bill, language that the State Department claims has made it difficult, and continues to make it difficult, for them to do the kinds of things they would like to be doing in Southeast Europe.

The Senate has already made a positive start with the recent unanimous passage of the Serbia Democracy Act. I believe we need to build on that progress.

Southeast Europe is strategic to our national interests and key to our efforts to maintain peace in the world. Until the nations of Southeast Europe are welcomed into the broader European community, those efforts will remain unfilled. The United States must provide the leadership because we do “have a dog in this fight.”

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Voinovich). Without objection, it is so ordered.

MILITARY STATE OF READINESS

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I was presiding when the distinguished Senator from Ohio was talking about the problems the U.N. faces in Kosovo. I share all of the concerns the Senator from Ohio expressed. In addition to that, since I am the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Readiness Subcommittee, I have another concern, and that is the deployment of troops in Bosnia and Iraq, and the way they are being deployed today has put us in an apparent condition in terms of our state of readiness.

It is very unfortunate that during this administration we have had a cut in our force strength by approximately 50 percent, only to have a short time last week that two of our Army divisions are now rated at C-4. That means they are not capable of combat today. Those
two divisions are the 10th Army Division, of which most are located in Bosnia, and the 1st Infantry Division located in Kosovo. This means that if something should happen, we are not in a ready condition to defend where we have not successful. We believe we should be looking very soon at any way we can bring our troops back to a state of readiness, to do what we are supposed to be doing, the No. 1 function of Government, and that is to defend America.

VIQUES

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I have been a little disturbed not knowing the certainty of the schedule and how long we will have to get some things done at the last minute. I want to bring up one issue that has to be discussed briefly, and that is the issue of the range that has been located on the island of Vieques located 6 miles off the shores of Puerto Rico. I am concerned about this because we started using this range 58 years ago. We have become dependent upon it because it is the only range we can use that offers an integrated three-level type of training—first, high-altitude bombing; second, the type of protection that comes from the ships to the shore using live fire; and third, the Marine expeditionary amphibious movements. All three of those can be done simultaneously and have been done successfully over the last 58 years.

The problem we have with this range is that there is no place else in the Western Hemisphere that we can actually give the training to our troops. Right, now we have deployed into the Persian Gulf the U.S.S. Kennedy. Because this President put a moratorium on training on Vieques, only half of those deployed on the U.S.S. Kennedy have ever had the necessary training they should have to become involved in combat. We have scheduled for the 18th of February the deployment of the U.S.S. Eisenhower Battle Group. If this battle group goes through the Mediterranean and goes to the Persian Gulf, the chances are better than 50-50 they will see combat. If we do not allow them to have the training on the island of Vieques prior to their deployment, they will have to go into combat very likely without ever having any live ordnance training. This goes for the pilots flying the F-18s and the F-14s that will be deployed off the U.S.S. Eisenhower.

I was there 3 weeks ago and watched them during their training, but they were not allowed to live fire as we have hard use that range. It goes for the 24th Marine Expeditionary Unit and the others who would be deployed at the same time.

I would like to quote, if I could, Gen. Wes Clark. Of course, he is one for whom we all have a great deal of respect. We watched the way he worked commanding the European forces and the NATO forces. He said:

"The live fire training that our forces were exposed to training ranges such as Vieques helped ensure that the forces assigned to this theater—" We are talking about Kosovo, those 78, 79 days—were ready-on-arrival and prepared to fight, win, and survive.

What General Clark is saying is, we were successful. Even though we have not always had the opportunity to start with, once we made that decision, we were successful in improving our operations. We were able to move our military forces before deployment will 'adequate live-fire training for our forces. The President is going to be on this issue.

The President has imposed a moratorium on training on the island of Vieques. We are going to try our best to encourage him, for the lives of Americans, to allow us to use it to train those people who are on the U.S.S. Eisenhower, ready to be deployed.

Richard Danzig, the Secretary of the Navy, said:

"If by providing this preparation can we fairly ask our service members to put their lives at risk.

In a joint statement between the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Chief of Naval Operations, and the Commandant of the Marine Corps, they said: Vieques provides integrated live-fire training "critical to our readiness," and the failure to provide for adequate live-fire training for our naval forces before deployment will place those forces at an acceptably high risk during deployment.

This is military language to mean casualties, those who can be killed in action.

I am proud of Admiral Johnson, the Chief of Naval Operations, and General Jones, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, when they say: Without the training on Vieques, the U.S.S. Eisenhower Battle Group and the 24th Marine Expeditionary Unit scheduled for deployment in February 2000 would not be ready to go into combat with "without greatly increasing the risk to those men and women who we ask to go into harm’s way."

Lastly, Admiral Murphy, the Commander of the Sixth Fleet of the Navy, said: The loss of training on Vieques would "cost American lives."

It is a very serious thing. I sometimes listen to the complaints we hear from the people of the Puerto Rico, but mostly from the people of the island of Vieques, who say: Wait a minute. How would you like to have bombs dropped and live ordnances fired where you are? You can't do anything about that. They actually have a 10-mile buffer range between the bombing range and where people live.

I happen to represent the State of Oklahoma. We have a very fine organization there called Fort Sill, where we do all our artillery training. I have said on the floor here several times before that, while on Vieques they have a 10-mile buffer zone, we have only a 1-mile buffer zone in the State of Oklahoma between a population of 100,000 people living in Lawton and the live-fire range.

So let me just wind up and conclude by saying that many of us, including Senator WARNER, the chairman of our Armed Services Committee, are asking the President and pleading with him to work out some type of arrangement to, at the very least during this interim while we are in recess, provide for training on the island of Vieques because that if does not happen, we will lose American lives.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INHOFE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Would the Chair be kind enough to tell me what the order of business is?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are in morning business until the hour of 12 o'clock and under the minority's time.

Mr. DURBIN. I understand that my colleague, Senator KENNEDY from Massachusetts, will be joining me on the floor shortly. I will certainly yield at that point.

VIDEO CAMERAS IN THE COCKPITS OF AIRCRAFT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I would like to address several topics that I think may be of interest to those who are following the debate in the Senate. One in particular has become a focal point of the news media across the United States and literally around the world. That was the crash of the EgyptAir jet just a few weeks ago and the loss of the 2001-2.
As I went through this, I was amazed. I stopped and thought for a moment, why in the world are we still stuck with a tape recording of voices and sounds in the investigation of this aircraft disaster? I am urging my colleagues, those who feel as I do, to join me in this effort to make certain we bring the very best technology to the cockpits of aircraft, not only in the United States but those who serve the United States, so the day may come that if there is a disaster, we will have a final and complete answer to satisfy curiosity but, even more important, to make sure passengers across the world can at least have some piece of mind knowing we have done everything we can to make airline safety our top and highest priority.

Mr. DURBIN. In the closing days of this Congress, as I find absolutely incredible, in 1999, is that we are dealing with such primitive tools when it comes to investigating aircraft disasters. The idea of an audio recording in a cockpit goes back to the 1930s. That was the state of the art then. But today, technology is far more advanced and I would suggest that we need to update planes today by putting a video camera in the new planes' cockpits so we can determine what is happening in a crash.

The obvious is not being used. If you walk into a bank, if you walk into most office buildings, a casino, a convenience store, or stand in front of an ATM machine, you will be on a video camera which will reflect your conduct and your activities. Think what a difference it would make to change the way aircraft are maintained and flown to protect those who are passengers. These investigations are critically important. We often come up with information about a mechanical failure. We then set out to repair it. We decide that planes won't go back up in the air until that is taken care of. If there is human error—that will happen in most accidents, at least get to the bottom of the equation and understand what is going on.

The thing I find absolutely incredible, in 1999, is that we are down to the wire. Most of the appropriations bills. Now we are trying to bring them to a close. We have some six or seven bills that will finally be lumped together in a huge package which literally no single Member of the Senate will have time to go through all of the details, they will call us in weeks afterwards, when people pore through the details, they will call us in our offices and say: Did you know there was a paragraph in this bill which has an impact on some people, some business? In all honesty, we don't. We rely on our leadership and other appropriators. Frankly, we rely on a system that is flawed, a system that allows this to happen too often. It is an unfortunate system and, frankly, reflects the fact that this Congress has been very unproductive.

When Members of the Senate return to their homes and are asked by average families in their States, what did you accomplish to make life better for the families of America, we will be hard pressed to point to any significant thing we have done.

If we pay attention to the polling data of what Americans are worried about and what families are concerned about, we have missed the boat entirely. We have missed it entirely, when it comes to the question of the relationship between American families and their health insurance policies. Those of you who have been asked, these families respond that they are concerned about the fact doctors are no longer making decisions, nurses are no longer making decisions. Decisions are being made by insurance companies and their clerks.

We are down to the wire. Most of the major issues that are on the minds of the American public are being buried in this session of the Congress. Most of the bills, such as the Patients' Bill of Rights, the new plane safety by putting a video camera in the cockpit of aircraft, not only in the United States but those who serve the United States, so the day may come that if there is a disaster, we will have a final and complete answer, not just to satisfy curiosity but, even more important, to make sure passengers across the world can at least have some piece of mind knowing we have done everything we can to make airline safety our top and highest priority.
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Mr. DURBIN. In the closing days of this Congress, as I find absolutely incredible, in 1999, is that we are dealing with such primitive tools when it comes to investigating aircraft disasters. The idea of an audio recording in a cockpit goes back to the 1930s. That was the state of the art then. But today, technology is far more advanced and I would suggest that we need to update planes today by putting a video camera in the new planes' cockpits so we can determine what is happening in a crash.

The obvious is not being used. If you walk into a bank, if you walk into most office buildings, a casino, a convenience store, or stand in front of an ATM machine, you will be on a video camera which will reflect your conduct and your activities. Think what a difference it would make to change the way aircraft are maintained and flown to protect those who are passengers. These investigations are critically important. We often come up with information about a mechanical failure. We then set out to repair it. We decide that planes won't go back up in the air until that is taken care of. If there is human error—that will happen in most accidents, at least get to the bottom of the equation and understand what is going on.
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passed by the Senate excluded more than 100 million Americans from basic protections of health insurance reform. Most of the provisions applied only to the 48 million Americans in big employer-sponsored plans. It failed to provide basic protection to millions of others.

In my State, Caterpillar Tractor Company’s workers would have been covered by the Senate bill; Motorola’s employees would have been covered. John Deere’s would be covered. But America’s small business employees would be left behind by the Senate Republican bill. A farmer in Macoupin County, IL, who pays for his own family’s insurance, and pays a lot for it, wouldn’t be safe from insurance abuses. Public school teachers, policemen, women, firemen, and so many others would be out of luck.

I will return to this in a moment. I will speak to another issue, which I believe the Senator from Massachusetts is going to address. That is the perils situation we find ourselves in in the closing hours of the session when it comes to the critical question of fairness in organ allocation.

We have a situation across America where over 4,800 Americans die every year waiting for an organ transplant. There are people in your State and mine sitting by the telephone hoping for the call that tells them they have a chance to live. It is hard to believe this has become a political issue. In fact, it has.

An effort by the Department of Health and Human Services to make organs available across America to those in need is being stopped by an organization and a special interest group that really has put profit ahead of human well-being. I hope we can address this and address it forcefully. Let it be known on a bipartisan basis that we want to take the politics and the special interests out of organ allocation, that our dedication is to the men and women in this country want to work and are able to work. But they are denied the opportunity, primarily because they lack the continued access to needed health care. As a result, the nation is denied their talents and contributions to our community.

Eliminating the health care barriers to work will help large numbers of disabled men and women in this country want to work and are able to work. But they are denied the opportunity, primarily because they lack the continued access to needed health care. As a result, the nation is denied their talents and contributions to our community.

For far too long, disabled Americans have been left out and left behind. It is time for us to take the long overdue action needed to correct the injustices and unfair barriers placed upon those with disabilities. We should not have this legislation brought down by a controversial provision that does not belong in this bill—a provision that is effectively what they call around here a “poison pill.” A provision that endangers the legislation.

I want to say that for a time it looked as if we were going to see a successful achievement for this legislation, and I want to commend my colleague and friend, the Senator from Vermont, Mr. JEFFORDS, for his strong leadership, as chairman of our Human Resources Committee. He has worked long and hard for this legislation. If we are able to achieve it, his role in support of it and also in its development is enormously important.

On the unacceptable amendment that I had mentioned, it is the amendment which would effectively undermine the progress which would make the Nation’s organ transplantation system more equitable. House leaders are maneuvering to undo a deal reached by conferees allowing the rules to go into effect, even threatening to block an unrelated authorization for research and training at children’s hospitals if the organ rules are not further delayed.

This was written at a time when they were threatening to hold up the help and assistance that pediatric hospitals need to train pediatricians, to make sure that pediatric hospitals were going to be treated fairly and equally, as other teaching hospitals.

There is widespread bipartisan support for the post-Hospital teaching in pediatric hospitals. But that was going to be the messenger, and the poison pill was going to be the language which, as I understand, would be a part of the legislation that we will see later on in the day.

Let me continue with the Post editorial:

The rules issuance last year touched off furious counter-lobbying by the supporters of the small local transplant centers who feared that a new system based on a new system based on the distribution of organs would effectively undermine the distribution system of some of its inefficiencies would have been welcome. In stead, local transplant centers, which would effectively undermine the distribution system of some of its inefficiencies would have been welcome.

Mr. President, that agreement was broken with the language that has been included on the disability legislation. By breaking that agreement, the bill opens door for the disabled and desperately ill people are put at risk. Every year, thousands of people die while waiting for transplantation—and at least one person every day dies because the transplantation system is not working. The proposal to support the amendment which would effectively undermine the process, which would make the Nation’s organ transplantation system more equitable.

On the unacceptable amendment that I had mentioned, it is the amendment which would effectively undermine the progress which would make the Nation’s organ transplantation system more equitable.

Congress finds it necessary to attach a controversial provision to the legislation that could jeopardize the opportunity for large numbers of people with disabilities to fulfill their hopes and dreams of living independent and productive lives.

A little history: when Congress enacted the Americans With Disabilities Act, we promised our disabled fellow citizens a new and better life in which disability would no longer put an end to the American dream. Too often, for too many Americans, that promise has been unfulfilled. The Ticket To Work and Work Incentives Improvement Act is basically the legislation that Senator JEFFORDS of Vermont and I, Senator ROTH, and Senator MOYNIHAN urged the Senate to accept and had been accepted by the Senate by a 99-0 vote. Now the title is the Ticket To Work and Work Incentives Improvement Act, and it will dramatically strengthen the fulfillment of that promise.

We know that millions of disabled men and women in this country want to work and are able to work. But they are denied the opportunity, primarily because they lack the continued access to needed health care. As a result, the nation is denied their talents and contributions to our community.

Eliminating the health care barriers to work will help large numbers of disabled Americans to achieve self-sufficiency and enable them to become equal partners in the American dream.

The Ticket To Work and Work Incentives Improvement Act removes these unfair barriers to work that face so many Americans with disabilities. It makes health insurance available and affordable when a disabled person goes to work, or develops a significant disability while working; it gives people greater access to the services they need to become successfully employed; it phases out the loss of cash benefits as income increases; and it gives workers with disabilities face today; it places work incentives in communities, rather than bureaucracies, to help workers with disabilities to learn how to obtain the employment services and support they need.

For far too long, disabled Americans have been left out and left behind. It is time for us to take the long overdue action needed to correct the injustices and unfair barriers placed upon those with disabilities. We should not have this legislation brought down by a controversial provision that does not belong in this bill—a provision that is effectively what they call around here a “poison pill.” A provision that endangers the legislation.

I want to say that for a time it looked as if we were going to see a successful achievement for this legislation, and I want to commend my colleague and friend, the Senator from Vermont, Mr. JEFFORDS, for his strong leadership, as chairman of our Human Resources Committee. He has worked long and hard for this legislation. If we are able to achieve it, his role in support of it and also in its development is enormously important.
Mr. President, I will take only a moment or two more—because the time is moving on—to refer to the Institute of Medicine report on organ transplantation. I will mention relevant parts of the institute report, and focus on the conclusion that the Institute of Medicine had on the whole question of developing rules of fairness for organ transplantation—the question of how to best address the moral issues and the ability of people to be treated fairly under a system of organ distribution.

The institute's analysis shows that patients who have a less urgent need for a transplant sometimes receive transplants before more severely ill patients who are served by different OPOs. There is no credible evidence that implementing the HHS's recommendation would result in closures of transplant centers.

Mr. President, that fear about the fate of small centers is the heart of the argument of those that have put on this rider. A rider that has no business being part of the legislation.

The Institute of Medicine analysis further found that there is no reason to conclude that minority and low-income patients would be less likely to obtain organ transplants as a result. Likewise, data does not support the assertion that potential donors and their families would decline to make donations because an organ might be used outside the donor's immediate geographical area.

The Institute of Medicine recommended that HHS—and this is on page 12 of the report—should exercise the legitimate oversight responsibilities assigned to it by the National Organ Transplant Act, and articulated in the Final Rule, to manage the system of organ procurement and transplantation in the public interest.

Federal oversight is needed to ensure that high standards of equity and quality are met. Those high standards of equity and quality were included in the Secretary's excellent recommendation. By tampering with those, we are undermining enormously powerful and important health policy issues. And this extremely controversial rider is added onto underlying legislation which is so important to millions of disabled individuals in our country. Individuals who thought—when this legislation moved through with very strong bipartisan support in the Senate, and through the final months, has moved through the House of Representatives, and has the strong support of President Clinton, and has had the bipartisan support here in the Congress—that there was going to be a new day for those who have physical or mental challenges. Individuals who really have the ability to participate in the workforce and become more productive, useful, active, and independent citizens in this country, and also to be able to contribute to the Nation in a more significant way.

I certainly hope we can work through this process because the legislation, which as I mentioned, has been completed and supported in a bipartisan way, is a lifeline to millions of Americans and deserves passage.

I see my friend and colleague, Senator Jeffords, who has been instrumental in having this legislation advanced. I achieved the floor at this time. I hope he will address the Senate on this issue.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.
The Senator from Vermont.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. Jeffords. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that morning business be extended until 1 p.m. with the time equally divided in the usual form. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. Jeffords. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Massachusetts. It would be happy if he desires to more fully discuss what we have done. I was not here to hear his full speech. I thank him. We have worked together. He was here years before I came to the Senate. In 1975, we had the initial big step forward for the disabled and were able to set up the 94142, as it was called, then, to make sure all children got a good education, and specialize those with disabilities.

As we have walked through this over a period of many years, we have fought year by year to remove block by block what the disabled community has had to face. Finally, we are at that point where we are opening the final door to allow them to do what all disabled want to do, and that is to have a meaningful life, to seek employment, and get employment without having the doors slammed because they lost their benefits.

I can't thank the Senator enough for what he has done. Also, there are others, some who have left this body, such as Bob Dole, who was another leader for the disabled. I praise him also for the work he did, and especially in this area where he helped us introduce the bill that we were so happy to be able to cosponsor and to see it put into the final steps.

I thank the Senator from Massachusetts profusely for all he has done. I would be happy to yield for any further comments.

Mr. Kennedy. As I mentioned earlier, this has been a continuing process beginning with the passage of the Americans With Disabilities Act, when we put into law protections for the disabled so they wouldn't be discriminated against in the workplace based upon their disability.

As the Senator knows very well, that has been enormously important and has been effective. But as the Senator has pointed out, with this legislation complimenting what has been achieved with the Americans With Disabilities Act, we can open an entirely new dawn for millions who have some disability. As we are getting closer to achieving that, I am sure the Senator agrees with me that when we finally have the President's signature on this, there will be people saying: What has taken them so long? This is such a common-sense approach. But as the Senator knows, this has been a very difficult step of the way. There have been those who have felt that if we do this for this particular group, we might be establishing some form of precedent that may be used somewhere down the road, and worry if we know where it might lead.

There are a number of strong negative voices out there. Nonetheless, I think with the leadership of the Senator from Vermont and others—he has cosponsored certainly Senator Dole, Senator Weicker, and our good friend on our human resources committee, Tom Harkin, who is generally recognized in this body as one of the real authorities on disability issues—this has been a common ground effort of this institution. It is an area of public policy where this institution has done what it is challenged to do; and that is to find common ground in a bipartisan way to address a common concern that affects millions of Americans and makes progress on it.

I again thank the Senator from Vermont for the opportunity to work with him. We still have a ways to go to make sure the legislation actually reaches the people and addresses the regulations in the way it is intended. But I think this is going to be enormously important—and I hope soon to finally have the President's signature on this legislation. We are much closer today than we have ever been in the past.

I join with the Senator to thank him for his good work. We hope to see that this is actually put into place and implemented so it will benefit those that it should benefit.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. Jeffords. Mr. President, again, I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for those comments and for all the work he has done.

I am delighted to stand before you today, to speak about an extremely important piece of legislation. The bill we are sending to the President today, a bill I know he is eager to sign into law, has a tremendous impact on people with disabilities. In fact, this legislation is the most important piece of legislation for the disability community since the Americans With Disabilities Act.

My reason for sponsoring this particular piece of legislation is quite simple. The Work Incentives Improvement Act of 1999 addresses a fundamental flaw in current law. Today, individuals with disabilities are forced to make a
choice...an absurd choice. They must choose between working and receiving health care. Under current federal law, if people with disabilities work and earn over $700 per month, they will lose cash payments and health care coverage from the Federal Treasury in cash payments for Social Security disability beneficiaries in each state return to work and forgo cash payments. That would be 10,000 individuals out of the 9.5 million individuals with disabilities across the country. The Federal Treasury in cash payments for just these 10,000 people would be $133,550,000! Imagine the savings to the Federal Treasury if this number were higher. Clearly, the Work Incentives Improvement Act of 1999 is fiscally responsible legislation.

I began work on this bill in 1996. Though it was a long and sometimes difficult task, many hands made light work. Senator Kennedy, Ranking Member on the HELP Committee, joined me in March of 1997. Senator Roth and Moynihan, Chairman and Ranking Member on the Finance Committee signed on as committed partners in December of 1998. Last January, 35 of our colleagues, from both sides of the aisle, joined us in introducing S. 331, the Senate version of this legislation. One week later, in a Finance Committee hearing, we heard compelling testimony from our friend, former Senator Dole, a strong supporter of this bill month. He marked this legislation out of the Finance Committee with an overwhelming majority in favor of the bill.

Finally, on June 19th, with a total of 80 cosponsors, we passed this legislation on the floor of the United States Senate, with a unanimous vote.

Four months later, over 35 of our colleagues in the House of Representatives took to the floor of their chamber, and spoke eloquently for their version of this legislation. Later that day, the bill passed the floor of the House with a vote of 412-9. Since then, the Senate and House Conferences have been working diligently in effort to reach common ground. I am very pleased today, that the differences in policy in the two different bills have been resolved and consensus has been reached on a conference agreement. This agreement does not compromise the original legislation, retaining key provisions from S. 331.

From my perspective, the Work Incentives Improvement Act of 1999 represents a natural and important progression in federal policy for individuals with disabilities. That is, federal policy increasingly reflects the premise that individuals with disabilities are cherished by their families, valued and respected in their communities, and are an asset and resource to our national economy. Today, most federal policy promotes opportunities for these individuals, regardless of the severity of their disabilities, to contribute to their maximum potential–at home, in school, at work, and in the community. I believe this bill will improve the lives of individuals with disabilities throughout my Congressional career. Providing a solid elementary and secondary education for children with disabilities, so that they will be equipped along with their peers, to benefit from post-secondary and employment opportunities is crucial.

When I came to Congress in 1975, Public Law 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act, now the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), was signed into law. IDEA assures each child with a disability, a free and appropriate public education. I am proud to be one of the original drafters of this legislation which has reshaped what we offer to expect of children with disabilities in our nation’s schools.

In addition, I have been committed to providing job training opportunities for individuals with disabilities. In 1978, I played a central role in ensuring that vocational rehabilitation services, offered by the federal government for individuals with disabilities through an amendment to the Rehabilitation Act. I believe that this amendment alone laid the foundation for significant legislation that followed, including the Technology-Related Assistance for Individuals with Disabilities Act of 1988, now the Assistive Technology Act of 1998, both of which I drafted. Most importantly, this legislation opened the door for the first time in America. It was the first piece of legislation of all, the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. This legislation prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability in employment, public services, public accommodations, transportation, and telecommunications.

These laws have forever changed the social landscape of America. They serve as models for other countries who recognize that their citizens with disabilities are an untapped resource. In our country, individuals with disabilities are doing everything. Just this past weekend, thousands of physically disabled individuals participated in the New York City Marathon, as they have been doing for years. The expectations that these people set for themselves and the standards we apply to them have increasingly been raised, and now in many circumstances equal those set and applied to other individuals.

Unfortunately, one major inequity remains. That is, the loss of health care coverage if an individual on the Social Security disability rolls chooses to work. Individuals with disabilities want to work. They have told me this. In fact, a Harris survey found that 72 percent of Americans with disabilities want to work, but only one-third of them do work. With today’s enactment of the Work Incentives Improvement Act of 1999, individuals with disabilities will no longer need to worry about losing their health care if they choose to work a forty-hour week, to put in overtime, or to pursue career advancement. Individuals with disabilities are sitting at home right now, waiting for this legislation to become law. Having a job will provide those of us who have access to job training and job placement assistance from a wider range of providers than is available at this time. Currently, there are 9.5 million individuals with disabilities across the country who receive cash payments and health care coverage from the Federal government. Approximately 24,000 of these individuals live in my home state, Vermont. Once enacted, the Work Incentives Improvement Act will actually save the federal government money. It is assumed that 200 Social Security disability beneficiaries in each state return to work and forgo cash payments. That would be 10,000 individuals out of the 9.5 million individuals with disabilities across the country. The Federal Treasury in cash payments for just these 10,000 people would be $133,550,000! Imagine the savings to the Federal Treasury if this number were higher. Clearly, the Work Incentives Improvement Act of 1999 is fiscally responsible legislation.

In addition, I have been committed to providing job training opportunities for individuals with disabilities. In 1978, I played a central role in ensuring that vocational rehabilitation services, offered by the federal government for individuals with disabilities through an amendment to the Rehabilitation Act. I believe that this amendment alone laid the foundation for significant legislation that followed, including the Technology-Related Assistance for Individuals with Disabilities Act of 1988, now the Assistive Technology Act of 1998, both of which I drafted. Most importantly, this legislation opened the door for the first time in America. It was the first piece of legislation of all, the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. This legislation prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability in employment, public services, public accommodations, transportation, and telecommunications.

These laws have forever changed the social landscape of America. They serve as models for other countries who recognize that their citizens with disabilities are an untapped resource. In our country, individuals with disabilities are doing everything. Just this past weekend, thousands of physically disabled individuals participated in the New York City Marathon, as they have been doing for years. The expectations that these people set for themselves and the standards we apply to them have increasingly been raised, and now in many circumstances equal those set and applied to other individuals.

I would like to take the time now to briefly outline the major provisions which have remained as part of this legislation. The conference agreement retains the two state options of establishing Medicaid buy-ins for individuals on Social Security disability rolls, who choose to work and exceed income limits in current law, as well as for those who show medical improvement, but still have an underlying disability.
For working individuals with disabilities, the conference agreement extends access, beyond what is allowed in current law, to Medicare. In addition, the legislation before us today retains several key provisions from S. 331, including the authority to fund Medicaid demonstration projects to provide access to health care to working individuals with a potentially severe disability; the State Infrastructure Grant Program, to assist states in reaching and helping individuals with disabilities who work; work incentive planners and protection and advocacy programs; and finally, most of the provisions in the Ticket to Work Program.

In order to control the cost of this legislation, compromises were made. Although the purpose of the State Infrastructure Grant Program and the Medicaid Demonstration Grant Program remain the same, the terms and conditions of these grants were altered in conference. As a result, states are not required to meet a Medicaid necessity exception to individuals with disabilities on Social Security, who work and exceed income limits in current law, prior to receiving an infrastructure or a Medicaid Demonstration Grant.

Also, the extended period of eligibility for Medicare for working individuals with disabilities has been changed from 24 to 78 months. During this extended period, the federal share will be covered through the Part A premium of Medicare for a working individual with a disability, who is eligible for Medicare. S. 331 would have extended such coverage for an individual's working life, if he or she became eligible during a 6-year time period.

I would like to note two changes to the Ticket to Work program made during Conference. The new legislation shifts the appointment authority for the members of the Work Incentives Advisory Panel from the Commissioner of Social Security to the President and Congress. In addition, language regarding the reimbursements between employment networks and state vocational rehabilitation agencies was deleted in Conference. The new legislation gives the Commissioner of Social Security the authority to address these matters through regulation.

Although several changes have been made from the original Work Incentives bill, I am still very pleased with what we are adopting today. This legislation that makes sense, and it will contribute to the well-being of millions of Americans, including those with disabilities and their friends, their families, and their coworkers. I express my gratitude to the staff of the Senate and the Congress for reaching this agreement.

As a matter of fact, the conference agreement eliminates in Conference. The new legislation before us today retains many of the provisions of the Ticket to Work Program. In addition to staff, we received countless hours of assistance and advice from the Work Incentives Task Force of the Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities. These individuals worked tirelessly to educate Members of Congress about the need for and the effects of this legislation.

If I might, I would like to urge my colleagues in both chambers to set aside any concerns about peripheral matters and to focus on the central provisions of this legislation. Let's focus on what today's vote will mean to the 9.5 million individuals with disabilities across the nation. At last, these individuals will be able to work, to preserve their health, to support their families, to become independent, and most important, to contribute to their communities, the economy, and the nation. We are making a statement, a noble statement and we must do the right thing. Let's send this bill to the President.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, under the unanimous consent agreement, how much time remains in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENVETT). We are in morning business until 1 o'clock, with the time equally divided between the two sides.

Mr. DURBIN. The remaining time on the Democratic side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twenty-six minutes.

LEGISLATIVE LANDFILL

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, as we reflect at the end of this legislative session on our accomplishments, it is important to note that there are very few things we can look back on and be proud of. It is true that we achieved.

100 Senators and 435 Members of the House of Representatives came to Washington, DC, at the beginning of the year and listened closely to President Clinton's State of the Union Address where he outlined a program and some objectives, many of which were not achieved. The applause lines were frequent during the conference speech. People of both political parties left the State of the Union Address saying they were now energized and invigorated to go forward and address the issues facing America, and we began the legislative process.

For me, it is the 17th time I have been through this. It is hard for me to remember another session of the Congress as unproductive as this session of the Congress. When it came to issues that the people and families across America care about, this Congress refused to do anything. This wasn't a titanic struggle between the Republican conservative agenda and the progressive agenda of the Democrats where we brought issues to the floor and fought for a principle. We do that in every Congress. That is what we are supposed to see on Capitol Hill. That didn't happen because there was no agenda on the other side. The Republican leadership had no agenda.

Finally, yes, a Republican Congressman said we considered this year a "legislative timeout." When timeouts occur during the course of an NFL football game, most people leave the room and go to the refrigerator. If America's families had left the room and gone to the refrigerator, they would have spent a lot of time there this year if they were waiting for Congress to do something. We didn't do it. We didn't respond. Now we have to go home, as we should, and explain it.

Let me state some of the issues we failed to act on this year, issues that make a difference to families across America. The Patients' Bill of Rights: The relationship of a person, a family, a business, to their health insurance company. That is pretty basic. When we asked America's families, they said that is the No. 1 concern. We want to make certain, when we go in a doctor's office, that the doctor makes the decision, not some clerk at an insurance company off in Topeka, KS.

I know from my experience in Illinois, as most others know from their own personal experiences, many times doctors are being overruled. I can recall a doctor who said to me a mother came in the office with an infant and the baby had been complaining of a headache on the right side of his head for several months. The doctor asked if it was always complaining about one side of his head, and the mother said yes. The doctor thought: I had better take an MRI to see if there might be a brain tumor. Before he said that to the mother, he looked at her file for the name of her insurance company. He said, excuse me, left the room, got on the phone and called the insurance company. He said: The mother presents herself with an infant complaining of headaches for several weeks and
months on one side of the head. It is my medical decision and opinion we should have an MRI to determine whether there is a possibility of a brain tumor.

The voice on the other end of the phone said: No, no. The insurance company that pays for the bills declines that procedure.

That doctor had to walk back to that room and not even tell the mother what had happened. He was bound by his contract not even to disclose that his medical judgment had been overruled by an insurance company clerk.

That is the state of health care in America. Families who go into those doctors’ offices, the patient-doctor relationship is a sacred one that can be trusted, are beginning to think twice. They appeal to Members of Congress, Democrats and Republicans: Do something; restore our faith in our medical system. Restore quality health care. Pass a Patients’ Bill of Rights.

No, not in this Congress. This Congress and the Senate on July 15 passed a bill friendly to the insurance companies—as if they needed another friend on Capitol Hill—a bill which, frankly, didn’t address the most basic issues families everywhere are facing everyday.

I won’t even get into the question of expanding medical insurance coverage. We wouldn’t even utter those words on Capitol Hill for fear it might bring down Chappaquiddick radicalism, the idea that the 44 million uninsured Americans who grow in number every year might have their Government care enough to do something. We are not in that business with the Republican-controlled Congress. We don’t talk about those things—like the aunt who is somewhere off in the distance, never referred to by a family.

We don’t talk about medical coverage for all Americans. Families talk about it. Families talk about their kids turning 26 years of age, coming off their health insurance policies of their moms and dads, and whether they have a chance to be covered. Families talk about whether or not someone with a preexisting condition can find insurance in this country. We don’t talk about it in Congress, no. The insurance companies don’t want Members to talk about it. The special interests ruled this session of Congress.

We see in the Republican legislative landfill of the 106th Congress, the Patients’ Bill of Rights, an issue we failed to address.

The nuclear test ban treaty: It was a sad day for America. It was a sad day for a country which has tried to lead the world and say to countries such as India and Pakistan, stop what you are doing, don’t keep this arms race going and develop nuclear weapons that could mushroom into a war that would destroy millions of people in those two countries but in many other nations. This Congress, this Senate, failed to enact a nuclear test ban treaty.

We failed to enact any legislation to deal with school construction. Take a look at the numbers: There will be more kids showing up for classes in the next 10 years than we have been serving in the last 10 or 20 years. Those kids need teachers, they need classrooms, they need modern schools, schools where they have the electricity to make certain they can sustain the computer technology, schools that are safe, schools where kids have a positive learning environment. When the President announced the school construction, it was greeted with disbelief and disapproval on the other side of the aisle. We have done nothing in this session of Congress to deal with school construction.

Campaign finance reform: Is there a more basic issue for the future of Congress? Will we ever change the current system which has become a bidding war among special interests where Members of the Senate such as myself literally have to be on the phone day and night, begging for money for a campaign that costs millions of dollars? If you are not independently wealthy and cannot write a big check to sustain your own campaign in the Senate, you spend most of your time begging for money. Is that what Americans want in the Senate or the House of Representatives? I don’t think so.

A bipartisan bill—Senator John McCain, a Republican, of Arizona, and Senator Paul Wellstone, a Democrat from Wisconsin—said we can clean up this system, but this Congress failed to enact meaningful campaign finance reform. Only 55 Senators—45 Democrats and 10 Republicans—came forward in support of this most basic change in reform.

As part of the legislative landfill of the 106th Congress, Republicans were successful in not passing campaign finance reform.

Minimum wage increase? The minimum wage in this country is $5.15 an hour. When you calculate that out, it means a little over $10,000 a year in income. Can any of us consider a life on $10,000 a year and what it would mean? Keep in mind these are single men and women who get up and go to work every single day and make $5.15 an hour. Inflation eats away at it, at a maximum wage in this country is $5.15 an hour. When you calculate that out, it means a little over $10,000 a year in income. Can any of us consider a life on $10,000 a year and what it would mean? Keep in mind these are single men and women who get up and go to work every single day and make $5.15 an hour. Inflation eats away at it, at a

President said, and I agree: We need to focus 100,000 teachers into starting their education and help them along. You take the kids who are the best and the brightest and you give them the biggest challenges. You take those who may be suffering from some learning disability, you diagnose their problem and try to deal with it at an early age. You take the kids who do not learn as quickly as others and give them special attention. For teachers to achieve that, they need smaller class sizes. If you put 30 kids in a classroom, the teacher is lucky to maintain discipline, let alone meet the special needs of individual students.

So the President said, and I agree: We need to focus 100,000 teachers into reducing class size across America. Until a few days ago, the Republicans had opposed this. Finally, the President succeeded. Final hurdle is moving forward on this initiative which we started last year that serves school districts all across America, not just in Washington, D.C., the very special interests that are represented in this Congress. We have a different agenda. We are writing a different agenda.
the cities but in the towns and suburbs alike.

Look at the efforts to help family farmers. We finally came through with that on a bipartisan basis. It is one of the things we achieved this year. But it begins to leave it—we have to move on because next year if we do not change the basic Federal farm policy, the so-called Freedom to Farm Act, we are going to see a rerun, unfortunately, of what we saw this year—farmers literally in danger of losing their farms. As prices across the world have plummeted, they cannot make a decent income.

In my home State of Illinois, a State that has a very strong farm sector, just a few years ago the average net farm income for a farmer was about $48,000 a year. This year it will be about $25,000. That is about half. But $13,000 of the $25,000 will come from Federal payments. The other about $12,000 will come in farm operations. We cannot sustain a farm economy where half the income is dependent on Federal payments. That is why we have to move on and change the Federal farm policy.

For years, the Social Security disability program has provided a vital safety net to those who fall on hard times and need help when they become sick or injured and cannot support themselves. It has done this job well. But for the many disabled people who have wanted to return to work and could be able to work, the disability program has not worked as well. It has not properly equipped them to return to the workforce. It has not given them the tools they need to move off the disability rolls. Obtaining this support is often a high degree of medical care even after they return to work. Obtaining this care—and paying for it—is often a high hurdle to cross, especially for those who move back to the workplace in entry and lower-level positions.

The bill we are dealing with today, the ticket-to-work legislation, is a good step forward in helping disabled people who want to leave the disability rolls and return to work—the availability of adequate health care. Many of these potential workers continue to require a high degree of medical care even after they return to work. The ticket-to-work legislation would open up new hope, the ladder they need to climb out of that hole. The Ticket To Work and Work Incentives Improvement Act modernizes the disability program and moves it into the modern age.

The Ticket To Work and Work Incentives Improvement Act makes a tremendous difference for the disabled in America. By passing this legislation, we are going to make it easier for them to return to work and become self-sufficient. We are going to give those who want to try to return to work the tools they need to support themselves and to escape from the dependency on a monthly Government check.
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The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

NORTHEAST DAIRY COMPACT

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, in a while—though it is not clear when—it is my understanding that Congressmen OBEY from Wisconsin—and I see Senator FEINGOLD from Wisconsin on the floor—what is in the press release with any number of different motions to adjourn before this conference report is acted upon.

We will eventually get this huge omnibus conference report. Those of us from the Midwest dairy States are incredulous about what has been done. It goes beyond dairy. Later on, believe me, we are going to have plenty of time to talk about dairy farmers. We are going to talk about what it means to dairy farmers. I do not think we are going to go under who are already struggling enough, but I think also, I want people in Minnesota to be speaking out loudly and clearly and then design rules in such a way you can do what they want.

I come to the floor to say to Congressmen OBEY in the House: I applaud your efforts. What we have is raw politics—just get this through. That is what they have done with this Northeast Dairy Compact. They could not do it on the Senate. They stuck it in a conference report. They did it in the dead of night. They did it outside any public scrutiny. And now they present it to us in a conference report as a fait accompli. They set up a continuing resolution that goes into next week.

They figure out ways of jamming people, and it is unclear as to what leverage we have left. But, as Congressmen OBEY is doing in the House, I am sure those of us who are from Wisconsin and Minnesota in the Senate intend to speak out. We intend to be very clear about what has happened, and we will do all we can as Senators. We will go forward.

I say to my colleagues that almost as much as the final product, I came to the floor of the Senate to strongly dissent from the way it was done. I understand the rules. I understand what it is all about. I think what the majority leader, the Senate majority leader, and House Majority Leader ARMEY have done. I think that is what the Republicans have done in this conference committee. There is no question about it.

But I want people in Minnesota to know that we will continue to speak out about this, even as we see less and less openness for our leverage. We will fight in whatever way we can. We will certainly not be silent about this. When this bill comes over, I would think, I say to my colleague from Wisconsin, Senator FEINGOLD, we can probably expect a considerable amount of discussion about not only the impact on dairy farmers and what it is going to mean for a lot of people who are going to go under who are already struggling enough, but I think also, I want people in Minnesota to be speaking out loudly and clearly, and then design rules in such a way you can just roll it through—we will certainly be speaking out loudly and clearly about it.

I yield the floor. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

A PRODUCTIVE SESSION AND ISSUES FACING AMERICA

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, while presiding and listening to some of my distinguished colleagues talking about the lack of productivity of this session of Congress, I want to mention a few things that were very productive and that we can be very proud of when we go home and say we were able to get certain things done.

Before doing that, though, and to ensure I get one point out before using up the time that is allotted, the distinguished Senator from Illinois named a number of issues that he thought were somewhat disgraceful—for example, the fact that we do not have more gun control legislation.

Maybe because of my roots back in Oklahoma, I find it very difficult to understand this mentality, that somehow guns are the culprit as opposed to the people, and somehow that honest, law-abiding, American citizen who wants to be disarmed, should have to give up their guns, while the criminal element would not be giving up their guns.

Time and time again, every survey that has been done, every study that has taken place, has come to the conclusion that the problems that we have are of a criminal element. There are people out there who are not getting adequately punished, and they will continue to have firearms, I will just make one statement. It seems incredibly naive to me anyone could believe that if we pass a law that makes it illegal for all citizens to own guns, somehow the criminal element, who by their very definition and nature, are criminals, will comply with the law.

Also, it seems very frustrating to me that we have a President of the United States who wants to have all kinds of legislation to take guns from law-abiding citizens and at the same time turns 16 terrorists loose on the streets of America; that we have a President of the United States who will make speeches—as this President made some 133 times, including in two State of the Union Messages—that now, for the first time in contemporary history, the first time since the dawn of the nuclear age, there is not one—I repeat, not one—missile aimed at American children tonight. When he made that statement, he knew full well that in at least one country, China, there were a minimum of at least 13 American cities that were targeted at that very moment. So we are living in a very dangerous world.

I listened to the concerns that we have on the nuclear test ban treaty. As chairman of the Readiness Subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I would like to kind of lead into that to at least explain to thinking people that we did the right thing by not unilaterally disarm.

We are now in the most threatened position that we have been in, in the history of America. By that, I mean for things that have happened in the last 7 years in three broad categories.

First of all, we have a President of the United States who, through his veto messages, starting in 1993 in vetoing the defense authorization bills, and then succeeding bills since that
time, has done so, so that we would have to cut down the size of our military, so that we now have ended up having a force strength of one-half of what we had in 1991 and 1992 during the Persian Gulf war.

It is another matter of the President vetoing defense authorization bills and taking money out of our defense system to put into his favorite domestic social programs, but at the same time he has deployed our troops to places all over the Earth where we have no national security interests. So now we have troops in Bosnia. I remember in December of 1995, when we were on the floor trying to pass a resolution of disapproval, to stop the President from sending our rare military assets to places such as Bosnia. We lost it by three votes. The President said: Let me do this. If we defeat this resolution, and if we get to send troops into Bosnia, I promise they will be home for Christmas 1996. Here we are getting close to Christmas 1999 and the troops are still not home. There is no end in sight.

We have the same thing in Kosovo. We have had serious problems. I have gone over to Kosovo, I am sure, more than any other Member has, only to find out this is a war that has been going on for 600 years, a war where the two sides alternate in who is the good guy and who is the bad guy. Ethnic cleansing has taken place historically for 600 years; both the Serbian side and the Albanian side. So it was a horrible awakening I had when I was over there, right after we went in there with cruise missiles, where we had refugees in different places such as Tirana, Albania. I can remember walking through the refugee camp. The people were well cared for. They were doing quite well. But then they looked at me and said: Where are you and America going to do something about our problem? I said: What is your problem? They said: Well, we're refugees. I said: Why should we in the United States be as concerned about that as other countries?

They said: Because it is because of you that we are refugees. It is because the ethnic cleansing was not accelerated until the time that the bombs started being dropped on that town. So we now have a weakened defense system because of this President, and 2 of 10 Army divisions should be made here in Washington, DC. They could fire one from North Korea that would take 35 minutes to get there. We have to have a defense system to knock it down because this President vetoed our national missile defense effort.

Now the American people have awakened to this, and we have enough Democrats who are supporting Republicans to rebuild our system and to try to get a national missile defense system deployed. Unfortunately, it couldn't happen for another 2 years, maybe 2½ to 3 years.

That goes back to the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty about which my distinguished colleague from Illinois was talking. I think probably the best thing that could have happened to us for our national security was to defeat that. If we don't have a national missile defense system, then what do we have to deter other countries from launching missiles at the United States?

What we have is a nuclear stockpile. We have the right to have a nuclear stockpile. Because of the President's moratorium, they haven't been tested for 7 years. We don't know whether or not they work. I suggest it might be better not even to have nuclear weapons than to have weapons but not know whether they work. That is exactly what we have right now. If we had passed the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, there would be no verification, there would be no way in the world we could have known our stockpile was working because they hadn't been tested.

I can remember quote after quote after quote by the people who were so much involved in this from our energy circle and all the Senate leaders: I don't have them in front of me right now—that if we can't test these nuclear weapons, there is no way we can determine whether or not they work. It is a very unsafe thing for America. These were the directors of the labs responsible for this nuclear arsenal.

So of the nine weapons we have, which I have listed here, we only have one we have adequately tested enough to know whether or not it would work. That is the W-84 warhead that we know would work.

This would have been a real disaster for America. People kept saying President Eisenhower was for a comprehensive test ban treaty, that President Kennedy was for a comprehensive test ban treaty, that President Reagan was. That isn't true at all. This flawed treaty was a zero-yield treaty. We would only have had the word of our adversaries that they would not test their nuclear arsenals.

To keep our word in America; we don't test our arsenal. But we don't have any idea whether or not they are going to test theirs. In fact, during the course of the debate, both China and Russia said they would not comply with the zero yield. There is no way in the world we can detect that, that we would know what our adversaries were doing. That would, for all practical purposes, be unilateral disarmament.

I am asked back in Oklahoma by people who have good street sense, why is it the liberals in Congress are so committed to disarming our country, to taking our money that we are supposed to have to defend America and putting it into these various discretionary social programs? I have to explain to them that the people in Washington, and some of the Senators in this Chamber, are not like the people of Oklahoma. I think President Clinton honestly believes that if we all stand in a circle and hold hands and we unilaterally disarm, everybody will do the same and it won't be necessary to have a defense system.

That is what we are up against. In a very respectful way, I have to disagree with many of the things my distinguished colleague from Illinois stated.

I think we have had a very successful session. We have ensured a sound Social Security retirement system. We have improved educational opportunities for our children. Along this line, the major disagreement we had was that the Democrats thought the decisions should be made here in Washington; Republicans want to use the
same amount of money but not make the decisions in Washington but send that money to the school districts. The school board in Tulsa, OK, is much better equipped to know what their educational needs are in Oklahoma than we are in this full body of the Senate. The Democrats say the answer is not school buses, not computers, not the physical facilities that are available; it is 100,000 teachers. I think the more we can send these decisions back to the local level, the better the people of America will be served.

I believe we have had a good session. I am not pleased with the way it is turning out right now. The old saying we have heard so many times in the past that there are two things you never want to watch while they are being made—one is sausage and the other is laws—becomes very true during the last few days of legislative sessions.

I think we have done a very good job. I think we did the right thing in defeating the unverifiable test ban treaty. I think we have passed legislation of which America will be very proud. I am anxious to see all this fun we are having go home and tell the people in Oklahoma about it.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Bunning). The clerk will call the roll. The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the period for morning business be extended to the hour of 2 p.m. and that the time be divided for the next 15 minutes in morning business.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I have to come to the floor of the Senate on a number of occasions recently to talk about the issue of prescription drugs for the elderly.

I think there is a particularly relevant point to make this afternoon given the very extensive press coverage we have seen on this issue in recent days.

Over the weekend, David Rosenbaum in the New York Times had an excellent article on the issue. In the last couple of days, Time magazine had another very lengthy piece on the question of prescription drugs for seniors. And both of these articles ultimately make the point that Congress probably is not going to be able to agree on legislation during this session. The authors offer considerable skepticism about the ability of Congress to come together on a very difficult issue. Both of them suggest to all of us how we might go about trying to make the process more possible.

What is central and what the Congress needs to do on a bipartisan basis is pass legislation that would make it possible for frail and vulnerable older people to get insurance coverage that would provide for their medicine.

For example, if you are an elderly widow who is 78, maybe having early signs of Alzheimer's, and you spend more than half of your combined monthly income of Social Security and pension on prescription medicine—those are the kinds of letters that senators are sending to me—it is not going to help you a whole lot to get a 10- or 15-percent discount because you shop over the Internet. Certainly, the role of the Internet in prescription drugs is going to be important. There will be a lot of issues. But to provide relief for the Nation's older people, what Congress needs to do is to pass bipartisan legislation that would provide for insurance coverage making it possible for older people to pay these big bills. Patience is, to some extent, going off the Internet are matters that are important, but what is needed is legislation that provides real relief.

Part of the effort to win bipartisan support for prescription drug legislation can be seen in the posters that are being used to send in copies of their prescription drug bills. Send them to each of us here in the Senate in Washington, DC.

I intend to keep coming to the floor of the Senate and actually reading from these letters. I have three today that I think tell an important story.

One is from a senior citizen in Medford, OR, in my home State. Another is from a senior citizen in Grants Pass, OR, and a third is from a senior citizen in O'Brien, OR, all of which reflect the kind of concerns I know are out there. Hopefully, as seniors learn about our campaign and see that we are urging them to send us copies of their prescription drug bills, it can help bring about bipartisan support for legislation in the Senate.

I am very proud that I have been able to team up in recent months with Senator Olympia Snowe on bipartisan legislation. I have been of the view that nothing more can happen in Washington, DC, unless it is bipartisan. The Snowe-Wyden legislation is a bill that uses marketplace forces and unleashes the innovative ability of the private sector in an effort to make medicine more affordable for the Nation's older people.

What is sad is that our elderly are in effect hit by a double whammy. Millions of them can't afford their prescriptions. Medicare doesn't cover medicines. It hasn't since the program began in 1965.

On top of that the fact that seniors don't have Medicare coverage, when they walk into a pharmacy—I see our friend from New Hampshire, our colleague who has a great interest in health care. He knows, when a senior walks into a drugstore in New Hampshire, Oregon, or Kentucky, and can't pay for their prescription medicine, in addition they are subsidizing the big buyers of prescription drugs. The HMOs and the health care plans are in a position to negotiate a discount. They get a break on their prices. The seniors, people who are spending half their monthly income on prescriptions, are, in effect, subsidizing those big buyers of prescription medicine.

The bipartisan Snowe-Wyden legislation, fortunately, has been able to generate a lot of interest in the Senate. Senator Snowe and I are proud to have the support. For example, more than 54 Members of the Senate—more than half the Senate—are now on record saying they would support a tobacco tax to pay for prescription drug benefits for older people. That strikes me as appropriate. Medicare spent more than $12 billion last year picking up the costs of tobacco-related illnesses, and more than 50 Members of the Senate are now on record as saying they would be willing to support additional funding to help the vulnerable seniors from whom we are hearing.

Let me read a little bit from some of these letters because I think they sum it up. One I received in the last couple of days from Grants Pass says:

"When I go to fill my prescription, I generally can afford the medicine. I did get a refill on Pepcid.

That is an important medication this elderly woman is taking now in Grants Pass, OR."
I do hope you can do something to help us seniors.

When she writes, “Now way can I afford to pay for my medicine,” that essentially sums it up.

We can talk about people buying prescription drugs over the Internet: we can talk about the patent issue, both involving substantial sums of money. Whatever that person needs in Grants Pass—and the letter goes on to say she has no insurance coverage for her medicine—she is now dependent on legislation that currently provides coverage through the insurance system to help pay for prescription drugs.

Another letter comes from Medford, OR. We can see the stack of bills going to a pharmacy in Medford, Southern Oregon Health Trust Pharmacy. This individual has spent $1,664 recently on prescription drugs in Medicare. She is sending bills to our office. Unfortunately, she doesn’t get any help through the various insurance coverage she has. The letter is representative of what we have been hearing. She also goes on to point out that this large stack of bills she sent me does not even include some of the over-the-counter drugs she is taking such as ibuprofen.

There is a very real concern today that our country cannot afford not to cover prescription medicine. All of these articles, including Time magazine, are always questioning whether the Nation can afford to cover prescription medicine. I have contended for some time now, that we cannot afford not to cover prescription medicine. These bills I have been reading from on the floor of the Senate show seniors can’t afford drugs that help to lower cholesterol, help to lower their blood pressure. These are drugs that help older people to stay well.

Prescription drug coverage for seniors has been a priority ever since my days with the Gray Panthers before I was elected to Congress. Frankly, it is much more important today than ever because these drugs that so many seniors write that they cannot afford today help seniors to stay well. The variety of anticoagulant drugs that help to prevent strokes, as I have commented on the floor of the Senate, is a very key, but holding down the costs of medicine is very key as well. There is a right way and a wrong way to hold down those costs. The right way is to use a model such as the health care system for Members of Congress. That is what is behind the Snowe-Wyden legislation that provides choice, competition, and marketplace forces for holding down medicine.

There is another way—the various approaches that call for price controls. The real danger behind price controls is that the costs for anybody who is not in the price control group will be shifted to other Americans who are having difficulty paying for medicines as well. It would not be a particularly useful thing for the Senate to come up with a price control regime for folks on Medicare and then have the costs shifted over to other Americans who are having difficulty paying for medicines as well. It would not be a particularly useful thing for the Senate to come up with a price control regime for folks on Medicare and then have the costs shifted over to other Americans who are having difficulty paying for medicines as well.

The Snowe-Wyden legislation is a bill that, on a bipartisan basis, can be supported in the Senate. If other colleagues have different ideas, let’s get them out on the table. Let’s come up with a marketplace approach to help seniors stay healthy.

These bills show access to coverage is very key, but holding down the costs of medicine is very key as well. There is a right way and a wrong way to hold down those costs. The right way is to use a model such as the health care system for Members of Congress. That is what is behind the Snowe-Wyden legislation that provides choice, competition, and marketplace forces for holding down medicine.

There is another way—the various approaches that call for price controls. The real danger behind price controls is that the costs for anybody who is not in the price control group will be shifted to other Americans who are having difficulty paying for medicines as well. It would not be a particularly useful thing for the Senate to come up with a price control regime for folks on Medicare and then have the costs shifted over to other Americans who are having difficulty paying for medicines as well. It would not be a particularly useful thing for the Senate to come up with a price control regime for folks on Medicare and then have the costs shifted over to other Americans who are having difficulty paying for medicines as well.
In February 1998, the price of a gallon of milk was $2.54 as compared to Minneapolis, where the price, on average, was $2.94 a gallon.

Let’s look at the cost of 1 percent milk for November 1997. In Augusta, ME, it was $2.37 per gallon, the same price in four New England States. In New Hampshire and Rhode Island, but in Minnesota, the price was $2.82 a gallon, in other words, 45 cents more per gallon in the area that opposes the compact as compared to the much lower price in the area that has the compact.

Opponents say the compact blocks interstate commerce in milk, that is comparing apples with oranges. Even though the compact doesn’t have an effect on them, they say we should not have a compact in the Northeast. Let farmers in the Midwest set up their own compact. I would vote for a compact that is doing fine and protecting their farmers when, if they wanted to, they could do exactly the same thing in their own part of the country.

I wish to mention for a minute what the compact replaces. Opponents of the compact prefer prices to be set by Federal bureaucrats, while supporters of the compact prefer pricing to be determined by consumers and local representatives, not by the Federal Government. The Governors and legislators in the six New England States have five goals in mind when they enacted the compact into law each of their States. They wanted to assure fresh local supplies of milk to consumers at lower prices than found in most of the Nation. They wanted to keep dairy farmers in business. They wanted to protect New England’s rural environment from sprawl and destructive development, and they wanted to do this without burdening Federal taxpayers.

The Northeast Interstate Dairy Compact has delivered beyond the expectations of those Governor and State legislators. The compact provided an added benefit. It has increased interstate trade into the region as neighboring farmers have taken advantage of the compact.

It is clear that our compact is working perfectly by benefiting consumers, local economies, and farmers, something that is not stated in the editorial page writers have ignored both the GAO report and the OMB report. Why? These are factual and objective reports that the Journal should have reviewed.

The compact was in force for the first six months, there was an 8 percent increase in milk sales into the region. Instead of blocking interstate commerce, I would say an 8-percent increase in interstate commerce is an 8-percent increase in interstate commerce.

I am fed up when opponents say the compact does not help dairy farmers in business. Indeed, half the farmers in New England no longer buy milk from Wisconsin and Minnesota, the price, on average, was $2.37 per gallon.

Let me read some examples from the GAO report. For example: In February, 1998 the average price of a gallon of whole milk in Augusta, ME, was $2.47. The price in Milwaukee, WI, was $2.63, and in Minneapolis, MN., it was $2.94 per gallon.

I wish to mention for a minute what the compact replaces. Opponents of the compact prefer prices to be set by Federal bureaucrats, while supporters of the compact prefer pricing to be determined by consumers and local representatives, not by the Federal Government. The Governors and legislators in the six New England States have five goals in mind when they enacted the compact into law each of their States. They wanted to assure fresh local supplies of milk to consumers at lower prices than found in most of the Nation. They wanted to keep dairy farmers in business. They wanted to protect New England’s rural environment from sprawl and destructive development, and they wanted to do this without burdening Federal taxpayers.

The Northeast Interstate Dairy Compact has delivered beyond the expectations of those Governor and State legislators. The compact provided an added benefit. It has increased interstate trade into the region as neighboring farmers have taken advantage of the compact.

I wish to mention for a minute what the compact replaces. Opponents of the compact prefer prices to be set by Federal bureaucrats, while supporters of the compact prefer pricing to be determined by consumers and local representatives, not by the Federal Government. The Governors and legislators in the six New England States have five goals in mind when they enacted the compact into law each of their States. They wanted to assure fresh local supplies of milk to consumers at lower prices than found in most of the Nation. They wanted to keep dairy farmers in business. They wanted to protect New England’s rural environment from sprawl and destructive development, and they wanted to do this without burdening Federal taxpayers.

The Northeast Interstate Dairy Compact has delivered beyond the expectations of those Governor and State legislators. The compact provided an added benefit. It has increased interstate trade into the region as neighboring farmers have taken advantage of the compact.

I wish to mention for a minute what the compact replaces. Opponents of the compact prefer prices to be set by Federal bureaucrats, while supporters of the compact prefer pricing to be determined by consumers and local representatives, not by the Federal Government. The Governors and legislators in the six New England States have five goals in mind when they enacted the compact into law each of their States. They wanted to assure fresh local supplies of milk to consumers at lower prices than found in most of the Nation. They wanted to keep dairy farmers in business. They wanted to protect New England’s rural environment from sprawl and destructive development, and they wanted to do this without burdening Federal taxpayers.
Texas, Kraft, which is owned by the tobacco giant Philip Morris, and other processors represented by the International Dairy Foods Association oppose the compact because they want to keep the money themselves. They do not want the farmers to have any of these profits.

Even the most junior investigative reporter could figure out the answer. All anyone has to do is look up the donations made by these and other giant processors. All the negative news stories about the compact have their provenance in the efforts of these giant processors and their front organizations.

I say this again on the floor, just so people understand, because it was an unfair editorial in singling out the distinguished majority leader of the Senate using facts which bear scrutiny. Indeed, one of the corporation front organizations, Public Voice for Food and Health Policy, apparently could not continue to exist when it was obvious that the corporation front organizations determine by corporate dollars rather than good policy. They had to close up shop when they lost their conscience.

I have detailed the close alliances between their lead executive who handled correspondence for them and the job he negotiated to represent the huge processors a couple of times on the Senate floor.

I will give the press another lead on the next public interest group whose funding should be investigated—the Consumer Federation of America. Indeed, one of their officers—formerly from Public Voice—is being taken around Capitol Hill offices by lobbyists representing processors. A glance at who funds their functions and efforts will be as instructive as investigations of Public Voice.

Why should Philip Morris or Kraft want to use these organizations instead of directly going to the editorial boards of the New York Times or the Washington Post? Indeed, one of their officers—formerly from Public Voice—is being taken around Capitol Hill offices by lobbyists representing processors. A glance at who funds their functions and efforts will be as instructive as investigations of Public Voice.

The question does not need me to prove the answer.

What would be the best attack—whether true or not—on the Compact that might swing public opinion?

It might be to simply allege that milk prices are higher for children in the school lunch program. Who would the editorial boards more likely listen to regarding school children: a public interest group or a tobacco company?

The question is, How do we deal with the Internet because of the extra-territoriality of the Internet? The question is, How do we deal with the Internet because of the extra-territoriality of the Internet? The question is, How do we deal with the Internet because of the extra-territoriality of the Internet? The question is, How do we deal with the Internet because of the extra-territoriality of the Internet? The question is, How do we deal with the Internet because of the extra-territoriality of the Internet?

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

There can be nothing that is a form of commerce more among the several States than the Internet as it presently is expanding, growing, and becoming a force for economic activity.

Thus, the taxing of the Internet by all these different entities would clearly, in my opinion, raise serious constitutional problems. In fact, the Supreme Court addressed this issue when it came to catalog sales in the Quill case, where the Supreme Court essentially ruled that States, unless they have a nexus relationship with the seller of the assets, do not have traditionally the ability to tax that transaction.

Secondly, Congress needs to look at the issue of taxation because of the extraordinary, as I have mentioned, chilling effect it would have on commerce generally. We, as a nation, as the preeminent industrial and inventive power and the Internet and, therefore, controllers not only of the initial and expanding technology, but also of the language which dominates the Internet, have put ourselves essentially as a nation on a road of economic prosperity. We have expanded and accelerated at an extraordinary speed past the rest of the world towards economic prosperity.

I recall, rather vividly, in the late 1980s when the "woe is me" crowd was saying that Japan was going to overtake the United States in all functions of economic activity, and that our economic model for prosperity simply could not compete with the Japanese economic model of prosperity, which was intimidating and which remains significant.

But the fact is that it did not work out that way. It did not work out that way because America's strength is our entrepreneurship and our inventive-ness. We took that entrepreneurship and inventiveness and we created this massive new vehicle for economic activity called the Internet. Thus, instead of being overwhelmed by our friends and neighbors in the industrial world, we have, instead, exploded past them in the ability to produce prosperity and economic activity, in large part because of the Internet and the offspring of technology which it has created.

So we do not want to do anything which jeopardizes the unique and special international lead that we have in this area. Yet allowing thousands of these jurisdictions to tax the Internet would do exactly that. It would jeopardize that lead and undermine and, as I said, possibly bring to a complete halt the use of the Internet as an element of commerce.

The third thing we must be sensitive to in this area of the Internet is the international implications beyond the questions of trade. It has been suggested by people at the U.N. that the U.N. should start to fund itself by putting in place a tax on e-commerce and e-mail. At first it was an outrageous suggestion, but it is the type of suggestion you get at the U.N. from people...
who represent nations which maybe do not have as much of a financial interest in it as we do and know that we would end up paying the tax, our Nation would end up paying the burden. But the fact that has been suggested is just a partial crack of the door behind which, if it were fully opened, you would see an international initiative of significant proportions to place taxes on the Internet.

As a result, if we have essentially come to believe, having already soiled our hands with taxing the Internet, it will be very extraordinarily difficult for us to resist, whether it is the U.N. or whether it is some other nation that also tries to pursue this course of action. It is essential, for the purposes of seeing an expansion of this technology and this form of economic activity, that we dampen down and restrict and as aggressively as we can resist having other nations pursue the path of taxation of Internet transactions.

Obviously, the U.N. has no right to step into this ground. In fact, as chairman of the appropriating committee that has jurisdiction over the U.N., I put specific language into an appropriation bill that hopefully will today, that says the United States will not spend any money at the U.N. should the U.N. pursue this course of action, which I am sure they will not. This was some idea put forward by some of my colleagues but I do not think it speaks to the majority at the United Nations.

But those are three core reasons why we have to be extraordinarily sensitive to what the tax policy is relative to the Internet.

The reason I raise this is because it took 8 months for the Internet commission to get started. That was not their fault. Really, it was the fault of those bodies which had the obligation of appropriating funds to the commission. Actually, under Governor Gilmore, this commission has done an excellent job of meeting. Governor Gilmore's position relative to taxation over the Internet is exactly the position that should be pursued. However, I am sure he has a majority position within the commission. I hope he does.

But in order for us to assure this threat to our commerce does not occur, I believe we should extend this moratorium, since we had at least 8 months of delay before we got this commission up and running. I think we should have an extension which recognizes that the commission should have the full 3-year period; therefore, we should extend the moratorium for another year, at a minimum, on the Internet.

I happen to think it should be extended beyond that, well beyond that, because I believe certainty in the area of taxation is one of the key issues for maintaining economic activity. If people participating in an economic activity can predict what their tax obligations are and what the tax implications will be to an economic initiative, then they are much more likely to be willing to invest capital and take the risks necessary to pursue that initiative. But if they cannot predict their tax liability, then that limits and dampens the desire to put capital and take risks in a certain economic activity. We have seen that happen.

So I believe very strongly that we should not only be extending this moratorium for a year but that we should be extending it for a series of years beyond the 3-year moratorium that presently exists.

Let's face it. The economic benefit which this Nation has seen as a result of this truly revolutionary event—in the history of economics, I suspect this is going to go down with the industrial revolution as one of the most significant turning points in the history of prosperity and the way nations generate wealth.

The benefits which we, as a nation, have obtained as a result of this, as a result of being the facilitator, the developer, and now the provider in expertise in the area of the Internet, and the use of the Internet for commerce, the benefits which we have received, as a nation, are basically incalculable: the jobs which have been created; the number of people whose standard of living has been increased; the number of people who have been able to purchase goods at less of a price; and the number of people who now have a better chance to participate in prosperity.

The Nation as a whole has seen economic activity and economic prosperity that has been a blessing to everyone, in large part because of this huge expansion in e-commerce and in the Internet as a force. Those benefits dramatically exceed any benefit which we would obtain by allowing a large number of different States or municipalities to start taxing the Internet for the purposes of expanding their local governments.

It is the classic situation of the goose that lays the golden egg, to say the least. We have confronted a goose that is laying a lot of golden eggs for America, and for the prosperity of America, and for the opportunity of America to create jobs. For America to maintain its place as a world leader, we should not make the mistake of maybe not cutting off the goose's head but taking some of the eggs. The additional thousands of different taxes which may cause it to, unfortunately, stumble or even be stopped as a result of allowing the creativity and the imagination of our various government units across this Nation to begin to tax the Internet.

So I hope we wrap up this session we will consider this. Obviously, we probably are not going to get it in this major omnibus bill, although I tried to do that and it was rejected in committee—an extension of the Internet moratorium.

I do hope when we come back next year this will be a priority item—to make it clear, to make an unalterable statement to the community which is developing and promoting this incredible engine of prosperity that we are not going to stop them by turning loose the forces of government and taxation on them.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the period for morning business be extended to the hour of 2:30 p.m. and that the time be equally divided in the usual form.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may consume, or whatever.

THE NORTHEAST DAIRY COMPACT

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I will take a moment to react to an editorial which I read this morning in the Wall Street Journal which had some very erroneous conclusions in it that shocked me to find out that such a fine newspaper as the Wall Street Journal would carry this.

I have been in Congress now 24 years, and as a result of unusual circumstances, for many years I had been sort of the leader of dairy for the Republicans in the House. That occurred because I was elected during the Watergate year. During the Watergate year, there were 92 freshmen Representatives who were elected and only 16 were Republicans. So all of us who came in that year immediately got seniority because there were not any other Members around.

I got to be the ranking member on the dairy subcommittee my first year. During that time, some 24 years, one thing I could be assured of was that any time something was going to come to the benefit of the dairy farmers, the Wall Street Journal, the New York Times, and the Washington Post would all write adverse editorials. Why is that? Well, do the dairy farmers buy any advertising in these newspapers? Of course, they don't. Who does buy the advertising? It is those who purchase milk. What is their motivation? To keep the dairy farmers getting the least money possible so they can maximize their profits. And they have done a masterful job.

But they also have a propensity, either because they, without any check, believe everything told to them by the processors who pay for their ads or they just ignore the truth. The Wall Street Journal article of this morning was a very typical example. I will run through some of the facts that were utilized in this great paper to point out that it is an error.

First of all, they make statements which are just not true. They say we have to have a compact because our
farmers are less efficient than the Midwestern farmers. Well, that is absolutely not true. Both are very efficient. The differences in the two areas are dramatic, but they are not relative to efficiency. Obviously, the Midwest farmers have the advantage—not a disadvantage, not a 20-cent disadvantage, by being not only efficient—and I don't think our farmers are any more efficient than theirs—but having lower costs to start with.

So to make the statement that it is all based upon inefficiency is absolutely ridiculous.

Then this statement: Never mind that this milk costs consumers to the tune of about 20 extra cents a gallon. This is absolutely false. In fact, one of the ironic aspects of this whole argument occurred back when the compact first went into effect and the Midwestern farm representatives said: We will show them. We will show that this is all due to efficiency and all those kinds of things. So they asked OMB, not GAO or whoever else. Why? Because OMB was sympathetic to the administration at that time and they wanted help from the White House to try to back up their arguments.

Well, what happened? OMB did an analysis of the impact of the compact and found out just the opposite. Do we hear them quote that anymore? No. I have to bring it up every time. They still—either their friends in the newspapers that make the money off advertising or sometimes they do themselves—ignore the fact that the study they asked for came back saying that, contrary to what they were telling people, the actual consumers in New England, where the compact was in effect, paid 5 cents less a gallon—and not 20 cents more a gallon, 5 cents less a gallon—than the average in the rest of the country. But they still print something which they know is absolutely incorrect.

Also, for a conservative newspaper such as the Wall Street Journal—I wouldn't give that same label to the New York Times and the Washington Post—the Wall Street Journal should recognize that all of these States, all six States, are gaining advantage of the basic law. All these States that are going into compacts are saying: We want to make sure that our area of the country has an adequate supply of fresh milk, and we ought to be able to do that. So that is what the real fight is about.

We have already had the editorial I anticipated in the Post. The Wall Street Journal came through right on time with one I anticipated. Theirs is so incredibly inaccurate in what they cite, it was a little embarrassing, on behalf of the paper, to read that. I expect the New York Times will follow suit probably in the next couple of days.

I want to make sure these facts are out there. What this Nation needs is stable farming. We all love our farmers. I can't think of Vermont or New England without the cows on the hillside. I can't think of what the Southeast would be without the ability of our farmers to produce milk. And they have, because of the weather situation and all, special problems in the Southeast, being able to produce milk at reasonable prices. But they are doing very well. They want to form a compact with the Midwest. This is just in other parts of the country. What is wrong with people in the region getting together and deciding how to do it?

Another argument raised, which will be one for other editors, is that it causes higher prices for WIC—Women, Infants and Children—and food. That is all taken care of by the commission. Farmers in the Midwest, right now, on an average, receive significantly more in the checks they get on a weekly or bi-weekly basis. The farmers in the United States would go out of business except in the Midwest. And they are so sure they could provide all the milk the country needs, so why do we not put them out?

Well, the commission worked. The price to consumers has gone down, the farmers are getting a fair price, and the processors are not being injured in any way. That is why 25 States, not a total of 25, including New England, have said that is a great idea. Everybody is happy. What a wonderful situation.

The processor is happy, consumers are paying less in price, and everybody is happy. So why don't we join? Well, that, of course, has now made it a big threat to the Midwest. Because if the whole country goes to compacts, the farmers will stay in business, and the market expansion that the Midwest was hoping for won't occur.

That is the crux of it here today. The States have recognized that it is essential to make sure their farmers survive. Why is that? The basic concept of the law right now, from the 1930s and rewritten in the Farm Act of 1947, said it is critical that we ensure that every area of this Nation has an adequate supply of fresh milk. That is basic law; that is, to make sure that when you go to your store, there is always some milk available for you. That is the basic law. All these States that are going into compacts are saying: We want to make sure that our area of the country has an adequate supply of fresh milk, and we ought to be able to do that. So that is what the real fight is about.
It is important to reiterate that consumers also benefit from the Compact. Not only does the Compact stabilize prices, thus avoiding dramatic fluctuation in retail cost of milk, it also guarantees that the consumer is assured of the availability of a supply of fresh, local milk. Let’s remember that under the Compact, New England has lower retail fluid milk prices than many regions operating without a Compact.

Moreover, the Compact, while providing clear benefits to dairy producers and consumers, has proven it does not harm farmers or taxpayers from outside the region. A 1998 report by the Office of Management and Budget showed that, during its first 6 months of operation, the Compact did not adversely affect farmers from outside the Compact region and added no federal costs to nutrition programs. In fact, the Compact specifically excludes the Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) program from any costs related to the milk price.

The reauthorization of the Northeast Dairy Compact is also important as a matter of states rights. We often hear of criticism of the inside-the-beltway mentality that tells us here in Washington know better than you, even on issues traditionally under state and local control. Mr. President, that is wrong. In the Northeast Dairy Compact, we have a solution that was approved by all the legislators and governors of the New England States. It is supported by every state commissioner in the region and overwhelmingly—if not unanimously—by Northeastern dairy farmers. We in Congress should not be an obstacle to this practical, workable, local solution.

I urge my colleagues to refrain from holding up this critical measure for Maine and for our Nation’s dairy farmers. To small farms in my State and in states throughout New England, this is not just a matter of profit margins; it is a matter of survival. I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. COLLINS. Thank you Mr. President.

Mr. President, I rise today in strong support of the reauthorization of the Northeast Dairy Compact. I am pleased that we hear Congress will accomplish this vital task before we adjourn for the year.

The reauthorization of the Compact is more critical now than ever before. The U.S. Department of Agriculture recently predicted that milk prices for dairy farmers will be reduced 40 cents per gallon in December as a result of the announced drop in the basic formula price this past week. This translates into a 30 percent reduction in blended consumer milk and will continue on into next year with additional declines in prices expected throughout the winter. The Dairy Compact will blunt the 40 cent per gallon drop in farm milk prices by one-half and will, by itself, make the difference between continuing in business and closing down for many small dairy farmers.

The Northeast Dairy Compact is a proven success and is critical to the survival of dairy farmers in Maine and throughout New England. The Compact has a record of quantifiable benefits to both consumers and farmers. The Compact works by simply evening out the peaks and valleys in fluid milk prices, providing stability to the cost of milk and ensuring a supply of fresh, local milk. The Compact works with market forces to help both the farmer and the consumer.

As prices climb and farmers receive a sustainable price for milk, the Compact turns off. When prices drop to unsustainable levels, the Compact is triggered. The Compact simply softens the blow to farmers of an abrupt and dramatic drop in the volatile fluid milk market.

It is important to reiterate that consumers also benefit from the Compact. Not only does the Compact stabilize prices, thus avoiding dramatic fluctuation in retail cost of milk, it also guarantees that the consumer is assured of the availability of a supply of fresh, local milk. Let’s remember that under the Compact, New England has lower retail fluid milk prices than many regions operating without a Compact.

Moreover, the Compact, while providing clear benefits to dairy producers and consumers, has proven it does not harm farmers or taxpayers from outside the region. A 1998 report by the Office of Management and Budget showed that, during its first 6 months of operation, the Compact did not adversely affect farmers from outside the Compact region and added no federal costs to nutrition programs. In fact, the Compact specifically excludes the Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) program from any costs related to the milk price.

The reauthorization of the Northeast Dairy Compact is also important as a matter of states rights. We often hear of criticism of the inside-the-beltway mentality that tells us here in Washington know better than you, even on issues traditionally under state and local control. Mr. President, that is wrong. In the Northeast Dairy Compact, we have a solution that was approved by all the legislators and governors of the New England States. It is supported by every state commissioner in the region and overwhelmingly—if not unanimously—by Northeastern dairy farmers. We in Congress should not be an obstacle to this practical, workable, local solution.

I urge my colleagues to refrain from holding up this critical measure for Maine and for our Nation’s dairy farmers. To small farms in my State and in states throughout New England, this is not just a matter of profit margins; it is a matter of survival. I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to proceed as in morning business for not to exceed 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to proceed as in morning business for not to exceed 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. COLLINS. Thank you Mr. President.

Mr. President, I rise today in strong support of the reauthorization of the Northeast Dairy Compact. I am pleased that we hear Congress will accomplish this vital task before we adjourn for the year.

The reauthorization of the Compact is more critical now than ever before. The U.S. Department of Agriculture recently predicted that milk prices for dairy farmers will be reduced 40 cents per gallon in December as a result of the announced drop in the basic formula price this past week. This translates into a 30 percent reduction in blended consumer milk and will continue on into next year with additional declines in prices expected throughout the winter. The Dairy Compact will blunt the 40 cent per gallon drop in farm milk prices by one-half and will, by itself, make the difference between continuing in business and closing down for many small dairy farmers.

The Northeast Dairy Compact is a proven success and is critical to the survival of dairy farmers in Maine and throughout New England. The Compact has a record of quantifiable benefits to both consumers and farmers. The Compact works by simply evening out the peaks and valleys in fluid milk prices, providing stability to the cost of milk and ensuring a supply of fresh, local milk. The Compact works with market forces to help both the farmer and the consumer.

As prices climb and farmers receive a sustainable price for milk, the Compact turns off. When prices drop to unsustainable levels, the Compact is triggered. The Compact simply softens the blow to farmers of an abrupt and dramatic drop in the volatile fluid milk market.
the Senate. They have said they want to make progress with our gun laws, and they have it within their power to do so.

The Senate-passed juvenile justice bill is not an overreaching statement of where we want to go with gun control. I, for example, believe we should have universal registration and licensing of firearms, and in the next session I will introduce my legislation. I believe we should allow the Federal Government to set safety and consumer standards for guns, and I believe we should ban outright possession of military-style assault weapons. But none of these measures were even discussed in the Senate debate.

The provisions, rather, are very small in our bill. They are reasonable, and they can make a difference in the lives of our children. None of them are controversial, and every one of them, by virtually every poll, has a dominant majority of the American people supporting them. Let me describe what I am talking about.

That bill contains just four common-sense provisions to address gun violence. Does anyone in this Nation truly believe juveniles should be able to buy assault weapons? I do not believe it would plug a major loophole in the 1994 law. If they should not be sold without safety locks? I do not believe so.

In Memphis, TN, not too long ago, a 5-year-old took a pistol off his grandfather’s bureau and brought it to kindergarden to kill the teacher because the teacher had given that child a time-out the day before. Stories are legion about children mistaking real guns for play guns and shooting their friends.

The third provision is simple. It would require a safety lock with every gun sold. Does anyone believe guns should not be sold without safety locks? I do not believe so.

Finally, there is my provision which would plug a major loophole in the 1994 assault weapons legislation. That legislation, of course, says you cannot today manufacture, transfer, sell, or possess a clip, drum, or strip of more than 10 bullets manufactured in the United States. That is the law today. The loophole is to permit the foreign importation of these clips, and they are coming into this country by the tens of millions with literally tens of thousands of them in drums of 250 rounds. They come in, as a matter of fact, from the United Kingdom, and they come in from 20 different countries throughout the world.

My provision would simply close that loophole and prohibit the importation. It actually passed the House by unanimous consent, and both the Speaker and the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee have assured me personally that they see no problem with it and would support it.

These are the four provisions relating to guns—this bill contains countless provisions to stem the tide of youth violence. I sit on the Judiciary Committee. I have worked on this bill. I have worked on it with Senator HATCH. Part of this bill is a gang abatement act. It provides a Federal grant to help local government agencies to fight criminal street gangs that are now crossing State lines and moving into so many of the cities of our Nation. You, Mr. President, were mayor of a great city. You know this to be the fact. This is an important part of this legislation.

It also contains the James Guelff Body Armor Act which contains reforms to take body armor out of the hands of criminals and put it in the hands of police. It is named after a San Francisco police officer by the name of James Guelff who went to a call at the corner of Pine and California Streets and came across a Kevlar-clad sniper with thousands of rounds of ammunition. This bill would also amend a .38 revolver. As he speed loaded his revolver, this officer was shot in the head and killed. It took 150 police officers to equal the firepower of one sniper clad in Kevlar with high-powered weapons. That bill contains just four common-sense, reasonable; I call them commonsense commonsense commonsense commonsense measures—might it be for the people of America.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. Collins). The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

Mr. BYRD. Reserving the right to object, and I will not object, would the Senator mind stating how long he wishes to speak?

Mr. BAUCUS. I would be very happy to tell the Senator. Less than 10 minutes.

Mr. BYRD. I have no objection. I thank the Chair and thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAUCUS. I thank the Senator.

SATELLITE TV ACCESS TO NETWORK PROGRAMMING

Mr. BAUCUS. Madam President, I would like to make a few remarks about a serious problem for people in our country who do not live in our Nation’s cities; that is, the loss of satellite TV access to network programming.

We all know that modern technology has made it possible to broadcast TV programming directly from satellites. Nationwide, over 11 million households subscribe to satellite TV. That number increases by over 2 million households every year.

Rural areas have come to depend on network coverage that satellites provide.

In my State, Montana, where over 35 percent of homes depend solely on satellite broadcasting for their TV reception, obviously this development has been a real boon.

While satellite broadcasting has improved the quality of life for folks in rural America, it has not been perfect. Satellite systems have not been able to carry local broadcast stations. So local viewers have not always been able to get local broadcasting.

This is not just a problem for satellite subscribers; it is a problem for local television broadcasters and for the fabric of local communities. Local
broadcasters play a key role in our communities. They provide local news, local weather, and public service programming.

Viewers depend on these local broadcasts to find out what is going on in their communities. When the school board, the PTA, and the city council are meeting, or when there is a parade or a fundraiser for their church or a civic group.

Local broadcasters are vital to our communities. They provide jobs, and they allow local businesses to grow through advertising. In short, the importance of local broadcasting is evident in all parts of community life.

Local broadcasters also provide network programming: NBC, ABC, CBS, and FOX. Nineteen of the 20 TV stations in Montana are affiliated with some of these networks or with PBS. These stations air national news, sports, and entertainment at times of the day when people with jobs and kids can watch them.

Without local broadcasts, you might miss the evening network news because it comes on before you get home from work or because it airs late at night.

People want local network coverage because it works in their own lives and in their local community.

Until now, technology has not provided for rebroadcast of local signals by satellites. Many rural residents have not been able to get decent reception over the air.

Of course, we in the Senate cannot change technology or geography, but what we can do is change the law. We can make local-by-local broadcasting a reality, and we should.

Last spring, we passed H.R. 1954. At the time, we neglected an important responsibility. The language we passed would have required the turnoff of network programing to many rural satellite viewers. It would have done nothing to help the many local broadcasters in smaller cities and towns. It was an oversight.

Following the vote, I wrote a letter to the conference asking them to pay attention to the needs of the many viewers, communities, and stations that had been ignored. Twenty-three of my colleagues, from both sides of the aisle, signed the letter.

As you know, Madam President, the conference on the satellite bill has paid little attention to our request. The language of the conference report, now titled "Intellectual Property and Communications Omnibus Reform Act of 1999," includes some important new provisions.

It does allow satellite viewers in poor reception areas, the so-called "grade B" contour viewers, to continue to get network programming from satellites. Without this, many satellite viewers will lose their network TV at the end of next month.

It also gives a loan guarantee that will make it possible for all local stations to broadcast on satellite, not just those in the very largest cities and towns.

With this, the other local into local provisions of the act are an empty promise to rural and small town America that depends on satellites.

Last week, the House passed the conference language by a near unanimous vote. But too many senators from members—and I might say on the other side of the aisle—are blocking a vote on this conference report.

They say: We promise to have more hearings. We should have another committee look at this.

They might as well say: Let them watch the radio.

The Senate should act now to ensure that the conference report language becomes law. It is clear the majority of the Senate is ready to vote to approve the measure, just as the House did. Instead, we are offered a weakened version attached to the omnibus appropriations bill, which we will get sometime soon, and a weak promise to do something next year.

This is a no-brainer. There are many people in rural America who would like to add satellite TV, network programing from their local stations. It is that simple. We have it within our power today to very simply pass a provision and provide for the financing, a loan guarantee. We all know it is going to pass. We all know we are going to do it. But there is one Senator who wants it in his committee. And I say, that one Senator represents a State where there are a lot of people who I think want local into-local broadcasting from the satellites.

There are millions of Americans who depend on their satellites and want local network coverage—not national network coverage—or at least the option to get both local and national.

This is a no-brainer. I get more mail on this subject than any other subject. I daresay, Madam President, you probably get a lot of mail on this subject, too. I know a lot of Senators probably get as much mail as I get on this subject as any other. And we can simply solve it today very easily. It makes no sense for us not to.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

NOMINATION OF T. MICHAEL KERR

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I want to make a few comments regarding the nomination of T. Michael Kerr to be Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor. I held up this nomination until I could secure an agreement regarding the issue of unauthorized break time from the Secretary of Labor, outlined in a letter I will submit for the Record.

The need for this agreement with the Secretary was precipitated by a case pending before the Wage and Hour Division regarding an employee exceeding the allotted time for a rest period, and an employer deducting from the employee's compensation the time taken in excess of the break time.

The Fair Labor Standards Act does not require employers to provide its employees with a rest period/break. Nevertheless, many employers offer short breaks to their employees. Although the duration of a voluntary break is up to the employer, the breaks generally run between 5 and 20 minutes.

The Department of Labor does recognize that employers have the flexibility to determine the number of breaks and the length of breaks that they offer to their employees. The Department of Labor has taken the position that when an employer allows its employees to take a short break and an employee abuses the break time policy by exceeding the time that the employer allotted for the break, then the employer's only recourse against the employee is disciplinary action (such as a reprimand or termination), or elimination of the rest period.

Under the agreement I reached with the Secretary, the Department of Labor will conduct a complete review of its policy regarding unauthorized breaks. That review will be completed by February 1, 2000. Upon completion of the review, the Department of Labor will submit its findings in writing to the Chairman and Ranking Members of the relevant committees in the House and the Senate. The review will include consideration of what outcome is in the best interest of the employee if the employee exceeds the length of a rest period/break: disciplinary action against the employee (such as a reprimand or termination); elimination of the rest period/break option; or deductions of compensation for the time in excess of the allotted break time.

Also, the Secretary committed the Department of Labor will assure that the resolution of any cases in which unauthorized break times are at issue, will be consistent with the findings in their review.

This is an important review of what is clearly an outdated policy. I look forward to the outcome of their review, and I thank the staff at the Department of Labor for working in good faith with my office, and the Secretary for working to a quick resolution of this issue so this nomination can move forward.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Secretary of Labor be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:
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SECRETARY OF LABOR,
Washington, DC, November 18, 1999.
Hon. DON NICKLES,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR NICKLES: This is a follow-up to the meeting of our respective staffs yesterday. While the Department of Labor recognizes its employees have the flexibility to determine the number and length of breaks they offer to their employees, the Wage and Hour Division has taken the position that if an employer offers a break of less than 20 minutes in duration, the time the employee spends on that break typically is compensable hours worked under the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Most of the Wage and Hour Opinion Letters that address this issue involve authorized breaks. However, on several occasions, the Wage and Hour Administrator has stated that short unauthorized breaks may also count as hours worked. Wage and Hour has taken the position that if an employee exceeds the time allotted for an authorized break, an employer may take a disciplinary action against the employee, or the employee may eliminate the option for rest periods.

I am committing the Wage and Hour Division and the Solicitor's Office to carefully review our policy with respect to the compensation of unauthorized breaks under the FLSA. We will also consider what outcome is in the best interests of the employee if the employee exceeds the allotted time for a rest break, including the option of deductions of compensation for the time taken in excess of the allotted break time.

As part of our review, we will consider the statutory text, relevant legislative history and regulation, case law, previous Wage and Hour Opinion Letters, changing technology and any information that your office or a member of the public may provide. We will complete our review of this matter by February 1, 2000, and transmit our conclusions and supporting rationale in writing to the Chairman and Ranking Members of the relevant committees in the House and the Senate.

It is important that all officials of the Wage and Hour Division interpret and apply the law in a uniform manner, and so advise the public. I will instruct the Wage and Hour Division to assure that the resolution of any cases in which unauthorized break time are at issue will be consistent with the outcome we reach in our overall review.

I very much appreciate your interest in these important questions.

Sincerely,

ALEXIS M. HERMAN.

COMPENSATING CERTAIN DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY WORKERS

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, yesterday, my colleague from New Mexico, Senator BINGAMAN, and I introduced legislation that is, frankly, long overdue.

For more than 2 years, I have been concerned that the Department of Energy was not taking seriously the complaints of a number of workers in Oak Ridge, Tennessee who are ill and who believe that their illnesses are linked either to their employment at the DOE site in Oak Ridge. In November of 1997, two years ago, I wrote to the then-Surgeon General, Dr. David Satcher, to request that the Centers for Disease Control, CDC, come to Oak Ridge to try to determine whether a pattern of unexplained illnesses was present and, if so, if its cause could be determined. The CDC study, like others before it, looked at a work sample and found that they should work with us to address the situation.

Since then, I have been working to get the Department of Energy to acknowledge that there is a problem, that certain of its current and former workers are ill, and that they should work with us to address the situation. This legislation—which we developed in conjunction with the Department—is an important step in that direction. It says, for the first time, that if mistakes were made, and if harm was done to workers who helped this country win the Cold War, we need to act now to remedy those mistakes. It represents a recognition on the part of the government that if people have illnesses that are linked to their employment at a DOE facility, they deserve compensation. That is progress, and I am proud to be a part of it.

Our bill has three parts. The first section, the Energy Employees' Beryllium Compensation Act, would provide compensation to current and former workers who have contracted chronic beryllium disease or beryllium sensitivity while performing duties uniquely related to the Department of Energy's nuclear weapons production program. There are approximately 90 Oak Ridge workers who have been diagnosed with either chronic beryllium disease or beryllium sensitivity to date, and a total of 2,200 Oak Ridge workers who were potentially exposed.

The second section, the Energy Employees' Pilot Project Act, would establish a special pilot program for a specific group of 55 Oak Ridge workers who are currently the subject of an investigation by physicians specializing in health conditions related to occupational exposure to radiation and hazardous materials. This section authorizes the Secretary of Energy to award $100,000 each to those Oak Ridge workers whose illnesses are determined to likely be linked to their employment at the Oak Ridge site.

Finally, our bill creates the Paducah Employees' Exposure Compensation Fund, which would compensate those current and former workers at the Paducah, KY gaseous diffusion plant who were exposed to plutonium and other radioactive materials without their knowledge, and who develop one of a specified list of conditions linked to radiation exposure. I want to note that there are workers at the K-25 gaseous diffusion plant in Oak Ridge who were exposed to the same contaminants as those in Paducah, and workers in Portsmouth, Ohio who were similarly affected. I am hopeful that in assessing its authority over these drugs, Congress declared in the preamble of the Controlled Substances Act of 1970 that "Federal control of the interstate incidents of the traffic in controlled substances is essential to the effective control of the interstate incidents of such traffic" (21 U.S.C. 801 (6)).

In 1984, Congress amended the CSA due in part to a specific concern regarding the misuse of prescription narcotics and dangerous drugs—including powerful prescription drugs which have a legitimate medical use but can also be misused to harm the public. In asserting its authority over these drugs, Congress declared in the preamble of the Controlled Substances Act of 1970 that "Federal control of the interstate incidents of the traffic in controlled substances is essential to the effective control of the interstate incidents of such traffic" (21 U.S.C. 801 (6)).

In 1984, Congress amended the CSA due in part to a specific concern regarding the misuse of prescription narcotics and dangerous drugs—including powerful prescription drugs which have a legitimate medical use but can also be misused to harm the public.
license if he or she uses it to endanger “health and safety” regardless of whether state law has been violates (21 U.S.C. 824, referencing 21 U.S.C. 823). The chairman of the Health subcommittee in the House argued: “Drugs legally prescribed for use in medicine are responsible for a substantial majority of drug-related deaths and injuries” (Rep. Waxman, Hearing of July 31, 1984, Hearing Record No. 98-168, p. 368). Congress’s view was that while the state’s best line of defense against misuse of prescription drugs, the Federal Government must have its own objective standard as to what constitutes such misuse—and it must have the authority to enforce that standard when a state cannot or will not do so. Congress’s 1970 and 1984 decisions have been upheld time and time again by federal courts.

It is clear that federal law is intended to prevent use of these drugs for lethal overdoses, and contains no exception for deliberate overdoses approved by a physician. Nowhere in the Controlled Substances Act has death or assisting suicide been considered a “legitimate medical purpose” for use of these drugs. In the past, physicians who were involved in the use of these drugs for suicide or other lethal overdoses have lost their federal authority to prescribe controlled substances on the grounds that they had endangered “health and safety.”

In 1997, Congress passed the Assisted Suicide Legislation Act of 1997 without a dissenting vote in the Senate and by an overwhelming margin of 398-16 in the House. President Clinton signed into law taking the bill that “it will allow the Federal Government to speak with a clear voice in opposing these practices.” He further warned that “to endorse assisted suicide would set us on a disturbing and perhaps dangerous path. I would add only that authorizing a physician to end their own life is clearly not within current laws and the practice of medicine.”

In November 1994, the State of Oregon adopted by referendum the so-called “Death with Dignity Act,” allowing physicians to prescribe medication for the purpose of assisting patients’ suicides. The week of that vote, Professor George Annas of Boston University pointed out the inconsistency between the Oregon referendum and the Controlled Substances Act in an article in the New England Journal of Medicine. He questioned whether such a state law was compatible with existing federal laws governing federally controlled drugs, “since the drafters of the federal statute certainly did not have this purpose [assisting suicides] in mind."

However, on June 5, 1998, overturning a previous determination by her own DEA Administrator, the Attorney General issued a letter carving out an exception to DEA scrutiny of doctors prescribing controlled substances for assisted suicide. She claimed that Congress did not “intend to override a state determined as to what constitutes legitimate medical practice in the absence of a federal law prohibiting that practice.” The Pain Relief Promotion Act will respond to the Attorney General’s challenge, by clarifying that the intention for use of these drugs to cause patients’ deaths is not authorized by Congress in any state, nor has it ever been.

On October 27, 1997, Oregon’s “Death with Dignity Act” became effective. In the first year at least 15 patients have committed suicide with doctor’s assistance under the new Oregon law. We really do not know the total number, because all reporting of cases is left to the doctors themselves, and the Oregon Health Division admits it has no idea how many unreported cases there are. But regarding those 15 reported cases we know one thing: Every one of those patient’s deaths was caused by a federally controlled substance, prescribed with a federal DEA registration number, using federal authority. Today, without any decision by Congress or the President, the Federal Government is actively involved in assisting suicides in Oregon.

To hear some of the critics of this bill you might think that the Pain Relief Promotion Act creates a new authority on the part of the DEA to revoke doctors’ registrations if they use controlled substances to assist suicide. On the contrary, its only effect in 49 states (and even in Oregon in cases involving those who are not terminally ill) is to provide new legal protection for physicians who prescribe controlled substances to control pain.

In Oregon, this bill eliminates the Attorney General’s artificial exception designed to accommodate assisted suicides that are no longer penalized under Oregon law. The DEA can meet its responsibility here simply by looking at the reports required by Oregon law, in which doctors must identify the drugs used to assist suicide. Those records will tell whether federal controlled drugs were used; and since the physician is clearly reporting that his or her own intent was to help cause death, there will be no question of murky intentions or ambiguity. The DEA’s only role in this case is to increase in the DEA trying to “second guess” or infer physicians’ intentions, even in Oregon.

What of any unreported cases in which physicians assist the suicides of terminally ill patients? Those assisted suicides are already a crime under Oregon law, and thus already subject to adverse action by the DEA as well under the Attorney General’s interpretation. Only if a physician officially reports the case to the Oregon Health Division is he or she exempted from state criminal penalties. So those cases are already covered by the same DEA authority that covers the current exception to DEA scrutiny of doctors prescribing controlled substances to assisted suicides in the other 49 states.

Let me take this situation step by step.

First, removing the Oregon exception to the existing nationwide policy cannot increase any “chilling effect” on...
pain relief outside of Oregon, because the bill does not increase one iota the authority of the DEA to investigate the misuse of controlled substances to assist suicide outside of Oregon. In fact, in those states its only effect is to provide it “safe harbor” for the practice of pain control, which is a significant advance and improvement for doctors and terminally ill patients. This is also true of assisted suicide cases within Oregon that do not comply with the state’s reporting requirements. Indeed, under these cases, the Pain Relief Promotion Act gives the DEA no new mandate to investigate cases of assisted suicide more directly. Rather, it is expected to follow its longstanding practice of generally deferring to state authorities and allowing them to take the lead in investigating possible wrongdoing.

Second, no new questioning of physicians’ intentions is warranted to address the cases of assisted suicide that are now occurring under Oregon law. To be free of criminal penalties under state law in Oregon, a doctor who assists a suicide must submit a report to Oregon authorities that includes information on the drugs prescribed to assist suicide. The Drug Enforcement Administration, DEA, can obtain those reports from the Oregon authorities. It already has the authority to subpoena them, if necessary; again, our legislation has no impact on this.

This, then, in Oregon, this bill will not result in any increase in DEA oversight or investigations of doctors based on their prescribing patterns or the dosages they use for particular patients. This is clearly stated in the House Judiciary Committee report on this bill, H. Rep. 106-379 Pt. 1, pp. 12-13.

It follows that if this bill is enacted, any doctors in Oregon who prescribe controlled substances for pain relief need not fear any increase in DEA scrutiny. Prosecutions, any investigations, and therefore not in any way be deterred from prescribing adequate pain relief.

This bill cannot have a “chilling effect” on pain control, but will have the opposite effect. For the first time, it will place in the Controlled Substances Act, as the American Society of Anesthesiologists notes, “recognition that alleviating pain in the usual course of professional practice is a legitimate medical purpose for dispensing a controlled substance.” And it will disprove existing law by adding significant new legal protections for physicians and pharmacists who prescribe and dispense controlled substances for pain control. It will reduce, and in no uncertain terms, the DEA’s “chilling effect” that could deter adequate pain control. And by clarifying federal law so the federal government will not facilitate the medical institutionalization of assisted suicide in any state, this legislation may help discourage doctors from simply assisting assisted suicide instead of working to address their patients’ real problems of uncontrolled pain. As protectors of public health and safety we should be encouraging doctors to kill the pain, not the patient.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following two editorials be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

From the Wall Street Journal, Nov. 4, 1999

DON'T KILL THE PAIN-RELIEF BILL
(By Wesley J. Smith)

Last week, by a vote of 271-156, the House approved the Pain Relief Promotion Act, designed to promote effective medical treatment of pain while deterring the misuse of narcotics and other controlled substances for assisted suicide. The bill’s passage prompted an outpouring of hyperbole and misinformation from opponents. Here are the facts about the act:

It would not outlaw assisted suicide. Critics accuse Congress of “overturning” Oregon’s assisted-suicide referendum. That would it did. In fact, the act would outlaw assisted suicide. The DEA’s authority to determine what is and is not a “legitimate medical purpose” would return national uniformity to the enforcement of federal drug laws.

It would not interfere with states’ rights. Under the Controlled Substances Act the federal government, not the states, has the authority to determine what is and is not a legitimate medical use of the drugs specified in the act. Thus, as an editorial in the Portland Oregonian noted, it is the Oregon law that “barges into an area of longstanding state jurisdiction.” The act would return national uniformity to the enforcement of federal drug laws.

It merely reaffirms existing federal law. Because the act declares that assisted suicide is not a “legitimate medical purpose” under the Controlled Substances Act, critics have wrongly accused supporters of granting new authority to the Drug Enforcement Agency to punish doctors. In fact, DEA has had that authority for nearly 30 years. Since 1980 it has brought more than 250 enforcement actions for violation of the legal standard of “legitimate medical purpose.”

The medical community overwhelmingly favors it. Proponents of the bill include the American Medical Association, the American Society of Anesthesiologists, the Hospice Organization of America, the American Academy of Pain Management, the American Society of Hospice Organization, the Hospice Association of America, the American Academy of Pain Medicine, the American Academy of Neurology, and the American Academy of Neurology.
Pain Management, the American Society of Anesthesiologists and the American College of Osteopathic Family Physicians. (True, support isn’t unanimous. Dissent within the medical community has been led by the Rhode Island Medical Association.)

It has broad bipartisan support. Seventy-one House members and 17 senators came out for the bill. But when its Senate sponsors include Joe Lieberman (D., Conn.), Chris Dodd (D., Conn.) and Evan Bayh (D., Ind.),

it would enhance pain control. If the act becomes law, pain control will for the first time be specifically identified in federal law as a proper use of controlled substances—
even if it conflicts with the state’s objectives to control drugs. The version that passed the Senate resembles the version that the House approved. That is, it would make it easier for doctors to prescribe these drugs to manage pain and depression—

things that, when uncontrolled, can lead the terminally ill to consider killing themselves in the first place. We thought then that the problem could be worked out and that it was possible to keep doctors from using federally controlled substances to kill their patients without making it easier for them to relieve their terminally-ill patients’ agonies.

This Congress’s Pain Relief Promotion Act proves it, and the proposed legislation is not a throwback. A new report by the Center for Ethics in Health Care at Oregon Health Sciences University shows that end-of-life care in Oregon—which fancies itself a leader in this area—is far from all it should be. Too many Oregonians spend the last days of their life in pain.

This Congress’s Pain Relief Promotion Act looks like
to pass the Senate. If President Clinton truly feels our pain, will he sign it the moment it hits his desk?

[F from the Oregonian, July 1, 1999]

KILL THE PAIN, NOT THE PATIENTS

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Ð SENATE

The Pain Relief Promotion Act looks like
to pass the Senate. If President Clinton truly feels our pain, will he sign it the moment it hits his desk?

Prison Card Program

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President I rise today to talk about an important and highly successful program operated for more than 25 years by the Salvation Army in conjunction with the Bureau of Prisons. It is called the Salvation Army Prison Card Program. Under the program, greeting cards are donated to the Salvation Army that are then given to inmates at correctional facilities across the country. This program allows inmates to keep in touch with family and friends—not only during the holiday season—but throughout the year. The benefits of this program to the inmates and their loved ones are clear. However, there are also benefits to the community as well. Inmates who maintain strong ties with their families and friends are less likely to return to prison once their sentence is completed.

I want to commend the Salvation Army, the Department of Justice, and the Bureau of Prisons for supporting this program. In particular, I want the Department to know that this program has the support of Congress. I have spoken to Chairman Gregg, who has indicated that he is prepared to work with me and other members of the Appropriations Committee in the coming months to ensure that this important charitable program is sustained well into the future.

The current CBI trade program provides preferential tariff treatment to apparel made from U.S.-formed components that are finished in a CBI-eligible country. Currently such components may be cut from fabric, or formed from yarn, originating either in the United States or Israel. The legislation before the Committee incorporates a U.S.-only “yarn forward” requirement for CBI inputs, such as yarn, fabric or thread, under the U.S.-Israel Free Trade Area Agreement ("FTA").

My Government urges the inclusion of a provision in the CBI legislation that will enable U.S. companies to continue utilizing Israeli-origin inputs in producing American-made products without making such products ineligible for CBI duty-free trade preferences.

The current CBI trade program provides preferential tariff treatment to apparel made from formed components that are finished in a CBI-eligible country. Currently such components may be cut from fabric, or formed from yarn, originating either in the United States or Israel. The legislation before the Committee incorporates a U.S.-only "yarn forward" requirement for CBI inputs, such as yarn, fabric or thread, under the U.S.-Israel Free Trade Area Agreement ("FTA").
both Israeli companies and U.S. companies that supply raw materials used in the manufacture of Israeli inputs, such as nylon yarn.

I am bringing this matter to your attention because the legislation to be considered by the Finance Committee should not damage U.S.-Israeli trade. Protecting against such harm can be accomplished by providing in the legislation that Israeli-origin inputs will, for purposes of CBI preferences, be treated no less favorably than U.S. inputs. Such a provision would ensure that restrictive consequences of the proposed legislation would not adversely affect U.S.-Israeli trade.

The legislative measure that we are asking you to support is consistent with previous trade measures approved by your Committee and enacted into U.S. law to preserve U.S.-Israeli trade under the FTAA. Such a provision would preserve the status quo in U.S.-Israeli trade, a goal that has been endorsed previously on a number of occasions by the Committee. It is not intended to create any new benefit for Israeli products.

In sum, our objective is to ensure that the CBI trade bill does not withdraw the practical benefits of the U.S.-Israel Free Trade Area Agreement and our mutual goal of expanding bilateral trade would very much welcome the opportunity to review this issue with you.

Sincerely,

OHAD MARANI,
Economic Minister.

Mr. JOHNSON. I do not think that it is the intent of the CBI legislation to undermine our trade with Israel. Preserving our existing trade with Israel will not in any way lessen the trade benefits we extend to the CBI countries. And it is critically important that we consider our existing trade agreement with Israel as we develop further trade measures, I urge my colleagues to address this issue as this bill moves forward, so that we do not prejudice our trade with Israel under the U.S.-Israel Free Trade Area Agreement.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE REPORT

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, at the time Senate Report No. 623 was filed, the Congressional Budget Office report was not available. I ask unanimous consent that the report which is now available be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Hon. FRANK H. MURKOWSKI,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for S. 623, the Dakota Water Resources Act of 1999.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them.

The GAO cost estimates are Megan Cavall (for federal costs), and Marjorie Miller (for the impact on state, local, and tribal governments).

Sincerely,

BARRY B. ANDERSON,
(FOR Dan L. Crippen, Director.)

Enclosure.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE
S. 623—Dakota Water Resources Act of 1999

SUMMARY

CBO estimates the implementing S. 623 would cost $131 million over the 2000-2004 period, assuming appropriation of the necessary amounts. Dakota in fiscal year 2002, S. 623 would affect direct spending; therefore, pay-as-you-go procedures would apply. CBO estimates, however, that changes in direct spending would not become significant until 2007. S. 623 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA).

The legislative measure to be considered by your Committee in this bill would authorize the appropriation of $688 million (in 1999 dollars) for the Bureau to construct, operate, and maintain, on a nonreimbursable basis, municipal, rural, and industrial water supply projects in certain Indian reservations. CBO estimates that implementing both of these provisions would cost about $45 million between 2000 and 2004.

Operation and Maintenance.—During construction of the Red River Valley Water Supply Project, operation and maintenance costs of the GDU would be covered by using funds appropriated for construction. Once the facility is completed in 2007, S. 623 would authorize the appropriation of amounts necessary for the Bureau to operate and maintain certain portions of the system. Based on information from the Bureau, CBO expects the facility to be put into use in 2007. At that time, CBO estimates that the appropriation of about $3 million would be required each year for operation and maintenance.
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supply features are not expected to be put into service, and thus will not generate offsetting receipts from repayment contracts. According to the Bureau, under S. 623 the unit would be placed into service during 2007 and the Secretary is authorized to collect repayments from project beneficiaries in that year. Repayments would be deposited in the Treasury as offsetting receipts and would be unavailable for spending without appropriation. CBO estimates that these receipts would total about $7 million a year starting in 2007.

Oakes Test Area Title Transfer.—CBO estimates that under the bill, the Secretary would transfer ownership of the Oakes Test Area to local users in 2002. This transfer would reduce offsetting receipts that are collected from irrigators under current law to reimburse the Bureau for operating costs. Thus, CBO estimates that this provision would reduce offsetting receipts by less than $200,000 a year starting in 2002.

Pay-as-you-go considerations: The Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act sets up pay-as-you-go procedures for legislation affecting direct spending or receipts. The net changes in outlays that are subject to pay-as-you-go procedures are shown in the following table. For the purposes of enforcing pay-as-you-go procedures, only the effects in the budget year and the succeeding four years are counted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Fiscal Year, in Millions of Dollars</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Changes in outlays</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in receipts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Changes in outlays: The Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act sets up pay-as-you-go procedures for legislation affecting direct spending or receipts. The net changes in outlays that are subject to pay-as-you-go procedures are shown in the following table. For the purposes of enforcing pay-as-you-go procedures, only the effects in the budget year and the succeeding four years are counted.

Estimated impact on state, local, and tribal governments: S. 623 contains no intergovernmental mandates as defined in UMRA. Under current law, and under the amendments made by this bill, the state of North Dakota and local governments in that state would provide some of the funds necessary to construct and to operate and maintain the authorized facilities. All such spending would be a condition of federal assistance and would be voluntary.

Estimated impact on the private sector: This bill would impose no new private-sector mandates as defined in UMRA.

Estimated cost: Federal Costs: Estimated impact on the private sector: This bill would impose no new private-sector mandates as defined in UMRA.

Estimated impact on state, local, and tribal governments: S. 623 contains no intergovernmental mandates as defined in UMRA.


Estimated approved by: Peter H. Fontaine, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Wednesday, November 17, 1999, the Federal debt stood at $5,963,820,000,000 (Five trillion, five hundred eighty-six billion, two hundred million). One year ago, November 17, 1998, the Federal debt stood at $5,860,918,151,426.47 (Five trillion, six hundred ninety billion, one hundred fifty-one thousand, four hundred nineteen million, one hundred twenty-six million, seven hundred fifty-two thousand, one hundred twenty-six billion, seven hundred fifty-two million, one hundred twenty-six dollars and forty-seven cents).

Ten years ago, November 17, 1989, the Federal debt stood at $4,722,352,000,000 (Four trillion, seven hundred fifty-two billion, seven hundred sixty-two billion, seven hundred ninety-two million, one hundred fifty-one thousand, four hundred twenty-six dollars and forty-seven cents) during the past 10 years.

Ten years ago, November 17, 1989, the Federal debt stood at $2,958,621,000,000 (Two trillion, nine hundred eighty-six billion, two hundred million). One year ago, November 17, 1998, the Federal debt stood at $2,918,126,000,000 (Two trillion, nine hundred eighty-six billion, two hundred million). One year ago, November 17, 1998, the Federal debt stood at $2,806,091,464.47 (Two trillion, eight hundred sixty billion, one hundred ninety-one million, four hundred sixty-four dollars and forty-seven cents).

Ten years ago, November 17, 1989, the Federal debt stood at $742,352,000,000 (Seven hundred forty-two billion, three hundred fifty-two million). One year ago, November 17, 1998, the Federal debt stood at $5,963,820,000,000 (Five trillion, five hundred eighty-six billion, two hundred million).

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The period for morning business has expired. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY WISHES FOR THE HON. TED STEVENS

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, I want to call attention to the fact that today, November 18, 1999, is the birthday of the very distinguished chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, my friend. I would like to say lifelong friend; I just haven't had the pleasure of knowing him all of my life. The day after tomorrow, I will be 82 years old, if the Lord lets me live. So I can't say he is my lifelong friend, but he has been my friend over all the years he has served in the Senate. I wish him a happy, happy birthday. He is a Senator who doesn't look up to 82 years old. He doesn't look down on the poor. He is a good man on the inside and on the outside. And he is a man who sticks by his principles.

He is a Republican. I am a Democrat. But neither he nor I puts political party above everything else. We know that political party is important, but there are other things in this life that are even more important. He recognizes that. His handclasp is like the handclasp of our ancestors. His word is his bond, as was the word of our ancestors.

I could say much more. I will simply say he is a Christian gentleman, a gentle

...
MAKING FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS

MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate now proceed to the short-term continuing resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BAUCUS addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Madam President, receiving the right to object, I speak on behalf of 11 million Americans, at least, many of them residents of the State of Alaska. We haven’t solved the satellite home viewer matter. I don’t see why we can’t. It is very simple. All we have to do is put that loan guarantee in, which is very simple. If there are any wrinkles, they can easily be worked out. It makes no sense for us to go home without passing the loan guarantee program that the satellite viewers can rest assured and so that those who are going to put up satellites and develop satellites for local-to-local coverage are able to do so. I cannot understand, on behalf of that 11 million Americans who cannot understand, why in the world we don’t do something that is pretty simple.

Mr. LOTT. Will the Senator yield to me, please?

Mr. BAUCUS. Madam President, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. LOTT. I have not propounded a unanimous consent request other than to proceed to the short-term continuing resolution so that Senator Byrd may begin to discuss an issue of concern to a number of Senators. I intended to talk to the Senator from Montana and others about trying to enter into an agreement with regard to time.

On the issue to which he referred, I think it is very important that we do take action in this final bill we will be taking up in the next day or so, or today, that will make sure the satellite bill is passed. People across this country will continue to receive service from the networks on their television sets in the future in order to have this so-called local-to-local service where you get your local station on your local satellite. We are going to have to have some process, some way to get that service into rural areas and smaller areas such as those in Montana, Alaska, and Mississippi. I am committed to getting that done. So is the Senator from Alaska, Mr. Stevens. We are going to get that done.

We are going to have to have a very carefully thought out loan guarantee system that will get the satellites up, to get the towers that are necessary to make sure that that is done. The problem we have, as with so many other issues we have been dealing with in the last week, is getting all of that done in the last few hours to make sure we get it right without the whole process being held up as we go forward.

I will talk to the Senator privately, but he has my assurances—Senator Daschle and I will put a colloquy in the Record—that we are going to get this done. We are going to get it done early next year. If there are dilatory tactics, we will have a bill that has been carefully massaged by all of the Members, and I am concerned it will not either get it done straight up or we will look for another vehicle. This is something to which we are committed, to which I am committed, and I know the Senator from Alaska is committed.

Mr. STEVENS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LOTT. I believe the Senator from Montana—

Mr. BAUCUS. Madam President, I yield to the Senator from Alaska without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. STEVENS. I certainly won’t make a long statement. I still am very committed to the loan guarantee provisions that were in the Satellite Home Viewer Act. But I am also convinced that we would have a period of time to get the regulations ready to proceed with that guarantee program. It would take roughly 6, 7 months.

I am going to ask the FCC to start preparing those regulations now. We have a loan guarantee bill before us, and we will be voting on it sometime in April. We will not delay the loan guarantee program for rural America by what we have done. I was assured of that, and I am assured in my own mind that it will work. We will be right on time by the time we get this bill.

We have a commitment coming that we will either have an improved authorization for a loan guarantee or we will vote what was in the bill we took out last night. I urge my friend to understand that we have not abandoned the loan guarantee program. Coming from where I do, I would never abandon it.

When I came to the Senate, the Army ran the communications system of Alaska; the U.S. Government owned all of the telephones in Alaska. Now, when you look at the distance we have come in a relatively short time of my service in the Senate, we are going to do the same thing with satellite communications in a very short period of time, in a new way, consistent with private enterprise, on a guarantee program rather than a Government loan program.

We need to have certainty to what we are doing, so I am not going to do it, I am going to ask the FCC to start preparing those regulations now. We have a loan guarantee program last night; we delayed the authorization for it, and we will have that authorization by April of next year.

Mr. BAUCUS. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I hear my good friend from Alaska and the majority leader. They have States that have the same concerns as we do. Not for a moment does it do any injustice to both of the Senators. They are two of the most honorable men I have had the pleasure to know. They are wonderful people.

But I also know how the Senate operates. I also know that the best intentions often don’t materialize and something happens. I also know that some of the regulations I suspect the Senator talked about—it is a lot easier for the Senator to write regulations than it is in knowing in the abstract what the regulations are. I don’t know what they can really do that is substantive or effective in the next several months, or whatever it takes.

I also know that the only objection to us proceeding really is one Senator who, for some reason, thinks he should have jurisdiction over this. It is an inside baseball objection. It is not a substantive objection in any great way.

I also know there is a lot in this omnibus bill that was written pretty quickly, where many minds got together to get something done. I also know that necessity is the motherhood of invention. If we want to do this, we will find a way to get it in.

I am suggesting that a vast majority of Members of this body want to do it. I suggest that 90 percent want to do it. There is an objection not based on substance but based on the Senator from speaking. He will find ample opportunity, and I support his right to be able to speak. This is so black and white, so much of a no-brainer, and there are millions of Americans in rural America who want this thing, and there is so little reason not to do it.

So I will object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The majority leader has the floor.

Mr. LOTT. Madam President, I yield the floor. I believe the Senator from West Virginia was prepared to proceed to discuss his issue. I think he probably will do that. We will see what might be done to address concerns he may have, and we will be back later.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I checked with my office. TEA 21, the highway bill, had a loan guarantee program. It took 16 months for the regulations to be drawn before there was one guarantee made. We have the process to be started on the Satellite Home Viewer Act to create regulations for a new loan guarantee program, and I said it couldn’t be done in 6 months. My staff tells me I was very conservative; it will take much longer than that. We will have the bill for authorizing the loan guarantee done by the end of April.

I do not believe that those who agree with us that the FCC will not do this, that there should be a loan guarantee program should be worried about the deletion of that authorization now. The problem on the loan guarantee program is to commence the drafting and, really, the presentation of the new program. It will necessarily be not similar to any contract a loan guarantee program in history. So it will take a considerable amount of time.
I want the Record to note there is no reason to oppose this bill and particularly to oppose this continuing resolution on the basis of the deletion of the loan guarantee program from the Satellite Home Bureau Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

MOUNTAINTOP MINING

Mr. BYRD. Madam President, in the rush to complete work on an omnibus appropriations bill that will attract enough votes to pass both Chambers of Congress without incurring a veto from the White House, a number of important measures that should have been in the conference report have ended up on the cutting room floor. One of those issues is mountaintop mining.

I am extremely disappointed at the shortsightedness of the White House, as well as some Members of Congress, on the issue of a chance on the omnibus package to right a wrong, to remedy the crisis in West Virginia's coal fields that was triggered by a recent Federal court ruling. But the White House blocked that effort, leading the charge to exclude the proposed legislation from the omnibus bill. As a result, thousands of coal miners in West Virginia, and throughout Appalachia, are facing a bleak and uncertain future.

Particularly troubling to me is that the ammunition used to defeat this proposal, the ammunition used to keep it out of the omnibus package, was, in large part, a campaign of misinformation, led by the White House.

My proposal is not anti-environment. The White House would have you believe otherwise. My proposal would not weaken or in any way alter the Clean Water Act. Let the White House hear! The White House would have the people believe otherwise. Let me say it again. This administration, which is sponsored by Mr. MCCONNELL, the senior Senator from Kentucky; Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the junior Senator from West Virginia; and Mr. BUNNING, the junior Senator from Kentucky, would not weaken or in any way alter, modify, change, repeal, amend, or undermine the Clean Water Act.

I know the White House has tried to mislead people into believing that it would. It would not. Fie on the White House for attempting to mislead people into believing that it would.

I have seriously considered this matter. This issue merits the time and the attention of Congress. I am prepared to give it some time.

I don't want to hold this measure up interminably. I want to see action on it. I want to vote. I want to vote on this amendment—the Byrd, McConnell, Rockefeller, Bunning, et al. amendment.

So, I take these few moments to speak the truth, to try to set the record straight. In Madam President, time is running out for the coal miners and their families, and for the retired coal miners, and their wives, or their widows, and their families. Time is running out for them. The President wants this Appropriations Bill sent to him, in Greece. Indeed! What are we going to send to the coal miners who have been working for this country before he was born? What are we going to send them?

I have seriously considered this matter. This issue merits the time and the attention of Congress. I am prepared to give it some time.

I don't want to hold this measure up interminably. I want to see action on it. I want to vote. I want to vote on this amendment—the Byrd, McConnell, Rockefeller, Bunning, et al. amendment.

All the Byrd-McConnell amendment would do is preserve the status quo until an environmental impact assessment, which is already underway, is completed and regulations resulting from it are issued. That environmental impact assessment was not put in motion by the White House; it was put in motion by a court action last December.

No laws would be weakened by the Byrd-McConnell amendment. No regulations would be discarded. The legislative remedy that is proposed by this amendment is not an either/or proposition. This amendment would permit carefully controlled mountaintop mining while allowing work to continue on a broad environmental study that could save better, might save and more environmentally friendly mining practices nationally in the years ahead. In my book, that is a win/win situation.

This mountaintop mining proposal is an effort to stand up for America's coal workers and the way they treat America's coal miners. But we can speak up for what we believe here in the Senate. We can send our message to the White House.

To get that message across, I hope to offer an amendment. I could speak at length on the omnibus appropriations bill when it comes before the Senate. We could be here another week. We could be here another 2 weeks.

They say time is running out for the continuing resolution. In Madam President, time is running out for the coal miners and their families, and for the retired coal miners, and their wives, or their widows, and their families. Time is running out for them. The President wants this Appropriations Bill sent to him, in Greece. Indeed! What are we going to send to the coal miners who have been working for this country before he was born? What are we going to send them?

I have seriously considered this matter. This issue merits the time and the attention of Congress. I am prepared to give it some time.

I don't want to hold this measure up interminably. I want to see action on it. I want to vote. I want to vote on this amendment—the Byrd, McConnell, Rockefeller, Bunning, et al. amendment.

Who were the parties to those agreements? The Federal Of- fer of Surface Mining, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the Department of the Interior through the Office of Surface Mining, and the White House intervened in a Federal court to prevent the White House and its allies from standing. Who agreed? Who entered into the memoranda of understanding? Who was the Federal Of- fer of Surface Mining, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the Department of the Interior, and those agencies that had been agreed upon.

Before the court issued its opinion, as part of a settlement the mining industry in West Virginia was operating under two memoranda of understanding—two memoranda of understanding that had been agreed upon. Hear this: Two memoranda of understanding. I didn't have anything to do with those memoranda of understanding. Who agreed? Who entered into agreements concerning mountain- top mining? Who entered into the memoranda of understanding? These were agreed upon by the Federal and State regulatory agencies. Hear me now! These were agreed upon by the regulatory agencies—both State and Federal—that oversee mining permits.

Who entered into those agreements? Who were the parties to those agreements? This administration's regulatory agencies entered into those agreements.

Let me say that again. Hear me. Who entered into those regulations? Who were the parties to those agreements? This administration's regulatory agencies entered into those agreements.
Let me say to the White House: Do you believe that your own Environmental Protection Agency signed onto agreements that weakened environmental protections? No. No. These memoranda of understanding—called MOUs—put into place stronger environmental protections in West Virginia.

Listen to this: These MOUs put into place stronger—get it, now—stronger environmental protections and regulations in West Virginia than exist in any other State in the Union. Hear me, environmentalists; you ought to be fighting for this amendment. You ought to be urging us on in our fight for this amendment. I am an environmentalist. Who was the majority leader of the Senate then? Who stood up for you environmentalists then?

West Virginia at one time was the only State in the United States that had no wildlife refuge. I put money in Appropriations bills, to bring the first wildlife refuge to West Virginia, the last State among the 50 that got a wildlife refuge. Hear me, environmentalists. Who put the money in for the Canaan Valley Wildlife Refuge—that West Virginia refuge was the 500th in the nation? I did.

I am an environmentalist. Who put the $138 million in for the fish and wildlife's national conservation and training facilities at Terrapin Neck, three miles out of Shepherdstown, WV? Who fought 5 years in the Senate Appropriations Committee for that $138 million? Who fought for it in the House-Senate conferences? This Senator; this environmentalist fought for it.

Nobody wants a cleaner environment than I do. But I hope I also have some common sense. We know that in West Virginia the great core industries have fueled the war machine of the Nation. The coal industry, the steel industry, the glass industry, the chemical industry, these and other core industries have employed hundreds of thousands of people in West Virginia. The core industries are still there, but they are diminishing. There were 125,000 coal miners in West Virginia when I first ran for the House of Representatives in 1952. Today, there are only 20,000, give or take, in West Virginia.

These core industries cannot always be what they once were. But there are those who want coal mining stopped now. They want it stopped tonight. They want it stopped tomorrow. Shut it down! That is what they want. But we can't do that. It can't be done overnight. People have to work. Children have to eat. Widows have to live. We have to continue to operate these mines. We are trying to develop other industries in West Virginia—high-tech industries. I have tried to encourage Federal agencies to look to West Virginia for a better quality of life, for a safer life, where the people who work can at last buy a home, where people want to work and will turn in a good day's work.

We are trying to diversify our industries. It takes time. I have put appropriations into the corridor highways of West Virginia, so that other industries will be encouraged to come into West Virginia and to expand. They won't come where there are bad roads. They need infrastructure that will support their industries and their people. It takes time. It can't be done overnight. Those environmentalists who want it done overnight, it can't be done overnight.

Those MOUs established stronger environmental protections and regulations in West Virginia than exist in any other State in the Nation, bar none. I say to the Administration, your own regulatory agencies agreed and supported these regulations, and now you, the White House, want to turn your back on your own environmental agency, on your own Army Corps of Engineers, on your own Office of Surface Mining.

Peter heard the cock crow three times, and then he hung his head in shame. He denied his Lord thrice and then hung his own head in shame and walked away. White House, hang your head in shame!

But the court's opinion, throw all these things out the window. The MOUs, the agreements that have been entered into by this administration's regulatory agencies, are all thrown out the window. The court ruled that the way in which the agencies were operating did not follow the letter and intent of the law.

Hear that. I helped to create those laws. I supported the Clean Water Act. I supported the Surface Mining and Control Reclamation Act. I supported it. But the court ruled that the way in which these agencies were operating did not follow the letter of the law and intent of the law.

Congress passed the law. The court disagreed with the way in which the Federal regulatory agencies and the State regulatory agency interpreted the law. But the court was wrong. There are 20,000 miners, 20,000 voices that come from the coal fields who say that the court was wrong. Its decision was completely contrary to the intent of Congress. Those two laws, the Clean Water Act and the Surface Mining and Control Reclamation Act.

While I disagree with the court, the ball is here. It is in our court now because the judge in his ruling said if application of Federal regulation prevents certain activities in the Appalachian coal fields "it is up to Congress." That is this body and the other body. He said... "it is up to Congress"—and the legislature—to alter that result.

So we have accepted the responsibility. The judge said it is up to Congress. We, who are supporting this amendment, have accepted that responsibility and we are trying to do something about it. We are being impeded and we are being undercut by the White House, by my own White House. Even the White House immediately after the judge issued his ruling, confusion reigned. There was chaos in the coal fields. Layoff notices went out. Mining companies announced that they might not make significant investments in the State that had just been destroyed. That is real money that has to be spent. Those are real risks they take on. As a result of the court ruling, coal companies, truckers, barge operators, railroads—none of them had any certainty that the investments they might make today would be justifiable tomorrow.

Some say, it's just a West Virginia problem. You tell the people of Kentucky that. Tell the people of Pennsylvania that. Too bad for West Virginia. But I am here to say to my colleagues in this national body—Look out. Look out. That cloud that is over West Virginia is headed your way next, Kentucky, and MITCH McCONNELL knows that. That is why he is a cosponsor of this amendment. That cloud just over the horizon in West Virginia will be coming your way next. You tell the people of Pennsylvania that. Look out, it is coming your way next. But if you want to head it off, the opportunity is here with this amendment. This is the time to head that off before it comes back. Take the sword that I offer, that MITCH McCONNELL offers, that JAY ROCKEFELLER offers, that Senator Bunning offers, and all the other Senators whose names are on this amendment offer—take this sword. Take this sword, and fight for the working men and women of this Nation, and do it now.

Some may say, "I would like to. I would like to sign up. I am willing to wear the suit of armor—but what about the environment? We can't upset the environment."

Let me assure my colleagues and the people who are watching out there—let me assure you, this amendment is not the toxic monster it is purported to be by some of the environmental organizations and by this White House. It is not the toxic monster they purport it to be. In fact, this amendment puts in place in West Virginia—get this—this amendment puts into place in West Virginia the tougher environmental standards prescribed by the very MOUs that this administration's own EPA helped to negotiate. But you certainly would not know that from all of the frothing at the mouth by people who neither have no idea what they are talking about, or who, for some reason, are deliberately trying to mislead the people of this country. They either have no idea of what they are talking about or they are deliberately and dishonestly trying to mislead.

Those who have expressed opposition to this amendment, including the White House, claim it would harm
clean water protections under both the Clean Water Act and SMCRA. There is not a word—not a word—of that true, and they ought to know it, the people who are saying it. As a matter of fact, as far as I am concerned, they do know it. But they certainly ought to if they don’t.

This amendment would not harm the Clean Water and the Surface Mining Reclamation Acts, would not harm those protections. This amendment would not lay a hand on those protections. It is not a touch—not a touch. It would not even brush up against them. This amendment specifically states—now hear this, hear this Senators—this amendment specifically states:

Nothing in this section modifies, supersedes, undermines, displaces or amends any requirement of or regulation issued under the Federal Water Pollution Act commonly known, isn’t it? Clean Water Act, or the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977.

What could be plainer? What could be clearer? What could give greater assurance than these words that are in the amendment?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Will the Senator from West Virginia yield for a question?

Mr. BYRD. Yes, I yield to my friend, Senator MCCONNELL. Yes, I do.

Mr. MCCONNELL. So the Senator from West Virginia is referring to the sentence in a letter from John Podesta, the Chief of Staff of the President, which says:

As you know, this is consistent with the President’s opposition to appropriation riders that would weaken or undermine environmental protections under current law.

I say to my friend from West Virginia—I ask him, that is simply incorrect, isn’t it?

Mr. BYRD. Absolutely.

Mr. MCCONNELL. They are not telling the truth, are they?

Mr. BYRD. They are not telling the truth.

Mr. MCCONNELL. They either know it, in which case they are not telling the truth, or they are woefully uninformed, aren’t they?

Mr. BYRD. They either know they are not telling the truth or they are woefully uninformed; exactly, precisely.

Mr. MCCONNELL. The President came to Hazard, KY, this year, and he bit his lip, and he felt our pain. And he said: What can we do for you? I am here in Appalachia to find out what I can do for you, to make life better.

This is it, isn’t it? I say to my friend from Virginia. This is what they can do for us to make life better.

Mr. BYRD. That is it, that is it, and it has my fingerprints on it, and it has your fingerprints on it, may I say to my dear friend from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. And we have 20,000 resource coal miners jobs in Kentucky, and 65,000 additional jobs that would not be there but for coal. And the only impression we can get from this is, they don’t care.

Mr. BYRD. Exactly.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I thank my friend. Mr. BYRD. What other impression could one get?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Because we have made it clear to them, haven’t we, the President? It does not change current law at all.

Mr. BYRD. It does not change current law at all. It doesn’t touch current law.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I thank my friend from West Virginia.

(Mr. ROBERTS assumed the chair.)

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the White House has pressed for changes in this amendment. The White House, according to Mr. Podesta’s letter to the Speaker and Mr. Podesta’s letter to me, wants a “time limited solution.”

This amendment is limited to 2 years or to the completion of the ongoing Federal study which was ordered by a court in December of last year and the issuance of final regulations resulting from that study.

The White House argues that because the district court has stayed its ruling, the jobs of thousands of miners in West Virginia and hundreds of thousands of workers in mining and related jobs on the east coast are no longer threatened. The White House is wrong.

The court, when it ordered the stay, said this stay has no legal basis. In other words, he said: The only reason I am issuing this stay is to pour a little oil on troubled waters, let the waters calm down a little bit. All this chaos and confusion flows from my decision; I am going to put a stay on that. You can have a little time to get your breath.

But he said there is no legal basis for it, which means that the court could lift the stay. When Congress gets out of town, who knows, the court may lift that stay. The court itself, as I say, noted that there is no legal basis for the stay, but, in fact, that the stay was issued in response to the uproar created by the court’s ruling. That is why we have a stay.

The administration, whose representatives had been working with me on the language of this amendment, said to me there is no need now for any legislation. Do not believe it.

The White House argues that because the district court has stayed its ruling, the jobs of thousands of miners in West Virginia and hundreds of thousands of workers in mining and related jobs on the east coast are no longer threatened. The court could lift its stay. Let me say again, the court itself noted that there was no legal basis for the stay.

The White House has argued that because the court’s ruling, the court itself noted that there is no legal basis for the stay. But he said there is no legal basis for it, which means that the court could lift the stay. When Congress gets out of town, who knows, the court may lift that stay. The court itself, as I say, noted that there is no legal basis for the stay, but, in fact, that the stay was issued in response to the uproar created by the court’s ruling. That is why we have a stay.

The administration, whose representatives had been working with me on the language of this amendment, said to me there is no need now for any legislation. Do not believe it.

The White House argues that because the district court has stayed its ruling, the jobs of thousands of miners in West Virginia and hundreds of thousands of workers in mining and related jobs on the east coast are no longer threatened. The court could lift its stay. Let me say again, the court itself noted that there was no legal basis for the stay.

We have no assurances as to how long that stay will remain in place. It provides no comfort for coal miners. It provides no comfort for mining companies who want to invest in new mines to employ the millions of mining families. Under the law, it does not change current law at all.

The court, when it ordered the stay, said this stay has no legal basis. In other words, he said: The only reason I am issuing this stay is to pour a little oil on troubled waters, let the waters calm down a little bit. All this chaos and confusion flows from my decision; I am going to put a stay on that. You can have a little time to get your breath.

But he said there is no legal basis for it, which means that the court could lift the stay. When Congress gets out of town, who knows, the court may lift that stay. The court itself, as I say, noted that there is no legal basis for the stay, but, in fact, that the stay was issued in response to the uproar created by the court’s ruling. That is why we have a stay.

The administration, whose representatives had been working with me on the language of this amendment, said to me there is no need now for any legislation. Do not believe it.

The White House argues that because the district court has stayed its ruling, the jobs of thousands of miners in West Virginia and hundreds of thousands of workers in mining and related jobs on the east coast are no longer threatened. The court could lift its stay. Let me say again, the court itself noted that there was no legal basis for the stay.

We have no assurances as to how long that stay will remain in place. It provides no comfort for coal miners. It provides no comfort for mining companies who want to invest in new mines to employ the millions of mining families. Under the law, it does not change current law at all.

The court, when it ordered the stay, said this stay has no legal basis. In other words, he said: The only reason I am issuing this stay is to pour a little oil on troubled waters, let the waters calm down a little bit. All this chaos and confusion flows from my decision; I am going to put a stay on that. You can have a little time to get your breath.

But he said there is no legal basis for it, which means that the court could lift the stay. When Congress gets out of town, who knows, the court may lift that stay. The court itself, as I say, noted that there is no legal basis for the stay, but, in fact, that the stay was issued in response to the uproar created by the court’s ruling. That is why we have a stay.

The administration, whose representatives had been working with me on the language of this amendment, said to me there is no need now for any legislation. Do not believe it.

The White House argues that because the district court has stayed its ruling, the jobs of thousands of miners in West Virginia and hundreds of thousands of workers in mining and related jobs on the east coast are no longer threatened. The court could lift its stay. Let me say again, the court itself noted that there was no legal basis for the stay.

We have no assurances as to how long that stay will remain in place. It provides no comfort for coal miners. It provides no comfort for mining companies who want to invest in new mines to employ the millions of mining families. Under the law, it does not change current law at all.
pneumoconiosis. He died of black lung contracted in the coal mines. And his father died under a slate fall—under a slate fall. He died in the darkness. He died in the darkness.

Many times I have gone to the miners' homes, pulled back the canvas cover and peered into the face of a coal miner whom I knew and who had been killed under a slate fall or killed by being run over by an electric motor.

Many times I have walked those steep hillsides and helped to carry the heavy—and I mean heavy—coffins of miners who died following the edict of the Creator, when he drove Adam and Eve from the Garden of Eden, saying: In the sweat of thy brow shalt thou eat bread. And those coal miners know what that means.

But this court ruling will take away the right of thousands of coal miners and truckers and railroad workers and barge operators to earn their bread in the sweat of their brow.

Hear me, coal miners! If you do not know now who your friends are, you soon will know. These dreamers would have us believe that only if our mountains are left alone—our mountains—our pristine mountains will come. "Or," they suggest, "perhaps coalfields residents should simply commute to other areas for employment."

To these individuals I say, "Get real." There are few of us who work in the White House who have been working behind my back on this amendment, down there and talk to those coal miners. Tell them what you have done.

You do not have to drive the dangerous, winding, narrow roads over which these workers would have to commute each morning and evening.

When the picket signs are gone, when the editorials in the big city papers are lining bird cages, the people of the small mining communities will be left. You have thrown down your placcards. You have thrown down your candles. But those people of the small mining communities will still be there. They will be left to repair the economic damage.

Mining will be part of the economic base of my State for the foreseeable future, and new ways must be explored to make mining practices more environmentally friendly. And I am for that. At the same time, we have to recognize that the amount of coal reserves in West Virginia is finite. We must continue to broaden our State's economic base. But such change cannot happen overnight.

A new economic base cannot spring from the ocean foam. It cannot emanate from the brain of Jove, like Minerva, fully clothed and in armor. That effort requires time. And it requires money. And if you want to know the worth of money, try to borrow some. It requires the development of improved infrastructure, better highways, more modern highways, up-to-date highways, safer highways, like those Appalachian corridors that I have been trying for years to build, and for which I have been horse whipped orally and with the pen. I do not mind. I know for whom I am working. I am working for the people of West Virginia, and always will as long as the Lord lets me stand.

Water and sewer systems, accessible health care, safe schools—these are the kinds of basic facilities and programs that I have been promoting for many years. Today, I must say and throw it down when the speech is over and go on somewhere else. Those coal miners are still there. And they are going to still have my attention, my respect, my reverence.

In a letter threatening a veto of legislation containing this amendment, the White House claimed to be prepared to discuss a solution that would ensure that "any adverse impacts on mining communities in West Virginia are minimized." Well, talk is cheap. But any real solution to minimize economic impact on these West Virginia communities won't be cheap.

Back in July, the President of the United States appeared in Hazard, KY, where he delivered an address to the people of Appalachia. Appalachia is my home. I was married there. Our first daughter was born there. Our second daughter was born there. I went to school there. I graduated from high school there in Appalachia.

The President of the United States expressed great sympathy for the economic distress in these mountainous States. It was an uplifting speech. He is very capable of giving uplifting speeches. It was a speech that reached out to the human spirit and built great expectations. Calling on corporate America to invest in rural America, President Clinton said: "This is a time to bring more jobs and investment to hope for the areas of our country that have not fully participated in this economic recovery." And I say: Amen, brother! Amen.

I agree with that message. It is the right thing to do. We should be bringing new businesses, too. But how can one peddle hope while undercutting the real jobs and businesses that do exist in Appalachia? If we don't act now, if the court lifts its stay, we will be back here a few months from now battling this issue all over again. It may not just be West Virginia then. It may be your own States, Senators. It may be your people, Senators. It may be our States. It may be your Senator, Senators. It may be your families.

There may be an appeal of the judges ruling, and that appeal may lead to a more equitable outcome. However, that appeal may simply maintain the judge's decision put two greatly opposed where we have been in recent weeks, trying to address the matter Congressionally—trying to reaffirm well-established Congressional intent that has been followed for the past 20 years while mining improvements in the way mining is conducted.

In the meantime, with the scales tipped against them, mining families must hold on to a crumbling ledge. The heel is poised above their fingertips, ready to mash down.

We have a pretty good idea who the opponents of this effort are. But what about the supporters? Let me tell you who is standing by us: The United Mine Workers of America; the National Miners Association; the U.S. Chamber of Commerce; the Bituminous Coal Operators Association; the AFL-CIO—hear me, coal miners, the AFL-CIO—the National Association of Manufacturers; the Association of American Railroads; the United Transportation Union; the Norfolk Southern Railroad; CSX Railroad; the Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen; the International Union of Operating Engineers; the Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees; the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers; the Transport Workers of America; the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers; the International Brotherhood of Electric Workers; the Utility Workers Union of America; American Electric Power.

You see, the environmentalists sent a letter to the White House, and they listed a few organizations that were supporting their opposition to this amendment. But listen to this list, too. This amendment has its friends.

I continue with the reading of the list: the Southern States Energy Board; the Southern Company; the United Steelworkers of America; the Independent Steelworkers of America—it isn't just coal miners, you see; these are brothers—the Laborers International Union of North America; the American Trunkers Association; the International Brotherhood of Teamsters; the American Waterways Operators; the International Union of Transportation Communications; the American Federation of Teachers; the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees; the American Federation of Government Employees—White House, it isn't just ROBERT BYRD and MITCH MCCONNELL and JAY ROCKWELL and BILL MONTGOMERY, PETE DOMENICI, LARRY CRAIG, and PHIL GRAMM, and the fine Senator who sits in the Chair, PAT ROBERTS. It isn't just these. It isn't just the House delegation, the three Members of the House from West Virginia. These are not alone.

It is also the National Council of Senior Citizens. These groups—representing millions of citizens—agree with us that a legislative remedy is needed, and is included now. They agree that there must be a balanced approach. What this amendment does is simple. It establishes a fair, moderate balance between jobs and environmental protection. It also provides for additional review and regulation once the environmental impact study is complete.

It is time to put aside whatever animosity exists between the coal mining industry and the environmental movement.

I am not much for making predictions, but I can make this one: the
coming years will bring us more challenges like this, when the environment and the economy must be harmonized. Today is a test of our ability to deal with those challenges ahead. This nation can put a man on the moon, and I have no reason to believe that I should fail in this task to this problem that protects the environment and protects jobs of the coal fields.

This amendment seeks to go back to the regulations and the agreements that made up the status quo ante before the judge’s order—that is all we ask—the status quo ante agreed upon by the administration’s EPA, by the administration’s Army Corps of Engineers, by the administration’s Department of the Interior, the Office of Surface Mining, That is what we ask. And we ask not only for justice, but we ask also for mercy for the coal miners and the other working people of America.

I ask unanimous consent that the names of the cosponsors and sponsors of this amendment be printed in the Record, and they are as follows:

Senators BYRD, MCCONNELL, ROCKEFELLER, BUNNING, REID, CRAIG, BRYAN, HATCH, BENNETT, MURkowski, CRapo, ENZI, BURNS, and KYL. I have not put forth any big effort to shop this around, I also add Senators BREAUX, SHELBY, GRAMm, and GRAMS, as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period of morning business until the hour of 5 p.m. and that the time be divided in the usual form.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BYRD-MCCONNELL MINING AMENDMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I first thank my friend from West Virginia for his leadership on this extraordinarily important issue to my State and to his and, for that matter, to all the people of Appalachia where coal is mined.

Thanks to my friend from West Virginia, I had a unique experience last week. As the proud possessor of a zero rating from the AFL-CIO, I had never been invited to a rally by the United Mine Workers of America. Thanks to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia, who I assume warned the crowd to say nice things or at least to refrain from throwing anything, I joined him on the west front of the Capitol last Tuesday and had an opportunity to watch a Senator adopt a solution to a problem in a different environment. I have seen him many times on the floor, always persuasive and always effective, but never before a rally largely of his people and my people who make their livelihood mining coal.

I must say, it was a memorable experience. If I ever do my memoirs, I say to my friend from West Virginia, that experience will be in it. We have joined together with many others on this side of the aisle, and I hope we will have some on that side of the aisle, who have had enough of this administration declaring war on legal industries engaged in an honest effort to keep this country moving forward. We have a number of Republican Senators from the West, and they all told us over the years about the war on the West. Senator DOMENICI and Senator CRAIG have educated some of us southerners about the problems they have had. And I am pleased to say I have supported them over the years, without exception, in their efforts to preserve those jobs in the mining industry out west.

Well, I would say the war on the West is moving east, and we are beginning to feel the sting. Even though this amendment was generated by a very poorly reasoned district court decision in the Federal court in West Virginia, let me say that is just the beginning, as the Senator from West Virginia pointed out; it is just the beginning.

All the Byrd-McConnell amendment seeks to do—not just for coal mining but for hard rock mining as well—is to restore to us the existing law, at least with regard to coal mining, as the distinguished Senator from West Virginia has pointed out. The letter from the White House, from Chief of Staff John Podesta to the President, either lies or is woefully ill informed.

It is clear to this Senator that the people downtown don’t care what the facts are. They don’t care about the 20,000 coal miners in West Virginia and the 15,000 coal miners in Kentucky. They really don’t care. I don’t think they have bothered to read the amendment, as the distinguished Senator from West Virginia because, as he pointed out a few moments ago with regard to coal mining, we are seeking to reestablish the status quo, agreed to and entered into by the most radical EPA in the history of the country, with no question in my mind that whenever any environmental group in America hiccups, it is felt downtown. Anytime they object to anything, the administration falls in line.

It has been fascinating to watch this issue develop because it pits the environmentalists against the unions—truly a Hobson’s choice for the administration. When they had to pick a side between the environmentalists and the coal miners in West Virginia and in Kentucky, it is pretty clear whose side they chose. They don’t care about these jobs. They are not interested in reading this amendment. They really don’t care about this amendment. They are willing to sacrifice the 20,000 coal-mining jobs in West Virginia and the 15,000 coal-mining jobs in Kentucky in order to score points with a lot of environmentalists—who, I assume, enjoy having electricity all the time so they can read their reports—decraying the people who work in the industry so important to our States. Clinton and Gore are determined to put the agenda of the environmental groups and Presidential political concerns ahead of the needs of coal miners in Appalachia.

As I said earlier in a colloquy with the Senator from West Virginia, and as he mentioned in his speech last week, President came to Appalachia last summer. He happened to have picked my State. He came to Hazard, KY. It was a large crowd. They were honored to have him there. The mayor of Hazard is still talking about it. It was one of the high points of his life. The President looked out at the people in Hazard, many of whom make a living in the coal mines, and he said, “I am here to help you.”

Well, Mr. President, we need your help. I assume the whole idea behind coming to Kentucky was not to increase unemployment. My recollection of what that visit was about was how the Federal Government could actually produce new jobs for the mountains—something a lot of people have talked about, and few have been able to deliver. Well, we would like to have new jobs, Mr. President, but I can tell you this: We would rather not lose any more of the few jobs we have remaining. That is not a step in the right direction.

We don’t have as many coal jobs as we used to. The production is about the same. The employment is much smaller. Every time there has been an improvement in the coal-mining industry—but for hard rock mining as well—there is no question in my mind that whenever any environmental group in America hiccups, it is felt downtown. Anytime they object to anything, the administration falls in line.

It is clear to this Senator that the people downtown don’t care what the facts are. They don’t care about the 20,000 coal miners in West Virginia and the 15,000 coal miners in Kentucky. They really don’t care. I don’t think they have bothered to read the amendment, as the distinguished Senator from West Virginia because, as he pointed out a few moments ago with regard to coal mining, we are seeking to reestablish the status quo, agreed to and entered into by the most radical EPA in the history of the country. There is no question in my mind that whenever any environmental group in America hiccups, it is felt downtown. Anytime they object to anything, the administration falls in line.

It has been fascinating to watch this issue develop because it pits the environmentalists against the unions—truly a Hobson’s choice for the administration. When they had to pick a side between the environmentalists and the coal miners in West Virginia and in Kentucky, it is pretty clear whose side they chose. They don’t care about these jobs. They are not interested in reading this amendment. They really don’t care about this amendment. They are willing to sacrifice the 20,000 coal-mining jobs in West Virginia and the 15,000 coal-mining jobs in Kentucky in order to score points with a lot of environmentalists—who, I assume, enjoy having electricity all the time so they can read their reports—decraying the people who work in the industry so important to our States. Clinton and Gore are determined to put the agenda of the environmental groups and Presidential political concerns ahead of the needs of coal miners in Appalachia.

As I said earlier in a colloquy with the Senator from West Virginia, and as he mentioned in his speech last week, President came to Appalachia last summer. He happened to have picked my State. He came to Hazard, KY. It was a large crowd. They were honored to have him there. The mayor of Hazard is still talking about it. It was one of the high points of his life. The President looked out at the people in Hazard, many of whom make a living in the coal mines, and he said, “I am here to help you.”

Well, Mr. President, we need your help. I assume the whole idea behind coming to Kentucky was not to increase unemployment. My recollection of what that visit was about was how the Federal Government could actually produce new jobs for the mountains—something a lot of people have talked about, and few have been able to deliver. Well, we would like to have new jobs, Mr. President, but I can tell you this: We would rather not lose any more of the few jobs we have remaining. That is not a step in the right direction.

We don’t have as many coal jobs as we used to. The production is about the same. The employment is much smaller. Every time there has been an improvement in the coal-mining industry—but for hard rock mining as well—there is no question in my mind that whenever any environmental group in America hiccups, it is felt downtown. Anytime they object to anything, the administration falls in line.

It has been fascinating to watch this issue develop because it pits the environmentalists against the unions—truly a Hobson’s choice for the administration. When they had to pick a side between the environmentalists and the coal miners in West Virginia and in Kentucky, it is pretty clear whose side they chose. They don’t care about these jobs. They are not interested in reading this amendment. They really don’t care about this amendment. They are willing to sacrifice the 20,000 coal-mining jobs in West Virginia and the 15,000 coal-mining jobs in Kentucky in order to score points with a lot of environmentalists—who, I assume, enjoy having electricity all the time so they can read their reports—decraying the people who work in the industry so important to our States. Clinton and Gore are determined to put the agenda of the environmental groups and Presidential political concerns ahead of the needs of coal miners in Appalachia.
relevant agencies are in the process of conducting a thorough environmental impact study. At the conclusion of this process, if any of these agencies believe it is necessary, they may create new environmental regulations addressing the practice of mountaintop mining. Some of us may say that Senator Craig, Mr. Byrd, and I are trying to delay the inevitable. I argue just the opposite. I argue that, by maintaining the status quo and allowing the EIS to move forward, you allow coal operators the ability to make these plans essential to the viability of this industry.

So there are only two things you need to remember about our amendment: No. 1, it doesn't alter the Clean Water Act. No. 2, it doesn't alter the Surface Mining Act. It seeks to preserve the status quo.

I say to all of you who you are going to be down here asking us someday to help you save jobs in your State because of some outrageous action on the part of this Congress—and some of you have done that already—we need your help. We need your help. This is an extraordinarily important vote to our States. The honest, hard-working people who make their living in the mines are under assault by this administration, and we would like to call a halt to it. We hope we will have your help in doing that.

Let me conclude by thanking again the Senator from West Virginia for his extraordinary leadership on this important issue to this State and to my State and, frankly, we believe, to a whole lot of other States because the principle is very sound. We call on our colleagues from the West—even those of us who have been voting with you over the years weren't quite sure what it was all about, but we have figured it out. This whole thing is moving its way east. We need your help.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my statement, Senator Rockefeller from West Virginia be allowed to speak.

Mr. Byrd. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Idaho is recognized.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my statement, Senator Rockefeller from West Virginia be allowed to speak.

Mr. Byrd. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The distinguished Senator from Idaho is recognized.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my statement, Senator Rockefeller from West Virginia be allowed to speak.

Mr. Byrd. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that morning business be extended until 5:30 p.m.

Mr. Byrd. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

BYRD-MCCONNELL MINING AMENDMENT

Mr. Byrd. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CRAIG. Yes.

Mr. Byrd. Mr. President, I forgot to mention the specific names of two Senators cosponsoring this amendment. The two are Nevada Senators, Mr. Reid and Mr. Bryan. I wanted to mention their names for the Record.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from West Virginia has included two colleagues from the State of Nevada. Today, Nevada is probably the lead mining State in our Nation as it relates to the production of gold.

For the last hour you have heard probably some of the most eloquent statements spoken on this floor on the issue of coal mining. The Byrd amendment does not deal only with coal, although it is extremely important, and the public attention of the last week has been focused on a judge's opinion about coal, coal mining in West Virginia, Kentucky, Pennsylvania, and up and down the Appalachian chain of this country.

But the amendment also has something else in it that my colleague from West Virginia described so nicely some time ago: When we talk on this floor about mining, when we talk about the economy of mining, the environment of mining, and the jobs of mining, we would stand together; that we would not allow differences to divide us. Because if you support the economy of this country, you have to stand together.

I am absolutely amazed that the Speaker of the House or the senior Senator from West Virginia would get a letter from the White House of the kind to which both he and the Senator from Kentucky have referred. Lying? I hope not. Uninformed? I doubt it. Here is the reason I doubt their lack of information.

For the last 7 years, this administration has been intent on changing current mining law. I am referring primarily to the law of 1872. I am referring primarily to hard-rock mining on public lands, because the laws that the Senator from West Virginia referred to that were passed in 1977, the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act, have become law, and established the principles and the policies under which we would mine the coal of America.

Then, on top of that, came the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, and the National Environmental Policy Act—all of them setting a framework and a standard under which we could mine the minerals and the resources of this country and citizens it would be done in a sound environmental way.

As the laws of West Virginia, which are the laws of America, which are the laws this Senate passed, apply to coal mining, at least in the instances of the Clean Air Act and the Clean Water Act, they, too, apply to the mining of the west—to hard-rock mining, to gold mining, to silver mining, to lead and zinc mining, and to open-pit gravel operations of America.

Yet there is an attorney—not a judge, not an elected U.S. Senator, but an attorney—who sits at a desk at the Department of Interior and upon his own volition 2 years ago decided he would rewrite the mining law of this country—a law that had been in place since 1872, tested in the courts hundreds of times, and that in every instance one principle stood out and was upheld. That principle was mill sites and how the operating agency, primarily the BLM, could, upon the request of a mining operation under a mining plan uniform with its processes, ask for additional properties under the National Environmental Policy Act, No. 1, it doesn't alter the Clean Air Act and the Clean Water Act, No. 2, it doesn't alter the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, and the Mining Control and Reclamation Act, that were passed in 1977, the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act, and every State office of the Bureau of Land Management said this is a practice in our country and assure our citizens it was well read across America.

I asked the solicitor to come before the subcommittee I chair, which is the Mining Subcommittee. I quoted back to him his own words and said: If that is not what you said, then what are you doing now? He didn't say yes, but he didn't say no. He said: Well, you didn't ask the question. He perjured himself. That is what he did say. He said: I have reached out to every State director of every BLM operation in this Nation, and I have asked them if the process I have overruled by my decision is a process that has been well used by the agency. He said they responded to him: Not so very lightly used and only used in recent years.

The tragedy of that statement is that it was a lie because the Freedom of Information Act shows that the solicitor to the director wrote a letter to the solicitor a year before I asked him the question and every State director of every State office of the Bureau of Land Management said this is a practice in our manuals and has been used consistently since the 1872 law was implemented.

What did solicitor John Leshy do before the Mining Subcommittee of the Senate? He perjured himself. That is what he did. And the Freedom of Information Act shows that he did it.

I would say to the Senator from West Virginia and the Senator from Kentucky, my guess is that the informational material that created the Freedom of Information Act shows that he did it.

Therefore, in the Byrd-McConnell amendment is a provision that said: Mr. Leshy, you cannot arbitrarily or capriciously overturn over 100 years of mining law. That is not your job. You are a hired attorney. You are not an attorney. You are a public servant. You are a public employee. You are not a judge.
elected Senator or a President. That is our job—to change public policy and to do it in a fair and sound environmental way.

We are all environmentalists. The senior Senator from West Virginia said it so perfectly when he said that we all know as politicians and public people that none of our colleagues have ever run on the dirty air or the dirty water platform. We are all proud of our environmental records. We want the air and the water to be clean. But have you ever driven to the mountains of the West or the mountains of West Virginia? They are rugged and steep. We must craft unique policies and procedures to mine the wealth from underneath those mountains. It is a tough struggle. We know it. We have learned in the last decades to do it in a much better way than our forebears. That is called good environmental policy and good stewardship.

Every one of us is an environmentalist. But we are not radical preservationists who would deny the thousands of working men and women in West Virginia and Kentucky no food for their table, no money in their pocket, or no education for their children. If you or I, or any of our colleagues, get in a car and drive down the road. To heck with your job and to heck with you.

I understand the young person in urban America today sitting at his or her keyboard. You digital natives. I remember the telephone; it was ringing. The President of the Senate from Idaho, West Virginia, and Kentucky: What are you talking about? Does it make much sense? We want a clean environment. Save the mountains of West Virginia, Idaho, Nevada, and Kentucky, and the plains of Texas.

Let me say to that marvelous young American sitting at his or her keyboard: As you touch that keyboard tonight, and it lights up for you and it energizes, it is the electricity generated by the coal of West Virginia that gave you the power to reach the Internet and to reach the stars beyond. That power surge through connections created of gold and silver came from the mines of Idaho, from the mines of Nevada, and from the Western States.

Please, America, broaden your vision of what it takes to make the leading economy of the world work so well. It is not big government, it is clean water, and that we are proud of. But 60 percent of America's electricity is generated out of the coal mines of America, and the connections that create the fluidity of the flow of that electricity so there is less restriction is the gold and the silver of the West. That is what makes our country work so well. That is what makes our country the cleanest country in the world. Our leadership, our policy, our clean coal technology, our ability now to tear up the Eagle—Actually, when we do, we replace it, we reshape it, we change it—that is our law that causes it to happen. That is the law that this Senate crafted. So, no, we cannot be extreme nor can we be radical. We have to offer balance and we will offer that in the context of the best environment we can create.

I will not forget, when I asked Alan Greenspan, Al Gore, come before the Republican Policy Committee this spring to talk about surplus and how we handle them, afterwards I said: Mr. Greenspan, you watch our economy everyday; why is it so good? Why is it literally pulling up the rest of the world with it? Last month, unemployment in this country was 4.1 percent; average wage, $13.39 an hour, the highest average wage ever; and the lowest unemployment rate in 29 years. And we do it with the cleanest of the environments of the developed nations of the world. Why do we do it? Mr. Greenspan said it well: We just know how to do it better than anybody else. We know how to mine better than anybody else. We know how to do it better than anybody else and, in almost every instance, we do it with the minimal form of government regulation.

The Senator from West Virginia makes a very clear case. It isn't that West Virginia was trying to do it better. They were. It is that this White House won't support this effort. They have not chosen to follow the route of the environmental community. They have chosen to follow the world of a few radical preservationists who would ask young Americans to turn on their computers tonight to the light of a candle. If it is the light of a candle that will lead this world, computers will not turn on, the flow will not surge, and the men and women of West Virginia will go hungry.

I support the Senator from West Virginia because he supports mining, as I do. It is time our Senate and the House of Representatives. I hope they will support attaching this critical amendment to the continuing resolution. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Sessions). The senior Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I note the presence of the Senator from Louisiana on the floor. I inquire if the Senator wishes to speak at some point on this subject.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I thank the Senator. I do wish to speak. I am happy to wait until the Senator has completed his remarks, if he could let me know how long he will take.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I will speak, then the Senator from Texas will speak, and then I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Louisiana be permitted to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I thank my distinguished senior colleague who has been daunting and relentless in his pursuit of his amendment, which is a very good amendment, an amendment which deserves to be passed.

What is fascinating to me has been said before by others. I will go back to the letter from John Podesta at the White House, the Chief of Staff to the President. He said that any solution that would undercut water quality protection under the Clean Water Act, or under SMCRA, the Surface Mining Control and Recreation Act, simply is unacceptable, and Senator Byrd's opposition to appropriations riders that would weaken or undermine environmental protections under current law would be unacceptable.

We emphasize as strongly as I possibly can he is wrong in that statement. The fact that he is wrong in that statement is of the utmost importance to our colleagues if they or their staffs are listening as they come to a decision about this amendment. If he were right, that would be an entirely different matter. However, he is not right. To make it perfectly clear, we have included that in the legislation that Senator BYRD and Senator MCCONNELL put forward. I will read it again for those who may not have been listening before. Nothing in this section modifies, supersedes, undermines, displaces or amends any requirement of or regulation issued under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act or the Surface Mining Control Reclamation Act of 1977.

It would be law. It is the case, in any event. We added this not because we thought it would be fortuitous to add it, not because we needed to add it, but because it was true at the outset. We did it to make the point even clearer for those who would raise this point.

Senator BYRD made the points most clearly and most powerfully. This amendment, on which we are asking for support, simply puts into law the memorandum of understanding which I hold in my hand, which has been signed off by the Environmental Protection Agency, by the Office of Surface Mining in the Department of Interior, and by the Corps of Engineers. When signatures are here—the signature from the Environmental Protection Agency, a very high senator official, the signature from the Regional Director at the Office of Surface Mining, the signature from the brigadier general of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and the signature from an official in West Virginia.

The point is the Environmental Protection Agency has approved, and the Corps of Engineers have approved and given their official written stamp of approval in writing, right here. This equals this amendment. There is no difference therein. I am not one who either baits or ridicules the environmental movement nor do most of my colleagues.

This country is constructed under the republican nature of its form of government as a system of checks and balances. I have a tremendous interest in health care public policy, and spend a lot of time being upset with the Health Care Finance Administration called HCFA. There are people, obviously, who are upset by EPA. By and large, I
I think EPA tries to do within its own understanding the best job it can. By and large, I think one of the reasons the environmental condition of our country is gradually improving, although slowly, is because some of those people in power positions, which are popular with members of this body or the other body or with Governors or with the public. I do not ridicule what they do.

However, I do think they know in their hearts that what Senator BYRD and Senator MCCONNELL and some of the other Members are trying to do is completely consistent with the intent of Congress, in fact, in the case of SMCLA, for other better purposes, sometimes when people say that, people say that is a word they use to get out of this situation or that situation. But this country has to run on a balance. One cannot simply say to southern West Virginia, to central West Virginia, to northern West Virginia, to other parts of our country: We are going to make these enormous changes, very radical in their content today because tomorrow will be a new day, because transition in America is not just something that happens, and we move from one sort of a core industry type of economy in West Virginia to a modern, totally smokeless type of economy, and there does not need to be any interruption. So we will come in and we will stop this business called mountaintop mining.

In the process of that, we are probably, unless this amendment is agreed to, going to stop much of the underground mining in West Virginia and Kentucky but, if this were to be extended and this were to catch fire, eradicating the potential for the 57 to 60 percent of electricity which is fueled by the use of coal across this country—that is a balance, sometimes—when people say that, people say that is a word they use to get out of this situation or that situation. But this country has to run on a balance. One cannot simply say to southern West Virginia, to central West Virginia, to northern West Virginia, to other parts of our country: We are going to make these enormous changes, very radical in their content today because tomorrow will be a new day, because transition in America is not just something that happens, and we move from one sort of a core industry type of economy in West Virginia to a modern, totally smokeless type of economy, and there does not need to be any interruption. So we will come in and we will stop this business called mountaintop mining.

In the process of that, we are probably, unless this amendment is agreed to, going to stop much of the underground mining in West Virginia and Kentucky but, if this were to be extended and this were to catch fire, eradicating the potential for the 57 to 60 percent of electricity which is fueled by the use of coal across this country—that is a balance, sometimes—when people say that, people say that is a word they use to get out of this situation or that situation. But this country has to run on a balance. One cannot simply say to southern West Virginia, to central West Virginia, to northern West Virginia, to other parts of our country: We are going to make these enormous changes, very radical in their content today because tomorrow will be a new day, because transition in America is not just something that happens, and we move from one sort of a core industry type of economy in West Virginia to a modern, totally smokeless type of economy, and there does not need to be any interruption. So we will come in and we will stop this business called mountaintop mining.

In the process of that, we are probably, unless this amendment is agreed to, going to stop much of the underground mining in West Virginia and Kentucky but, if this were to be extended and this were to catch fire, eradicating the potential for the 57 to 60 percent of electricity which is fueled by the use of coal across this country—that is a balance, sometimes—when people say that, people say that is a word they use to get out of this situation or that situation. But this country has to run on a balance. One cannot simply say to southern West Virginia, to central West Virginia, to northern West Virginia, to other parts of our country: We are going to make these enormous changes, very radical in their content today because tomorrow will be a new day, because transition in America is not just something that happens, and we move from one sort of a core industry type of economy in West Virginia to a modern, totally smokeless type of economy, and there does not need to be any interruption. So we will come in and we will stop this business called mountaintop mining.

In the process of that, we are probably, unless this amendment is agreed to, going to stop much of the underground mining in West Virginia and Kentucky but, if this were to be extended and this were to catch fire, eradicating the potential for the 57 to 60 percent of electricity which is fueled by the use of coal across this country—that is a balance, sometimes—when people say that, people say that is a word they use to get out of this situation or that situation. But this country has to run on a balance. One cannot simply say to southern West Virginia, to central West Virginia, to northern West Virginia, to other parts of our country: We are going to make these enormous changes, very radical in their content today because tomorrow will be a new day, because transition in America is not just something that happens, and we move from one sort of a core industry type of economy in West Virginia to a modern, totally smokeless type of economy, and there does not need to be any interruption. So we will come in and we will stop this business called mountaintop mining.

In the process of that, we are probably, unless this amendment is agreed to, going to stop much of the underground mining in West Virginia and Kentucky but, if this were to be extended and this were to catch fire, eradicating the potential for the 57 to 60 percent of electricity which is fueled by the use of coal across this country—that is a balance, sometimes—when people say that, people say that is a word they use to get out of this situation or that situation. But this country has to run on a balance. One cannot simply say to southern West Virginia, to central West Virginia, to northern West Virginia, to other parts of our country: We are going to make these enormous changes, very radical in their content today because tomorrow will be a new day, because transition in America is not just something that happens, and we move from one sort of a core industry type of economy in West Virginia to a modern, totally smokeless type of economy, and there does not need to be any interruption. So we will come in and we will stop this business called mountaintop mining.
acts in a far more intense way than most other States because if we do, we are hurt by them much more than other States because of the enormously mountainous, hilly nature of our State, with only 4 percent of it being flat. All the rest of it goes up or it goes down at one end or the other. We have to respect the laws.

Mountain mining has changed a bit over the years in the sense that it has gotten rather larger in the area it covers. But I think we in Congress understand that mountaintop mining in West Virginia is never going to be the same. In fact, the congressional delegation in the House and the Senate wrote an article in the West Virginia papers in which we said it is true, it never is going to be the same.

It may be possible we cannot afford to have, as far as the mountains are concerned, these enormous areas that are mined all at once. But when somebody comes along and says, oh, you shouldn't do it, I am going to, I do not think you, not even the President of the United States, should respect the size because you can't fill valleys, they are wrong. Under the Federal law, they are wrong. The Federal law specifically provides for that. I will not read it. I simply hold it up. Here it is in SMCRA. It specifically provides for that. I will not read it. I simply hold it up. Here it is in SMCRA. It specifically provides for being able to do valley fill.

If the Federal judge who made this decision in West Virginia wants to eliminate that—but then again, in his decision in West Virginia that mountain mining in West Virginia, not just in southern West Virginia, but it will probably be all over West Virginia because everywhere there are effects of the judge's opinion.

We have to have both. We have to have a way for people to provide the electricity the Senator from Idaho talked about to turn on those commitments. We have to have a way to light up this Senate and to light up the homes of people all over America. As I indicated, 57 to 60 percent of all the electricity in this country is made by coal. It is not made by nuclear power. It is not made, at this point, by natural gas. It is made by coal. It is a fact of life. Reasonable people understand that.

You cannot just obliterate that and pretend there are not going to be consequences. Nobody wants economic devastation. I do not think any of our colleagues want economic devastation on the State of West Virginia. I do not think that is in their hearts; I do not think that is in their minds; but that is what is in the process of happening unless this Byrd-McConnell amendment is, in fact, agreed to and becomes part of the national law. All it will do is put into law precisely what the Environmental Protection Agency, the Office of Surface Mining, and the Corps of Engineers have officially signed on as policy.

The stakes are tremendously high in West Virginia, and the stakes are tremendously high not only in Kentucky but all across this country. This is a kind of a watershed decision we are about to make. Are we going to find some kind of a compromise, a way of finding a way that the industry and everyone, the Corps of Engineers have officially signed on as policy.

Global warming is a fact. I do not dispute the science. I look around me; I feel the temperature; I understand what is going on. On the other hand, at the same time I have those feelings in my bosom, having to speak grown up as an adult, as a VISTA volunteer in the southern coal fields of West Virginia, that these people who are mining coal—this is not a compromise. I have to keep talking about a compromise. If we have a way to do something that will more or less cease to exist in West Virginia because nobody will invest; nobody will say: All right, let's just wait for a couple of years and then we will come back and look at West Virginia. That will not happen. It will be more or less the end of mining in West Virginia, not just in southern West Virginia, but it will probably be all over West Virginia because everywhere there are effects of the judge's opinion.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, when I was up in Oregon I visited a coal mine that was going to be shut down. We got there and the judge gave the order, the federal judge, that they had to stop. We just talked about what that would mean to the miners in the southern coal fields of West Virginia that deprives them not only of their self-respect but of their ability to eat, to get medical care, or to exist as human beings.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, would my distinguished colleague briefly yield for a comment in connection with something he said?

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I certainly will.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, when I went up to Rhode Island on Saturday, a few days ago, to attend the funeral services of the late Rhode Island Senator John Chafee, the national press people—the Washington Post, the New York Times—were right on that plane indicated that the administration was supportive of that amendment. That was on Saturday.

I had run the language by the administration's representatives, who come...
to this hill often. I hoped the adminis-
tration would support the language. So I
was quietly running the language to the
administration and certainly get-
ting the support of the administra-
tion—if not openly, at least they were
not opposed to it. We were working
with them tacitly.

The very next day the tune changed,
and the newspapers announced the ad-
ministration was against the Byrd
amendment. So they flip-flopped over
night; they made a 180-degree turn over
night. The very day I had the confidence of
them. They were looking at the lan-
guage, making any responses they
wished to make to express their viewpoint. The next day they were 100 per-
cent on the other side.

So I say this amendment is a test. I
say to the working men and women of
America, do not believe the pretty words you may hear. Pretty words are
easy. And I have heard pretty words myself. Watch what happens with this
amendment, I say to the working men
and women of America. Watch what
happens to this amendment. See if the
actions of those who say they are your
friend do match those pretty promises.

I thank my distinguished friend and
colleague. I am pleased to associate
myself with his remarks. Well done,
my friend.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I thank my sen-
ior colleague and I yield the floor, Mr.
President, speaking on behalf of the people who
hear that alarm ring at 4:30 a.m. in
the morning—well, maybe it is 4:30
a.m. in one of those houses—I know Senator BYRD
did—the next sound you would hear is
those two feet hitting the floor. It is
predictable. You know what is going to
happen, whether it is raining or wheth-
er it is not raining. These are people
who struggle to make ends meet, who
sit down around the kitchen table on
the first day of the month and get out
that stub they got with their paycheck.
Then they take the back of an enve-
lope, or a piece of paper, and they try
to figure out how they are going to be
able to pay their bills, and who they
can get by without paying this month.
They contribute to America by pro-
ducing things America needs.

I think something is wrong in America when our laws are more fo-
cused on protecting sub-species of
crickets than they are focused on pro-
tecting people who earn a living with
the sweat of their brow and with their
hands.

I think something is very wrong in
America when there does not seem to
be much focus on working men and
women, and what was moving to me
about Senator BYRD's speech is he was
speaking on behalf of the people who
work with their hands, and who work
for a living, and who often do not have
much of a voice in American Govern-
ment.

I am not here to criticize people who
have focused, in some cases, their lives,
their civic activity, and their leisure
time activity on the environment. But
I think something is wrong when, in fo-
cusing on the environment, we forget
about people who work for a living and
are affected by the environment.

I think, in some cases, environ-
mentalism has gone too far. I think, in
some cases, that it has become anti-
growth. Maybe that makes sense if you
live in a fancy air-conditioned house
and if your children have gone to col-
lege. If you have boundless opportuni-
ties, it makes sense to say we need to
protect the environment at all costs
and that there is no burden that is too
great to bear. After all, the person say-
ing that already has a piece of the
American dream.

But I think what Senator BYRD has
reminded us of is that not every Ameri-
can has lived the American dream.

Not every American has gotten a piece
of the pie.

I think when we have focused so
much on a sub-species of crickets, it is
about time that people in the Senate
stand up and say: What about people
who work for a living if you grew up indus-
tries of this country—people who have
had placed on their livelihood less
weight by American law than we place
on the assumed well-being of sub-
species of crickets? I think something
is out of balance in America. I think
we need to bring it back into balance.
I think we need to remind people who
are so concerned about one particular
element of the environment that there
is no more basic part of the environ-
ment than the ability of the people in
West Virginia, or Kentucky, or Texas,
or any other State in the Union to
make their house payment, or their
ability to earn a livelihood, or their
ability to have self-respect in their own
worth of what they do.

We are not talking about tearing
down America's environmental laws.
No country in history has a better en-
vironment than we have. No country
has spent more resources and legiti-
mate effort on their environment than
we have.

EXTENSION OF MORNING
BUSINESS

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I ask
unanimous consent that morning busi-
ness extend until 6 p.m.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, re-
serving the right to object—and I shall
not—there are some of us who would
like to speak on this debate concerning
this particular issue and who have been
waiting for a while. Could we get some
sequence of order perhaps?

Mr. GRAMM. As far as I am aware,
we have gone back and forth from the
Democrat side to the Republican side. I
have listened to five other people speak.
I have been well served by hear-
ing their speeches. I will be as brief as
I can.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I
ask unanimous consent that I be in
order of sequence after the Democ-
rat side as we move back and forth.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, reser-
ving the right to object, if we could sim-
ply accommodate every speaker, while
realizing that we are waiting for the
omnibus bill to come over from the
House, may I suggest we amend that
unanimous consent request so that the
Senator be recognized in the order of
the sequence we have, but that when
the omnibus bill comes over from the
House it continue to take precedence.

Mr. KERRY. Reserving the right to
object, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sen-
ator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KERRY. It is under my under-
standing the Senator appropriately asked for an
extension until 6. It is my un-
derstanding the Senator from Louisiana
wants to speak for only 10 minutes, or
less. The Senator from Minnesota
wants 5 minutes. I think if we could
get an order, we could contain it with-
in the time and everybody would be
satisfied. I ask the Senator from Alas-
ka how long he wants to speak.
Mr. MURkowski. In responding to my friend from Massachusetts, about 6 minutes. I am satisfied if we go back and forth, as suggested, it would concur with the unanimous consent agreement pending.

Mr. KERRY. I ask unanimous consent that following the Senator from Texas, the Senator from Louisiana be recognized for 10 minutes; following that, the Senator from Alaska be recognized for 5 minutes; the Senator from Minnesota for 5 minutes; and I would follow the Senator from Minnesota for 5 minutes.

Mr. LOTT. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. LOTT. To clarify that, when the District of Columbia appropriations conference report and its parts arrive, that will be taken up at that point regardless of the order. But then, of course, when that is completed, we can go back to the original order.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, again, may I ask the distinguished majority leader: I think we have such a tight containment here, there are some who have some problems off the floor. So it may be that we would be held up by about 5 minutes, I think, in total.

Mr. LOTT. If it is something like that, it should not be a problem. But they are voting in the House at this time, so the papers will be headed this way. If we can hold up the debate getting started, I think with the order we have lined up, we should be all right. I think we could extend the colloquy to the point where we couldn’t do the business of the Senate.

Mr. KERRY. Would the majority leader then permit us to put in place the request we have made?

Mr. LOTT. I withdraw my reservation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, it is obvious that there are a lot of people who want to speak. Let me sum up by saying that in an era where I think we want to speak. Let me sum up by saying about 5 minutes, I think, in total.

Mr. LOTT. I ask unanimous consent that this list be printed in the RECORD.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I am appreciative of the 10 minutes granted to speak on a different subject. I understand that the Senate is about working for many days. I know that the Maryland Senator from West Virginia feels very passionately about this issue, and other Members may want to add their voices as the evening goes on, so I will try to be brief.

A week from tomorrow, many of us will head home to be with our families and celebrate Thanksgiving. In my mind, it is extremely appropriate that Thanksgiving falls in this month, which many of you know is National Adoption Month. For like Thanksgiving, National Adoption Month is a time not only for celebration but also for reflection.

So let me begin with some facts about adoption that perhaps some children some are older. Although they are all different, all of them are more concerned about specific elements of the environment, as they define them, than they are concerned about the environment based on good science. I think they are more concerned about those values than they are interested in something that someone who does the work and pay the taxes and pull the wagon in America.

It is easy for a planner or an idealist to set out a policy and act as if destroying the livelihood of a coal miner is as irrelevant as simply overturning a regulation. But we know the difference between a regulation and the livelihood of a coal miner. It is because we know the difference that we are here.

I hope this amendment passes. I hope it sends a clear signal that the Clinton administration has become an extremist administration in terms of the environment. This is a bipartisan effort. I think it is important. I think it pulls back to the center in recognizing we cannot live without the love and security of a permanent family. We need to shorten that time. If a child has to be removed from their biological parents because of terrible, unfortunate circumstances, they should spend a short time in foster care and then be placed permanently with a loving family. Seventy percent of the children available for adoption and foster care are under the age of 10. They should not spend their tender years without a home. We are making progress and we should be proud. In 1996, 26,000 children in foster care were placed in permanent homes. It is projected that, in 1999, the number will be 36,000, an increase of about 30 percent.

In celebration of those who made this progress possible, the Congressional Coalition on Adoption instituted a wonderful idea that we hope will go on year after year, The Congressional Angels in Adoption. We asked all of our colleagues to send nominations for individuals in their respective States and districts who had done something extraordinary in the area of adoption. I would like to submit for the RECORD a list of the 55 families who have been nominated and selected for the first 1999 Angels in Adoption Awards.

I ask unanimous consent that this list be printed in the RECORD.

TheAngelsof Adoption

Freddy Mac Foundation, Virginia, Nancy Kleingartner, Bismarck, North Dakota. J eff and Earlette Morris, Marshalltown, Iowa, Earl and Judy Priest, Caldwell, Idaho, Dave Thomas, Dublin, Ohio, Peter and Mary Myers, Sikeston, Missouri, J ames and Denise Jones, Grand Rapids, Michigan, Fletcher Thompson, and Jim Thompson, Spartanburg, South Carolina, Carol McMahon, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, L ori and Willie Johnson, Rus selville, Arkansas, Candice Mueller, E wing, Nebraska, J anie Gla Cay, New Jersey, Carol Stoudt, Fargo, North Dakota, Bill and Laura Trickey, Kansas City,
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Missouri, Tom and Debbie Ritter, Warrensburg, Missouri, Debbie Breden, O’Fallon, Missouri, Senator Gordon and Sharon Smith, Hope Marindin, Chevy Chase, Maryland, Tom Forrester, Cold Spring, Minnesota, Plahack, Maryland, Sky Wasterlnd, of Lawrence, Kansas.

Doug and Mary Spangler, Kansas City, Vivian Robinson, Harrisburg, Illinois, Reverend George Coates, Eldorado, Illinois, Ms. Gloria King of Oakland, California, Becky and Mike Dornoff, Williamsburg, Michigan, Steve and Cherie Karban, Rapid River, Michigan, James L. Gritter, Traverse City, Michigan, Ms. Sidney Duncan, Detroit, Michigan, A.E. Tran, Lancaster, Pennsylvania, Jane Sarnes, Lexington, Nebraska, Peggy Soule, Rochester, New York, Laurence and Jane Leach, Raleigh County, South Virginia, Judge Gary Johnson, West Virginia, West Virginia, West Virginia, West Virginia, West Virginia, West Virginia, West Virginia, West Virginia, West Virginia, West Virginia, West Virginia, West Virginia.

Having practiced adoption for over 25 years, they are rightly considered angels that helps build families and children a year. They practice law in a standing that there is more to a home than four walls. We thank the Freddie Mac Foundation of Virginia, nominated because of countless contributions to the promotion of adoption. In this year alone, Freeby Mac has donated millions of dollars to help fund programs, construction and foster care. Their commitment and dedication demonstrates their unique understanding that there is more to a home than four walls. We thank the Freddie Mac Foundation for their effort.

I will read a few more brief entries to give an example of some of the people that were honored. My friend, the Senator from Arkansas, submitted a family from Russellville, Arkansas, and nominated that they have adopted children. They are the proud parents of 17 children, 13 of whom are adopted and have special needs. Because of their love and dedication, these children have found their own homes.

From Spartanburg, South Carolina, we have selected Fletcher Thompson and Jim Thompson, nominated by our colleague in the House, James Demint. Having practiced adoption for over five years, they are rightly considered adoption experts. They place over 100 children a year. They practice law in a way that helps build families and brings hope to children and joy to parents. We thank them for their great work.

I would also like to mention, the Angel from Idaho—since the Senior Senator from that State was on the floor early this morning—about the important mining issue, as Co-chair of the Congressional Coalition he nominated Earl and Judy Priest from Caldwell, Idaho. For over 25 years, the Priests have opened their hearts and home to children of all ages and abilities. They are parents of five children, three of whom are adopted. In addition, they have fostered 160 other children.

Hays and Gay Town, from my own home State of Louisiana, founded and personally funded an agency that has placed over 200 children. They have also reached out to help young mothers in crisis.

There are many examples, from California to New York to Louisiana to Michigan. There have been examples of judges, attorneys, parents who have adopted children, advocates in the community, agencies, who are really contributing to making our goal of finding a home and a family in America and the world a reality.

In closing, I would like to remind my colleagues, of several pieces of pending legislation concerning adoption. First, we look forward to passing, with Senator HELMS’ and Senator BIDEN’s leadership, the Hague Convention on Intercountry Adoption. This treaty will, for the first time, lay out a framework for international adoption. Mr. Chairman, as a lawyer, you must consider that we have reached a point where we must most certainly know the importance of laying out a legal framework to prevent fraud and abuse, reduce costs and make the process easier for families adopting abroad. Together with Senator ABRAHAM, I have introduced the Adoption Awareness Act to fund a nationwide campaign promoting adoption. Through this campaign, we hope to encourage potential adoptive parents to open their homes to a waiting child.

Finally, I hope to be able to increase the present adoption tax credit from $5,000 to $10,000. As you can see, there is a lot of work we have to do when we come back. I am looking forward to this opportunity, once again, to recognize all of our “Angels in Adoption,” and to thank my colleagues for all the good work they have done on this issue. I look forward to working with them when we return to make the reality of a permanent and loving home real for so many children who need it.

Thank you. I yield the remainder of my time.

BYRD-MCCONNELL MINING AMENDMENT

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I think we all owe a tremendous debt of gratitude to the senior Senator from West Virginia.

What we have now is a situation concerning mining in the U.S. where a crucial decision is either going to be made to maintain an atmosphere where mining can continue or through the prevailing attitude within the Clinton administration to simply drive this industry offshore.

The Clinton administration, by its actions, evidently opposes the working people of America who are involved in mining. So the opposing Senator BYRD’s proposal basically are destroying the entire coal industry which exists west of the Mississippi—the mine workers whose jobs depend on that industry, the railroad workers, the barge men, and the truck drivers.

I think it is important to note that Senator BYRD’s amendment directs the application of the Clean Water Act to be returned to the way it was at the beginning of October of this year.

Senator BYRD’s amendment does not change the law. It would not change any practice that has been followed over the years. It is our job to change the law—not the White House and not the courts.

Senator BYRD’s amendment gives the Congress and the Federal agencies time to apply existing law without destroying the coal mining industry of this country—time to apply the law, or make such adjustments that are necessary in a way that protects the environment, the coal mining industry, and all those who depend upon that industry for their well-being.

We are looking for a balance. The administration’s proposal throws this out of balance.

The amendment goes further. There are two additional issues involved.

One deals with the recent Solicitor’s opinion that would throw out 127 years of precedent on the size of mill sites—only 5 acres per claim, if followed through with, this would make mining on public lands absolutely impossible. I do not know how many Members have an idea about what it takes to make up a mine. The mine needs a mill site, grinding and crushing facilities, shops, processing plants, tailings disposal, headquarters, a water plant, parking lots, and roads. This simply cannot fit on the space provided within the 5-acre mill site per claim. It simply can’t be done. This is how they propose to prevent mining, the coal mining industry, and all those who depend upon that industry offshore.

You are depriving us and this country the right to produce minerals from the rich resources we have.

I do not know how many Members have an idea about what it takes to make up a mine. The mine needs a mill site, grinding and crushing facilities, shops, processing plants, tailings disposal, headquarters, a water plant, parking lots, and roads. This simply cannot fit on the space provided within the 5-acre mill site per claim. It simply can’t be done. This is how they propose to prevent mining, the coal mining industry, and all those who depend upon that industry offshore.

You are depriving us and this country the right to produce minerals from the rich resources we have.

One deals with the recent Solicitor’s opinion that would throw out 127 years of precedent on the size of mill sites—only 5 acres per claim, if followed through with, this would make mining on public lands absolutely impossible. I do not know how many Members have an idea about what it takes to make up a mine. The mine needs a mill site, grinding and crushing facilities, shops, processing plants, tailings disposal, headquarters, a water plant, parking lots, and roads. This simply cannot fit on the space provided within the 5-acre mill site per claim. It simply can’t be done. This is how they propose to prevent mining, the coal mining industry, and all those who depend upon that industry offshore.

You are depriving us and this country the right to produce minerals from the rich resources we have.

I do not know how many Members have an idea about what it takes to make up a mine. The mine needs a mill site, grinding and crushing facilities, shops, processing plants, tailings disposal, headquarters, a water plant, parking lots, and roads. This simply cannot fit on the space provided within the 5-acre mill site per claim. It simply can’t be done. This is how they propose to prevent mining, the coal mining industry, and all those who depend upon that industry offshore.
The second issue is also a simple provision that would require the administration to follow sound science for a change—not emotion.

The provision would limit the ability of the Secretary of the Interior to propose new mining regulations for those areas where the National Academy of Science found that there were deficiencies. Why not give science a chance instead of emotion?

Finally, the National Academy of Science found that State and current Federal regulations on hard rock mining sufficiently protected the environment and needed only a few changes to bring it up to current standards.

What is wrong with the objective of the National Academy of Science?

There are two simple provisions: One that provides fundamental fairness by allowing companies that have relied on 127 years of interpretation to continue while the courts sort out whether this new interpretation is legal and one that requires the administration to follow and comply with sound science.

We are calling for fundamental fairness and sound science. The White House, in its single-minded determination to eliminate the nonunion mining industry, seems to have denied us both.

I certainly appreciate the support of the senior Senator from West Virginia. He has a sympathy and an understanding for the needs of the mining industry.

Unfortunately, we have seen these differences of opinion between the West and the East. But we certainly now have a common interest.

We need fairness. We need to meet the needs of the men and women who labor in our mines.

This Nation will pay the price as coal mines in West Virginia, mining sites throughout the West, and in my State of Alaska close. Good, honest jobs that provide fundamental fairness by the National Academy of Science? There are two simple provisions: One that provides fundamental fairness by allowing companies that have relied on 127 years of interpretation to continue while the courts sort out whether this new interpretation is legal. The second issue is also a simple provision that would require the administration to follow sound science for a change—not emotion.

The provision would limit the ability of the Secretary of the Interior to propose new mining regulations for those areas where the National Academy of Science found that there were deficiencies. Why not give science a chance instead of emotion?

Finally, the National Academy of Science found that State and current Federal regulations on hard rock mining sufficiently protected the environment and needed only a few changes to bring it up to current standards.

What is wrong with the objective of the National Academy of Science?

There are two simple provisions: One that provides fundamental fairness by allowing companies that have relied on 127 years of interpretation to continue while the courts sort out whether this new interpretation is legal and one that requires the administration to follow and comply with sound science.

We are calling for fundamental fairness and sound science. The White House, in its single-minded determination to eliminate the nonunion mining industry, seems to have denied us both.

I certainly appreciate the support of the senior Senator from West Virginia. He has a sympathy and an understanding for the needs of the mining industry.

Unfortunately, we have seen these differences of opinion between the West and the East. But we certainly now have a common interest.

We need fairness. We need to meet the needs of the men and women who labor in our mines.

This Nation will pay the price as coal mines in West Virginia, mining sites throughout the West, and in my State of Alaska close. Good, honest jobs that built this Nation will be lost. Union and nonunion workers will join the bread line that this administration will leave as its legacy for the mining industry.

I yield the floor.

I thank the President for his patience and perseverance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, my understanding is that Senator Kohl was seeking recognition. I ask unanimous consent that Senator Kohl be allowed to speak for 5 minutes after Senator KERRY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the Chair. Mr. President, I come to the floor to speak with some mixed feelings because I have heard several of my colleagues, and I specifically want to talk about the remarks of Senator BYRD and Senator ROCKEFELLER for whom I have a tremendous amount of respect. I know when they speak about miners, they speak from their hearts, and they speak from their souls.

I haven't looked at the specific wording of the amendment. But I want to raise some questions, if this amendment comes to a vote, I will look at the amendment and then decide. But I tell you, Mr. President, I have not had the opportunity of my colleagues trivialize this question. Just looking at it from another very important point of view, I can say that I have spent a considerable amount of time in eastern Kentucky. That is where my wife's family is from. I spent some time years ago with an organization called "Save Our Cumberland Mountains" in east Tennessee.

When my colleagues come to the floor and talk about this as saving some earth, I want to speak about what I have seen with strip mining. What I have seen with strip mining in east Tennessee and east Kentucky is a situation where, first of all, the coal mining companies came to the region and took an awful lot of the wealth, and then they left an awful lot of the people poor.

But one of the things people had was their streams, rivers, and their creeks. They had the outdoors, and the land that they loved.

I want to say to my colleagues that when you take the tops off these mountains with the strip mining as opposed to deep mining, and you let the leftover rock and earth get dumped into the adjacent valleys and bury or pollute streams, it raises a big question.

Again, I say, in deference to my colleagues, that I know what they are saying. We will have a chance to analyze this and then decide how to vote.

But I do not think it is a trivial question at all. I have seen communities ravaged by this strip mining. I have seen courageous people who have lived in the mountains their whole lives speak up. So I want to speak up by raising this question on the floor of the Senate.

I also want to say to my colleague, Senator BYRD—and others—who, as I said, from his heart cares about the miners, that when I hear some of my colleagues talk about the miners, I hope there will be equal concern for the miners in east Kentucky when they don't have the unions. Right now, they can't see 6 inches in front of them because of the coal dust level. I hope we will have the concern for the health and safety of the miners. When I hear speakers on the floor, I hope we will have the concern on raising wages; I hope we will have concern for civilized working conditions; and I hope we will have a concern about the right of miners and other people to be able to organize and bargain collectively.

When I hear about the President's trip to Hazard, KY, where is the concern for poverty? I hope we will also see the same kind of commitment to health care, to education, to affordable child care, to economic development, and all of the rest.

It is a little too much to hear several colleagues from the debate in these terms given this broader context. It is a difficult question. I said to Senator BYRD earlier I have not looked at the specific amendment yet. I will do that. But I don't want any Senator to come to the floor and act as if there is some question—again, the Senator from Minnesota can clear this up for me—as to whether or not, given section 404 of the Clean Water Act, we are or are not creating a loophole. That is a terribly important question for me to resolve before a final vote on the issue.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. BYRD. The distinguished Senator has mentioned my name. The word "waste" has been used. The newspapers have repeatedly used the word "waste," saying this amendment that I am sponsoring is to let coal companies continue to dump their waste into the streams.

And so to the use of the term "waste," the Clean Water Act, section 404, governs the disposal of "dredged and fill" materials into waters of the United States. Excess material from coal mines has always been regulated in this fashion as "dredged and fill" material under section 404 of the Clean Water Act.

Judge Hayden in West Virginia, however, determined that excess material from coal mines is "waste" and, as such, could not be disposed of in valley fills.

For 20 years, the stream buffer zone regulation has not been interpreted as allowing the disposal of excess material from coal mines into streams. Rather, Congress relied on the Clean Water Act to govern this activity.

I thank the distinguished Senator for yielding.

I ask unanimous consent Mr. SHELBY be added as a cosponsor to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

GRATITUDE TO JEANETTE BOONE SMITH

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I want to share with all of my colleagues, particularly with the citizens of Massachusetts, the deepest sense of appreciation I have for the longest serving member of my staff, someone I have been privileged to have work with me since I entered elective office in 1982. Jeanette Boone Smith is leaving my staff after serving all of that time, since 1982, both in the Lieutenant Governor's Office of Massachusetts and in
Jeanette's abilities and her commitment to improving her community. It has been recognized with awards for its architecture and innovative program of mixed-income housing. She is also deeply involved in the Roxbury Presbyterian Church where she serves as an elder, director of the choir, and a member of the renovation committee. These words today—and I know my colleagues will share this sense for any long-term staff person who departs—is not the time to recognize Jeanette's contributions to the people of Massachusetts or the full extent of my personal appreciation for her time with me. Although she departs my staff tomorrow, the principles she has represented in her work will never leave; rather, they will do as Jeanette has done, which is to serve as a moral compass pointed toward a better world where a bright future is open and available to everyone in this country. I am deeply grateful for her time with me, and I extend to her and Perry my very best wishes as they begin a wonderful new chapter in their lives.

Mr. DASCHLE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The quorum call be rescinded.

The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

THE NORTHEAST DAIRY COMPACT

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, in the omnibus package that will be brought to the floor sometime this evening, there are two pieces of legislation on dairy that I want to spend a couple of minutes discussing because I think they are unfair and very much not in the spirit of the American economic system.

One is the Northeast Dairy Compact. The Northeast Dairy Compact is an arrangement in which the New England States literally fix the price of milk in those seven States and no one can tamper with that price. It is the only price at which milk can be distributed from the Northeast. The effect, I think, is that it takes all the competition out of that product in that State, in all the New England States. We have never done that before in this country. It is contrary to everything that is represented by the economic system in the United States.

The reason why we have such a great country in part is because our economic system provides that anybody with a good idea to develop a product or a service has an unfettered opportunity in all 50 States to market that product. That is what has made America great: competition. That is why we have full employment, the best economy in the world, and an economy that can compete anywhere in the world and succeed. That is because in this country we say: In order to get your share of market, you have to be able to provide the best product at the best price and you will do it in the best way. There are no restrictions in the 50 States to do that. That has been true since the United States of America was originated.

The northeast dairy cartel is in contradiction to that. There is nothing about the cartel that is American in terms of how we do business. There is something else about that. They say, and I have heard this from some of the leaders in the northeast: Can't we just have our cartel? After all, it represents only a fraction of the milk market in the country. Why can't we just have our cartel? But, obviously, if they can have their cartel, then everybody can have a cartel. What stops us from having a Southeast cartel or a Southwest cartel, or a Midwest, or a Plains States wheat cartel? If a cartel makes sense in any form, then it makes sense not only in the New England States and not only for milk; it makes sense anywhere, conceivably, and for any product.

Now I ask the question: Does the Senate want to go on record as favoring this type of legislation? I think all of us know the answer is not yes. Nobody has defended this to me, even though it is coming tonight. Nobody has defended it to me. I talked with the leaders in the Senate. I asked them to explain why we should have this kind of legislation in the omnibus bill. I tell you, not a leader, not a single Senator, has explained to me and defended in any way that makes sense the idea of price-fixing cartels. Yet here it comes.

I am told it is coming because promises have been made and arrangements have already occurred, and so on and so forth. On something as important as this, which is price-fixing cartels, it seems to me that saying "promises have been made," and "it has been passed in the House," or "it is too late," or whatever, does not make any sense. May I also say I have been in dialog with the leaders in the Senate for months on this, so this is not a surprise. We are with this piece of legislation.

Then we also have this milk pricing policy which, as you all know, arbitrates that the farther you are from Wisconsin in this country, the more you get for your milk if you are a dairy farmer. We all know, again, this was set up 50 or 60 years ago when there was no refrigeration to transport milk and they wanted to encourage the development of the dairy industry. So we point with pride to points distant from Wisconsin to develop the dairy industry and to circumvent the need for refrigerated transportation. That is no longer true.
So what we are trying to do is not to eliminate that price differential because that would be too big a step to take at once. We are trying to reduce the price differential—not eliminate it, reduce it. USDA has come up with a program and 97 percent of the farmers in the Northeast have voted for the change in the present milk pricing program. I am not suggesting we need to eliminate the price differential at this time. But let's accept the reduction of the price differential in view of the fact that the present system is archaic and makes no sense.

Again, coming over from the House is legislation that continues to mandate that the old Depression-era pricing system be continued. May I also say the present system, both with respect to the Northeast Dairy Compact and the pricing system, was mandated to conclude on October 1, and we would put in a new system. But before October 1, there was a Federal judge in Vermont who struck down that kind of outcome. So right now it is tied up in the courts and nothing is going to happen. The present system will stay until at least the courts rule on the validity of a new system.

So I suggested, and many have suggested, there be no dairy language in the omnibus; just don't say anything and let's let this thing roll because it is tied up in the courts now anyhow, and we can discuss it next year.

No, it has not been made. People have been won over in one way or another. Other agendas are on the table. So today it comes in an omnibus bill, with the Northeast Dairy Compact re-added. Price fixing cartels, does any Senator want to vote for that? Price fixing cartels, not just for the Northeast, because if you accept it in the Northeast you accept it elsewhere; not just on milk, because a cartel is not uniquely suited to milk. It can be on any commodity anywhere.

Does the Senate want to go on record as supporting price fixing cartels in this country? Do we want to tear up the American economy in that way? That comes in the omnibus tonight. We are going to vote on that. We are also going to vote on going back to the old milk marketing price system which, again, is totally outdated. The USDA has come up with a new system, I am very upset, obviously, and I had hoped to work it out, but I am not going to take it lightly. I am not going to make that decision over this issue.

But I do want to point out to my colleagues that some strong-arm tactics are at work here. Allowing price fixing cartels is a bad thing for this country. I very much hope we can and will find a way to undo the damage of price fixing cartels in an outdated milk marketing system in the very near future. Having said that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, there are a number of issues we are working on, but we have one unanimous consent request with regard to the loan guarantee for the satellite local situation we have worked out.

I ask unanimous consent that no later than March 30, 2000, if no Senate committee has reported a bill limited to providing loan guarantees to establish local television service to rural areas by satellite and other means, the Republican leader, or his designee, or the Democratic leader, or his designee, be recognized to introduce a bill limited to sections 301, 302, 303, 2004, and 2006 of the conference report accompanying H.R. 1554 providing such loan guarantees, and that the Senate immediately begin consideration of the bill with relevant first-degree amendments in order and second-degree amendments that are relevant to the first-degree amendment proposed to be amended. Further, that if legislation is reported that is limited to such loan guarantees, it be considered by March 30 and be open to relevant amendments as provided above. Further, that upon disposition of all amendments, the bill be read a third time and passed, with no intervening action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DASCHLE. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I compliment the majority leader. This is the result of ongoing discussions we have had for some time. I appreciate very much the involvement and the work done by the distinguished Senator from Montana. This accomplishes much of what we hoped we could do. It is not everything. I am very hopeful we can get this done before April 1, but the majority leader has made a strong commitment to me personally, and I am sure he is prepared to do it on the record, that he will work with us to accomplish the objectives laid out in this unanimous consent agreement.

I appreciate, as well, the cooperation of the distinguished Banking Committee chairman, and I believe as a result of the effort we have been able to demonstrate in getting to this point, we will achieve our goal. We cannot leave rural America out. We will have an opportunity to provide service to them. This will give us the vehicle to make that happen. So I do not object.

Mr. BAUCUS. Reserving the right to object.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, before the Senate reserves the right to object, I want to add my own personal comments rather than just the dry UC that I gave. I, too, commend and thank the other Senator from Montana, Mr. Burns, for his efforts in this area and for his tenacity. In fact, this very day, he ruined my lunch talking to me about this issue. I know Senator Baucus believes very strongly in it.

It is not just a Montana issue. This is important in South Dakota and this is important in Mississippi. This is important nationwide. If we are going to incorporate satellite local service in these smaller markets, we have to have this opportunity, but we want to make sure it is a loan guarantee that will work, that is actually going to do the job, that is not in some way going to improperly benefit any one individual or group of individuals, for that matter, and that it has been carefully thought through.

Again, I am absolutely determined to get this done. I will not only live up to the UC, which I have to, but I will do it with a great deal of vigor and activity.

I thank the Senator from Texas for his willingness to focus on this and get it done by a date certain and make sure he and other committees have added to it to make sure we do it right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, earlier objection to bringing up the continuing resolution because I felt it made much more sense to include the loan guarantee along with the other provisions in the omnibus bill that will be taken up later providing for local-to-local satellite network service.

I thank the Senator from Mississippi, as well as my colleague from Montana. I have been working with my colleague today to figure out some way to lock in even more having loan guarantees passed by this body and the other body.

The other body has made a similar commitment in a colloquy about 2
hours ago to make sure this is passed so rural viewers of America have the opportunity to have local satellite service.

I compliment my friend from Montana for working so hard on this. He has worked very hard, as well as others, and I am not going to hold up the continuing resolution to shut down the Government. In the whole scheme of things, we have our own priorities and know what the priorities should be. But it is important to get this provision in here because it does make it even more certain we are going to get this loan guarantee provision passed in the next year.

I thank the majority leader. He has been very gracious in working this out, as well as the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, who I know wants to work this out as well, and my good friend from Montana. I also thank the Banking Committee chairman. He has been very helpful.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a unanimous consent request before the Senate. Is there objection?

Mr. BURNS. Reserving the right to object, and I will not object, this is a compromise to facilitate the passage of this omnibus bill. We have worked a long time on this. We are working up to a deadline where we could see some blue screens after December 31. But one cannot ignore the fact that even our satellite viewers should be able to receive local broadcasts or network stations in their local areas. The only way we will ever provide any competition for the cables under the rules they live by, under must carry, and still have a viable satellite service that will compete with cables is through this method.

I appreciate the commitment of the Senator from Texas, the chairman of the Banking Committee. I thank my friend from Montana. He has worked very hard, as well as others. I am entitled to that recognition. I ask I be recognized immediately after the distinguished Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia has proposed a unanimous consent request. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues. This has obviously been a very difficult issue. We passed the satellite bill in the Senate unanimously. I think every Member of the Senate realizes the ability to receive television signals in America is critically important. On Saturday, you want to watch Texas A&M. On Sunday, you want to watch the Dallas Cowboys. And one's life is diminished if you cannot do either one of those things.

The problem we had was we passed a bill in the Senate to set up the legal structure to get that job done. They passed a bill in the House to do the same. Neither bill had any loan guarantee language in it. The conference realized there was a problem, but in their haste to get it done, it is my opinion perhaps we ended up with language that was as good as anybody could have written during that short period of time.

Under the agreement we have reached, we have an opportunity to save the representatives of the television stations, the satellite companies, and potential Internet suppliers come in. We have the ability to look at the technology.

We have the ability to look at loan guarantees we have given in the past. We have the ability to get the input of the Treasury. Hopefully, we will have the ability to put together a bill that will maximize the chances that every American will have access to their local television station.

I want my colleagues to know, as I have said many times as this debate has evolved, I intend, by the 30th of March, to report a bill from the Banking Committee. It is my goal not only to write a bill that will deal with this problem, but I hope we can develop a prototype for the future, where we recognize that there are some social goals that are not necessarily met by market forces, and that the market by itself might not provide this service which we have deemed to be important.

The question then is: What can you do to provide this service at the lowest possible cost and in the most efficient manner? It is my goal to put together a bill that will achieve that goal and perhaps be a prototype for similar problems in the future.

So I thank my colleagues. Probably as much effort has gone into this one little issue as anything throughout this whole process. It is an important issue. It involves an important principle. I think we have reached a good conclusion. I am happy about it. I believe, when we complete it, that every Member of the Senate and every Member of Congress and, hopefully, everybody who has a satellite dish or wants one will be happy about it as well.

I thank my colleagues.

Mr. BYRD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

Mr. BYRD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. I yield to the majority leader first.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is yielding to the majority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, would the majority leader yield?

Mr. COVERDELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. COVERDELL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. WELSTONE, Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Burns). Objection is heard. The clerk will continue to call the roll.

The bill clerk continued with the call of the roll.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. FEINGOLD. I object.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill from Minnesota can——

Mr. WELSTONE. Mr. President, I object until I can read this.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The clerk will continue the call of the roll.

The bill clerk continued with the call of the roll.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The bill clerk continued with the call of the roll.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.


Mr. LOTT. I thank my colleagues for not objecting.

Mr. President, I have a unanimous consent request that has been very
carefully worked out, and after it is agreed to, we have three colloquies that Senator Daschle, Senator Stevens, Senator Byrd, and I would like to enter into.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now turn to H. Res. 82, the continuing resolution, and following the reporting by the clerk, there be two first-degree amendments in order, and no second-degree amendments or motions to commit or recommit be in order. Those amendments are the following:

The Byrd-McConnell amendment regarding mining.

The Helms-Edwards amendment regarding disaster funds.

I further ask consent that following the disposition of the amendments, the joint resolution be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

I further ask consent that when the Senate receives H. J. Res. 83, the joint resolution be deemed agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, all without any intervening action or debate.

I finally ask consent that when the Senate receives the conference report to accompany H. R. 3194, the reading of the conference report commence immediately following the motion to proceed made by the majority leader, to be followed by a vote on the motion to proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

Mr. WELSTONE. Reserving the right to object, could I ask the majority leader, following the motion to proceed made by the majority leader, it says “to be followed by a vote on a motion to proceed.” Is this going to be read?

Mr. LOTT. This is after the reading has been done.

Mr. WELSTONE. That is our understanding.

Mr. LOTT. That is correct.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Reserving the right to object, could I ask the majority leader a question, if I could. We had an understanding prior to removing the quorum call that there is no time limitation.

Mr. LOTT. Correct, there is no time limitation in this agreement.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I thank the majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Hearing no objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, we do have a collegial group here. I do not know how much debate time will be required since there was no time limitation. It is safe to say there will be a period of time for debate, so if Members want to take this time to get something on the record, I ask the majority leader a question, if I could. I had an understanding prior to removing the quorum call that there is no time limitation.

Mr. LOTT. Correct, there is no time limitation in this agreement.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I thank the majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Hearing no objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I want to emphasize that the Senate can do, and then our action has to go to the House. The House must act. With regard to these continuing resolutions, they have a number of options. I personally am going to vote for the Byrd amendment. I think the Senate is entitled to make his case. I hope the Members that if they don’t, it will be back in another venue in another way.

The same thing with regard to the Helms-Edwards disaster funds. An oversight occurred, as I understand it, last night in the final hours last night with regard to disaster funds for North Carolina. There were about three tranches of money that had been requested for disaster assistance. Two of those were included, which come to a total of around $800 million. However, $80 million, an important tranche, was not included. Hopefully, the House will accept this and hopefully the House will see fit to accept them both. I will talk to the Speaker and encourage him to do that.

I want to also emphasize, as has been the case in the past when my State has been involved, when South Dakota or North Dakota has been involved, when any place is involved in a disaster, they should get the assistance they need from a caring American people. That is the way we have been doing it for all the years I have been in the Congress. That is the way it is now and the way it should be.

If for whatever reason in this waning hour of the session this money is not made available, I am committed publicly, along with Senator Daschle and the chairman of the committee, that this money will be provided. It will be provided in the first available vehicle after the first of the year, and I presume that will be in a supplemental because there will be a supplemental available, and with the commitment of the chairman and the commitment of the leaders and also the commitment of the Appropriation Committee funds will be available. I want to make that part of the RECORD at this point.

I yield the floor for others to respond.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, let me say I agree wholeheartedly with the comments made by the majority leader. I don’t know if there is a State right now that is hurting as badly as North Carolina. Senator Edwards has made that point over and over again in the hearing, and I know that Senator Helms has worked with Senator Edwards to try to provide the most comprehensive response to the situation as we can.

We have come a long way and made a great deal of progress in the legislation pending, the omnibus bill. As things happen when we work late into the night with a lot of different people working, there is always the possibility something will fall through the cracks. As I truly believe that is what happened, I believe it was an honest mistake. As the majority leader has indicated, whether it is fixed tonight, whether it is fixed before the end of the session, or whether it is fixed immediately when we come back, I don’t know how one can get a stronger commitment than the one given by the majority leader or the one I am prepared to give and the one I intend, now the chairman will be prepared to give to accommodate North Carolina.

I appreciate their willingness to work to do this. This should resolve this matter successfully once and for all, either tonight or at some point in the not too distant future.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, as chairman of the Appropriations Committee, I regret this error. It was an error. We have put together several bills in one bill and it has been a rather difficult week in many ways. This error occurred because some of the Members of the House who are involved and should have been involved were not notified of the final decision that was made with regard to a request that came from the Senators of North Carolina.

Senator Helms called me several times on the matter. I talked on the floor and on the phone with Senator Edwards before the final arrangement was reached. Frankly, they sought more money than is even in the amendment that was left out of the bill. However, we said we would have to take up the further money in the supplemental that comes before the Congress in the early part of the next year.

Last evening when this bill was being read out, I did receive a call concerning the fact that some of the Members of the House were disturbed by the changes that were proposed. It was determined then that that had not been properly conveyed to the Members, although some of the staff, I believe, were notified and were part of it. It is just one of those things that a staff person must take place, and I personally did not go over and tell the House Members—I probably should have—but it was one of the final items on the discussions we had, including those that involved the White House representatives who were before our committee yesterday.

As a consequence, I want to assure the Senators from North Carolina, do believe that once we have reached a decision such as that, and we felt it had been checked out. However, it is our responsibility now to make certain this commitment is made good, and we will do that. This bill will do it if the House will accept it and send it to the President. If that does not happen, we will, at the very earliest, bring it up in the first supplemental that comes before the Congress next year. We will have the supplemental bill for Kosovo coming. That was another request we received which was not fulfilled in this continuing budget bills that are before the Senate now.

I want to assure Senator Edwards and Senator Helms on this side—and
both have been very diligent in seeking these moneys—that we will put this money in the next bill if this is not accepted by the House. I have every reason to believe it will be accepted by the House. I intend to get on the phone and talk to my colleagues and make sure they understand. If there was an error, it was one that was caused by the intensity of the work that was going on by the staffs of five different subcommittees trying to put a bill together, along with all the other bills that were being considered, many of which were rejected and not in this bill that we all considered over this last week.

I do hope the Senators from North Carolina and from North Carolina, Mr. EDWARDS, who is the majority leader, will do everything in their power to achieve the assurance that we have given. We can assure them this is an $81 million item and it is, in my judgment, small compared to the amount of money that will be in the next supplemental for the people who were affected by Hurricane Floyd and which will make up for this problem. We will make up the money, and we certainly will see to it that there is some reparation.

I plead with the Members of the House to pass the bill tonight. In any event, we will take care of that error as quickly as we can.

Second, with regard to my good friend from West Virginia and his amendment and that of Senator McCONNELL and the Western Senators, I think there is a clear, growing understanding of the provisions of this amendment. I have been saying, as Senator Byrd has been saying for some time, this does not change existing law. It will be incumbent to try to preserve the status quo until Congress has a chance to review the changes that would take place if decisions of the Solicitor's Office and decisions of one Federal judge were followed, which would be a disaster for the whole Nation. I hope the House will certainly see fit to send that measure to the President, so we can see what the White House is going to do with that.

But for now, I hope the Senators involved will let us get on with the major bill, which is going to take some time. I again express my regret to the Senators involved that this incident has taken place, and we will do our best to see that this does not happen. But the distinguished minority leader reminded me, on an amendment that we had on a bill earlier this year, a similar thing happened when there were just too many things going into one bill. Our provision was left out, but it got back in the next bill, I assure you.

Mr. President, I do hope the Senators involved will give us the courtesy now of permitting the Appropriations Committee to do its work. Last, the omnibus appropriations bill that will fulfill our commitment to pass 13 appropriations bills this year.

Mr. LOTT, Mr. President, I know the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. Frist), the Senator from Washington (Mr. Gorton), the Senator from Texas (Mrs. Hutchison), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. McCain), and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. Smith) are necessarily absent. Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. Boxer), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. Lautenberg), the Senator from New York (Mr. Schumer), and the Senator from New York (Mr. Schumer) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 80, nays 8, as follows:

YEAS—80

Abraham
Abraham
Akaka
Akaka
Allard
Allard
Baucus
Baucus
Bayh
Bayh
Bennett
Bennett
Burns
Burns
Campbell
Campbell
Chafee, L.
Chafee, L.
Cleland
Cleland
Collins
Collins
Coverdell
Coverdell

Mr. EDWARDS. I thank the majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. President, the human suffering and devastation we incurred in North Carolina is absolutely unparalleled. Our people have never suffered and struggled the way they are suffering right now. This storm has completely devastated us. Our farmers are in the worst shape they have ever been in.

I appreciate very much the majority leader's commitment. Senator STEVENS' commitment, and the minority leader's commitment. We have talked throughout this process on a daily basis. We had an agreement, a commitment to two things, basically. One was a loan forgiveness program, which has been talked about, and, second, some language that would help the payment for structural damage on farms in North Carolina.

I appreciate very much the commitment we have received today. I do have to say I am counting on my colleagues' commitments—the majority leader's commitment, Senator STEVENS' commitment, Senator Daschle's commitment—do everything in their power to get this thing passed in this Congress; that it will be included in the CR we are discussing right now and that, when it goes to the House side, the majority leader will speak to the Speaker. We will do everything in our power, Senator Helms and myself, to make that happen. But it is critical to Senator Helms and me that we not need to rely on the commitment to do something after the first of the year, that we get this done tonight or tomorrow.

With that, I thank the majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. LOTT. I will say on behalf of Senator Helms, he has been following this very closely. I have spoken to him, and Senator Edwards has been in constant conversation with him, as has Senator Stevens. He understands what we are doing here, and we have made a commitment to him, which we certainly are going to honor, and to Senator Edwards, that we will pursue this aggressively with the other Chamber. This money is going to be available, hopefully in this CR; if not, the first available vehicle next year.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the conference report to accompany the DC appropriations bill, H.R. 3194, and the conference report be considered as having been made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. FEINGOLD. I ask for the reading.

Mr. FEINGOLD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the conference report.

The legislative clerk read the conference report.

(The conference report is printed in the House proceedings of the RECORD of November 17, 1999.)

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Enz). Is there a sufficient second? There appears to be a sufficient second. The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I believe the regular order is for the vote to begin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Missouri (Mr. Ashcroft), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. Bond), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. Bunning), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. Frist), the Senator from Washington (Mr. Gorton), the Senator from Texas (Mrs. Hutchison), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. McCain), and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. Smith) are necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. Boxer), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. Lautenberg), the Senator from New York (Mr. Schumer), and the Senator from New York (Mr. Schumer) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 80, nays 8, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 369 Leg.]
The motion was agreed to. The PRESIDING OFFICER, the Chair recognizes the majority leader.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk to the pending conference report. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion. The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the conference report to accompany the District of Columbia appropriations bill:

TRENT LOTT, TED STEVENS, LARRY E. CRAIG, JUDD GREGG, TIM HUTCHINSON, DON MURkowski, CONNIE MACK, SLade GORTon, BEN NIghtHorsE CAMPBELL, ARLEN SPECTER, PAT ROBERTS, CHUCK HAGEL, RICHARD SHELBY, THOMAS Daschle, and ALBERT MOYNIHAN. The PRESIDING OFFICER, the majority leader.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent this cloture vote occur at 3 p.m. on Friday, November 19, and the mandatory quorum call be waived.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I object. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. LOTT. Unfortunately, our colleagues from Wisconsin has chosen to object to what I think is a reasonable request, which would give us an opportunity to have a full debate and then get to a final vote on this issue. It would be a few hours to do that. However, that is my request. Therefore, Senators should expect this cloture vote to occur at 10 a.m. Saturday, November 20; 1:01 a.m., Saturday, November 20. I just want to make sure everybody understands that is my request.

At that time, when we invoke cloture, then we can, in a relatively short period of time, go to a final vote.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 235—ADJOURNMENT OF THE TWO HOUSES OF CONGRESS

Mr. LOTT. I now ask the Senate turn to the adjournment resolution, H. Con. Res. 235, the resolution be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, all without intervening action or debate. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 235), was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on any legislative day from Thursday, November 18, 1999, through Monday, November 22, 1999, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it shall stand adjourned until noon on Tuesday, December 2, 1999 (unless it sooner has received a message from the Senate transmitting its concurrence in the same), and the report accompanying H.R. 3194, in which the House shall stand adjourned sine die, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it shall stand adjourned sine die, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 3 of this concurrent resolution.

SEC. 2. When the House convenes for the second session of the One Hundred Sixth Congress, it shall conduct no organizational or legislative business on that day and, when the House adjourns on that day, it shall stand adjourned sine die, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 3 of this concurrent resolution.

SEC. 3. The Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House and the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the House and Senate, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant.

SEC. 4. The Congress declares that clause 2(h) of rule II of the Rules of the House of Representatives and the order of the Senate, of January 6, 1999, authorize for the duration of the One Hundred Sixth Congress the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate, respectively, to receive messages from the President during periods when the House and Senate are not in session, and that the presentation of any adjournment sine die of the final regular session of the One Hundred Sixth Congress the constitutional prerogative of the House and Senate shall be carried in light of the objections of the President, since the availability of the Clerk and the Secretary during any earlier adjournment of either House during the current Congress or prevent the return by the President of any bill presented to him for approval.

Sec. 5. The Clerk of the House of Representatives shall inform the President of the United States of the adoption of this concurrent resolution. Passed the House of Representatives November 18, 1999.

FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, 2000

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent the Senate resume the consideration of H.J. Res. 82 and there be 5 minutes of debate on each of the two amendments in order to the resolution. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LOTT. Therefore, at least one further vote will occur yet tonight. In addition, the Senate will convene tomorrow at 10 a.m., and hopefully proceed with some legislative items that have been cleared and that would be considered by the House.

The Senate could also consider the Work Incentives conference report. Therefore votes can be expected to occur during the session of the Senate on Friday. We will stay in close touch with both sides of the aisle to see when the best time might be for that. We will try to accommodate as many Senators as possible and stack them if we need to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the joint resolution. The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 2780

Mr. BYRD addressed the Chair: The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will please come to order.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The amendment from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], for himself, Mr. McCONNELL, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. REID, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. CRapo, Mr. ENZI, Mr. BURNS, Mr. KYL, Mr. BREAUx, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. GRAMm, and Mr. GRAMS, proposes an amendment numbered 2780.

Mr. LOTT: Without objection, I ask unanimous consent the reading of the amendment be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows: At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 2. DISPOSAL OF EXCESS SPOIL AND COAL MINE WASTE.

(a) IN GENERAL. Notwithstanding any other provision of law (including any regulation or court ruling), hereafter in rendering permit decisions for discharges of excess spoil and coal mine waste into waters of the United States from surface coal mining and reclamation operations, the permitting authority shall apply section 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344) and the section 404(b)(1) guidelines pursuant to section 404(b)(1) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344(b)(1)) and implementing regulations set forth in part 230 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on October 19, 1999).

(2) the permitted disposal of such spoil or waste meeting the requirements of the section 404(b)(1) guidelines referred to in paragraph (1) shall be deemed in compliance with the criteria for granting a variance under regulations set forth in sections 816.57 and 817.57 of Federal Regulations (as in effect on October 19, 1999).
1999). The permitting procedures set forth in paragraphs (1) and (2) all applicable Federal and State water quality standards shall apply to all portions of waters filled or displaced by the mining or by those filled pursuant to the permitting procedures set forth in paragraphs (1) and (2).

(b) DURATION OF EFFECTIVENESS.—The permitting procedures specified in subsection (a) shall remain in effect until the later of—

(1) the date that is 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act; or

(2) the date on which the States are consistent with—

(A) the Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) or the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (30 U.S.C. 1261 et seq.); or

(B) any operation or property for which a plan of operations has been approved before the date of enactment of this Act; or

(c) EFFECT OF SECTION.—Nothing in this section modifies, supercedes, undermines, displaces, or amends any requirement of, or regulation issued under, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (commonly known as the "Clean Water Act") (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) or the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (30 U.S.C. 1210 et seq.), as applied by the responsible Federal agencies on October 19, 1999.

(d) PERIOD OF EFFECTIVENESS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law repealing or terminating the effectiveness of this Act, section shall remain in effect until the date of termination of the effectiveness of the permitting procedures in accordance with subsection (b). SEC. 3. HARDROCK MINING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For the purposes of section 1003(a) of division B of the Act enacting H.R. 3194 of the 106th Congress, in lieu of section 337 of title III of H.R. 3423 of the 106th Congress, as introduced on November 17, 1999, regarding the issuance of regulations on hardrock mining, the following shall apply:

(1) MILLSITES OPINION.—No funds shall be expended by the Secretary of the Interior or the Surface Mining Control Act for fiscal years 2000 and 2001, to limit the number or acreage of millsites based on the ratio between the number or acreage of millsites and the number of coal mining permitted under the previous agreement, there is 5 minutes equally divided for debate at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The previous agreement, there is 5 minutes equally divided for debate at this time.

Mr. WELLS. Mr. President, can we have order in the Chamber, please? The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. I ask unanimous consent that the time be extended on October 19, 1999.

Mr. BYRD. I yield myself another minute and a half.

Mr. BYRD. I ask unanimous consent that the time be extended on October 19, 1999.

Mr. BYRD. I yield myself another minute and a half.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time was 5 minutes equally divided, which is 2½ minutes.

Mr. BYRD. I ask unanimous consent that I may speak another minute and a half.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD. I thank the Chair.

The amendment is proposed by Mr. BYRD, for himself, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. REID, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. CAPITO, Mr. ENZI, Mr. BURNS, and Mr. KYL—I thank all those Senators who supported this amendment and others who will vote for it. Particularly I want to recognize the efforts of my chief of staff, the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky, whose early and strong support was given to this amendment, for which I am extremely grateful. I thank both leaders for making this vote possible. I could speak longer, but I have said enough already. I urge all Senators to vote for this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the bill is offered by Mr. BYRD, for himself, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. REID, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. CAPITO, Mr. ENZI, Mr. BURNS, and Mr. KYL. The amendment has been adopted by the Senate by the following vote: AYE 90; NO 0; NEITHER 0.
Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I know many others in this body in expressing my support for miners and for mining communities. In Virginia’s Southwest region, mining creates the jobs that provide enough income to lift the next generation, that is, the sons and daughters of miners through college, and that gives the region options other than coal.

Virginia miners have expressed deep concerns that the broad application of Judge Haden’s ruling would result in the devastation of the mining industry in the Southern Appalachian coal fields. The judge’s decision is not limited to the mountain top mining that was the subject of the original suit. It is going to apply to the valley cuts and valley fills from other forms of mining, including underground mining. The practical effect of this ruling is a virtual moratorium on mining in mountainous regions. We need to protect the environment and we also need to protect the livelihood of those families. I had hoped we could reach a compromise on this issue that would effectively allow us to do both.

I have reviewed the Memorandum of Understanding between the federal and state agencies that could be used to mitigate the consequences of valley fills if they were allowed to continue. It was signed by the EPA, Department of the Interior, Army Corps of Engineers, and the State of West Virginia. All the signatories are sworn to protect the nation’s water. I am convinced that if the MOU stood, the agencies involved would work diligently to mitigate any negative consequences from mining in the West Virginia coal fields. Nevertheless, it is imperative that we continue to be vigilant on the effects of mining on the environment, and work to minimize its effects.

I have also reviewed Judge Haden’s ruling and see in that ruling the underlying conflict between what the regulations intend to do, and the actual costs of applying those regulations. It demonstrates once again how essential acting on regulatory reform is going to be in this Congress. It is imperative that we place a real value on analyzing the true cost of the regulations, before they are put into place. I am certain the agencies involved want to do the right thing, by both miners and the environment. The rules as I read them make that virtually impossible. I am hopeful that this conflict can be resolved as quickly as possible. In the meantime, I intend to support the miners of Southwest Virginia.

I must however, voice my strong opposition to the additional language and rock mining that has been added at the last minute to this amendment. My vote on this amendment stems only from my concern for the immediate effect Judge Haden’s ruling and see in that ruling the underlying conflict between what the regulations intend to do, and the actual costs of applying those regulations. It demonstrates once again how essential acting on regulatory reform is going to be in this Congress. It is imperative that we place a real value on analyzing the true cost of the regulations, before they are put into place. I am certain the agencies involved want to do the right thing, by both miners and the environment. The rules as I read them make that virtually impossible. I am hopeful that this conflict can be resolved as quickly as possible. In the meantime, I intend to support the miners of Southwest Virginia.

I must however, voice my strong opposition to the additional language and rock mining that has been added at the last minute to this amendment. My vote on this amendment stems only from my concern for the immediate effect Judge Haden’s ruling and see in that ruling the underlying conflict between what the regulations intend to do, and the actual costs of applying those regulations. It demonstrates once again how essential acting on regulatory reform is going to be in this Congress. It is imperative that we place a real value on analyzing the true cost of the regulations, before they are put into place. I am certain the agencies involved want to do the right thing, by both miners and the environment. The rules as I read them make that virtually impossible. I am hopeful that this conflict can be resolved as quickly as possible. In the meantime, I intend to support the miners of Southwest Virginia.
Haden’s ruling would have on the economy of Southwest Virginia. I have opposed and will continue to oppose efforts to delay the review and revision of the nation’s hard rock mining standards. My vote in no way supports the inclusion of hard rock provisions in this package.

I ask unanimous consent that this statement be placed in the RECORD before the vote on Amendment No. 2780.

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to support the Byrd amendment.

We are scrambling around right here in the U.S. Senate to pass a stopgap spending bill to keep from shutting down a major portion of the Federal Government.

So, it is very fitting that we add an amendment to that stopgap spending bill that would help us keep a Federal judge from shutting down the coal mining industry in West Virginia and possibly other States like Kentucky as well.

This is a matter of survival for many of our coal mines. It is essential that we act now to prevent unnecessary damage to the industry—to prevent unnecessary unemployment—and to prevent unnecessary economic devastation in areas which have already been bypassed by the economic boom times that have blessed much of the Nation.

A Federal district court judge in West Virginia ordered on October 21 that a well-balanced working agreement between the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, the U.S. Department of the Interior, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and the West Virginia Division of Environmental Protection violated the Clean Water Act.

That arbitrary ruling which basically overrules three Federal agencies’ interpretation of the law is going to jeopardize the coal industry immediately in West Virginia and potentially in other States like my own State of Kentucky as well.

We need to pass the Byrd Amendment to stay this ruling until we have had time to get the results of a pending environmental impact statement.

It is a matter of simple fairness. The jobs and lives of many of our constituents are at stake.

I urge my colleagues to support the Byrd amendment.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I voted in support of the Byrd Amendment to provide for a 2-year moratorium during which mountain top mining activities may continue under a memorandum of agreement with the Environmental Protection Agency, the Department of Interior and the Army Corps of Engineers. The EPA which is in charge of implementation of the Clean Water Act was a party to the agreement which would continue to force during the 2-year moratorium.

An environmental impact study will go forward during the moratorium and regulations pertaining to the environmental impact statement can be promulgated. My vote on this amendment does not commit me to support the continuation of any such moratorium beyond this 2-year period during which the courts and the regulatory agencies will more fully evaluate the impacts on both the environment and the affected coal miners and their communities. The fact that the court has stayed the effect of its own opinion is further evidence that this legislative moratorium is both warranted and will do no damage to the underlying act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, has all time expired?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to offer an amendment at this time on behalf of Senators HELMS and EDWARDS of North Carolina with regard to funds for their disaster. And I ask unanimous consent that that vote occur in a manner that is stacked, after the vote on the amendment by Senator BYRD and Senator MCCONNELL, and that the first vote be just 10 minutes, and then the second vote would be 10 minutes also.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2781

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I send to the desk then the amendment on behalf of Senators HELMS and EDWARDS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read as follows:

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place insert:

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION PRODUCER-OWNED MARKETING ASSOCIATIONS FORGIVENESS

SEC. 1. The Secretary of Agriculture shall reduce the amount of any principal due on a loan made to marketing association incorporated in the State of North Carolina for the 1999 crop of an agricultural commodity in a county, with respect to which an adjustment is made, as amended.

If the Secretary assigns a grade quality for the 1999 crop of an agricultural commodity marketed by an association as described in subsection (a) that is below the base quality of the agricultural commodity, the Secretary shall compensate the association for losses incurred by the association as a result of the reduction in grade quality to a level not to exceed $50,000,000 in emergency supplemental funding.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place insert:

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION PRODUCER-OWNED MARKETING ASSOCIATIONS FORGIVENESS

SEC. 1. The Secretary of Agriculture shall reduce the amount of any principal due on a loan made to marketing association incorporated in the State of North Carolina for the 1999 crop of an agricultural commodity by at least 75 percent if the marketing association suffered losses of the agricultural commodity in a county, with respect to which a natural disaster was declared by the Secretary for losses due to Hurricane Dennis, Floyd, or Irene; or (2) a natural disaster or emergency was declared by the President for losses due to Hurricane Dennis, Floyd, or Irene under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.).

If the Secretary assigns a grade quality for the 1999 crop of an agricultural commodity marketed by an association as described in subsection (a) that is below the base quality of the agricultural commodity, the Secretary shall compensate the association for losses incurred by the association as a result of the reduction in grade quality to a level not to exceed $50,000,000 in emergency supplemental funding.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place insert:

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION PRODUCER-OWNED MARKETING ASSOCIATIONS FORGIVENESS

SEC. 1. The Secretary of Agriculture shall reduce the amount of any principal due on a loan made to marketing association incorporated in the State of North Carolina for the 1999 crop of an agricultural commodity by at least 75 percent if the marketing association suffered losses of the agricultural commodity in a county, with respect to which a natural disaster was declared by the Secretary for losses due to Hurricane Dennis, Floyd, or Irene; or (2) a natural disaster or emergency was declared by the President for losses due to Hurricane Dennis, Floyd, or Irene under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.).

If the Secretary assigns a grade quality for the 1999 crop of an agricultural commodity marketed by an association as described in subsection (a) that is below the base quality of the agricultural commodity, the Secretary shall compensate the association for losses incurred by the association as a result of the reduction in grade quality to a level not to exceed $50,000,000 in emergency supplemental funding.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place insert:

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION PRODUCER-OWNED MARKETING ASSOCIATIONS FORGIVENESS

SEC. 1. The Secretary of Agriculture shall reduce the amount of any principal due on a loan made to marketing association incorporated in the State of North Carolina for the 1999 crop of an agricultural commodity by at least 75 percent if the marketing association suffered losses of the agricultural commodity in a county, with respect to which a natural disaster was declared by the Secretary for losses due to Hurricane Dennis, Floyd, or Irene; or (2) a natural disaster or emergency was declared by the President for losses due to Hurricane Dennis, Floyd, or Irene under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.).

If the Secretary assigns a grade quality for the 1999 crop of an agricultural commodity marketed by an association as described in subsection (a) that is below the base quality of the agricultural commodity, the Secretary shall compensate the association for losses incurred by the association as a result of the reduction in grade quality to a level not to exceed $50,000,000 in emergency supplemental funding.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place insert:

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION PRODUCER-OWNED MARKETING ASSOCIATIONS FORGIVENESS

SEC. 1. The Secretary of Agriculture shall reduce the amount of any principal due on a loan made to marketing association incorporated in the State of North Carolina for the 1999 crop of an agricultural commodity by at least 75 percent if the marketing association suffered losses of the agricultural commodity in a county, with respect to which a natural disaster was declared by the Secretary for losses due to Hurricane Dennis, Floyd, or Irene; or (2) a natural disaster or emergency was declared by the President for losses due to Hurricane Dennis, Floyd, or Irene under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.).

If the Secretary assigns a grade quality for the 1999 crop of an agricultural commodity marketed by an association as described in subsection (a) that is below the base quality of the agricultural commodity, the Secretary shall compensate the association for losses incurred by the association as a result of the reduction in grade quality to a level not to exceed $50,000,000 in emergency supplemental funding.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place insert:

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION PRODUCER-OWNED MARKETING ASSOCIATIONS FORGIVENESS

SEC. 1. The Secretary of Agriculture shall reduce the amount of any principal due on a loan made to marketing association incorporated in the State of North Carolina for the 1999 crop of an agricultural commodity by at least 75 percent if the marketing association suffered losses of the agricultural commodity in a county, with respect to which—a natural disaster was declared by the Secretary for losses due to Hurricane Dennis, Floyd, or Irene; or (2) a major disaster or emergency was declared by the President for losses due to Hurricane Dennis, Floyd, or Irene under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5121 et seq.).

If the Secretary assigns a grade quality for the 1999 crop of an agricultural commodity marketed by an association as described in subsection (a) that is below the base quality of the agricultural commodity, the Secretary shall compensate the association for losses incurred by the association as a result of the reduction in grade quality to a level not to exceed $50,000,000 in emergency supplemental funding.
The amendment (No. 2780) was agreed to.
Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.
Mr. CRAIG. I move to lay that motion on the table.
The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 2781. The yeas and nays have been ordered
The clerk will call the roll.
The legislative clerk called the roll.
Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Missouri: (Mr. ASHCROFT), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BOND), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. TOTTEN), the Senator from Washington (Mr. GORTON), the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH) are necessarily absent.
I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING) would vote “yea.”
Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG), and an Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN) are necessarily absent.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?
The result was announced—yeas 88, nays 1, as follows:

The amendment (No. 2781) was agreed to.
Mr. MURKOWSKI. I move to reconsider the vote and I move to lay that motion on the table.
The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the joint resolution having been read the third time and passed, the motion to reconsider is laid upon the table.
The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 82), as amended, was passed.

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 77

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

To the Congress of the United States:
I am pleased to transmit this report on the Nation’s achievements in aeronautics and space during Fiscal Year (FY) 1998, as required under section 206 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2476). Aeronautics and space activities involved 14 contributing departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and the results of their ongoing research and development affect the Nation in many ways.

A wide variety of aeronautics and space developments took place during FY 1998. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) successfully completed five Space Shuttle flights. There were 29 successful expendable launch vehicle (ELV) launches in FY 1998. Of those, 3 were NASA-managed missions, 2 were NASA-funded/Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)-licensed missions, 8 were Department of Defense (DOD)-managed missions, and 16 were FAA-licensed commercial launches. Scientists also made some dramatic new discoveries in various space-related fields such as space science, Earth science, and remote sensing, and life and microgravity science. In aeronautics, activities included work on high-speed research, advance subsonic technology, and technologies designed to improve the safety and efficiency of our commercial airlines and air traffic control system.

Close international cooperation with Russia occurred on the Shuttle-Mir docking missions and on the ISS program. The United States also entered into new forms of cooperation with its partners in Europe, South America, and Asia.

Thus, FY 1998 was a very successful one for U.S. aeronautics and space programs. Efforts in these areas have contributed significantly to the Nation’s scientific and technical knowledge, international cooperation, a healthier environment, and a more competitive economy.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON,
THE WHITE HOUSE, November 18, 1999.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE
At 2:47 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following joint resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.J. Res. 82. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2000, and for other purposes.

At 3:40 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 1418. An act to provide for the holding of an election to determine the concurrence of the Senate upon the bill, H.R. 3194, making further continuing appropriations for the District of Columbia and other accounts for the fiscal year 1999, and for other purposes.

At 4:40 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, with an amendment, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 1418. An act to provide for the holding of a court at Natchez, Mississippi, in the same manner as court is held at Vicksburg, Mississippi, and for other purposes.

At 6:40 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment to the bill, H.R. 3194, making further continuing appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.
H. J. Res. 83. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2000, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests concurrence of the Senate:

H.Con. Res. 234. Concurrent resolution making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

Enrolled bills signed by the Speaker have been signed as follows:

S. 278. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands to the United States and is an infringement of the United States and is an infringement of the United States, to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

At 7:40 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

S. 278. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands to the county of Rio Arriba, New Mexico.

S. 382. An act to establish the Minuteman Missile National Historic Site in the State of South Dakota, and for other purposes.


S. 1398. An act to clarify certain boundaries on maps relating to the Coastal Barrier Resources System.

The enrolled bills were signed subsequently by the President pro tempore (Mr. Thurmond).

The message also announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments made by the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1180) to amend the Social Security Act with respect to the women's business credit for individuals with disabilities, to establish a Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1968 to allow railroad police officers to attend the Federal Bureau of Investigation National Academy for law enforcement training.

At 9:23 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following joint resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.J. Res. 393. Joint resolution appointing the seventh section of the first article of the seventh section of the first article of the Constitution of the United States and is an infringement of the United States, to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

The message further announced that the House agrees to the resolution (H. Res. 394) returning to the Senate the bill (S. 1232) entitled the "Soldiers', Sailors', Airmen's, and Marines' Bill of Rights Act of 1999," in the opinion of the House, contravenes the first clause of the seventh section of the first article of the Constitution of the United States, and that such bill be respectfully returned to the Senate with a message communicating this resolution.

The message further announced that the House agrees to the resolution (H. Res. 394) returning to the Senate the bill (S. 1232) entitled the "Soldiers', Sailors', Airmen's, and Marines' Bill of Rights Act of 1999," in the opinion of the House, contravenes the first clause of the seventh section of the first article of the Constitution of the United States, and that such bill be respectfully returned to the Senate with a message communicating this resolution.

Executive and other communications

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC-6227. A communication from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Papayas Grown in Hawaii: Increase in Assessments Rate" (FV-99-928-1 FR), received November 9, 1999; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6228. A communication from the Acting Administrator, Farm Service Agency, Farm Credit Administration, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Pro-

viding Notice to Delinquent Farm Loan Program Borrowers of the Potential for Cross-Servicing" (RIN0590-AF89), received November 16, 1999; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6229. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Regulatory Analysis and Development, Policy and Program Development, Animal and Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medical Fly: Removal of Quarantined Area" (Docket # 98-083-7), received November 16, 1999, to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6230. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Regulatory Analysis and Development, Policy and Program Development, Animal and Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "User Fees; Agricultural Quarantine and Inspection Service" (Docket # 98-073-2), received November 16, 1999, to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6231. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of a rule entitled "Paraquat; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions" (FRL #052-9), received November 16, 1999, to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6232. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, three reports relative to EPA regulatory programs, to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-6234. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Annuity Contracts" (Revenue Procedure 99-44), received November 16, 1999; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-6235. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the U.S. Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance Fund for the Timor crisis and the North Caucasus crisis; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-6236. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the long-term strategy to carry out the counternarcotics responsibilities of the Department of State, to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-6237. A communication from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Annuity Contracts" (Revenue Procedure 99-44), received November 16, 1999, to the Committee on Finance.

EC-6238. A communication from the Acting Trade Representative, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, a draft of proposed legislation entitled "Trade Preference Act"; to the Committee on Finance.
EC-6239. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Changes in Flood Elevations Determinations; 64 FR 60711; November 16, 1999"; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6240. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Changes in Flood Elevations Determinations; 64 FR 60711; November 16, 1999"; received November 16, 1999; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-6241. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Comprehensive Small Business Subcontracting Plans" (DFARS Case 99-D-306), received November 16, 1999; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-6251. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval of Municipal Waste Composter State Plan for Designated Facilities and Pollutants: Indiana" (FR #6760-15270; November 27, 1999) to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6252. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, two reports relative to EPA regulatory programs to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6253. A communication from the Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Determination of Endangered Status for the Plant Lesquerella thamnophila (Zapata bladderpod)" (RIN 1318-AE54), received November 17, 1999; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-6254. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the National Commission on Postal Rate Fixing, to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-6255. A communication from the Executive Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on direct spending or receipts legislation dated November 10, 1999; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-6256. A communication from the Executive Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to an addition to and a deletion from the list of General Services Reports for September 1999; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-6257. A communication from the Executive Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to its commercial activities inventory; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-6258. A communication from the Executive Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to its commercial activities inventory; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-6259. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of the Comptroller General, Office of Management and Budget, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Prevailing Rate Systems; Definition of Napa County, California, to a Non-Competitive Labor Market Area" (RIN 1230-A180), received November 16, 1999; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-6260. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of the Comptroller General, Office of Management and Budget, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to its commercial activities inventory; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-6261. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Allocation of Joint and Several Liability Proceedings" (SPATS Case No. 99-012), received November 17, 1999; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-6262. A communication from the Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Indiana Regulatory Program" (SPATS No. IN-94-F-FOR), received November 17, 1999; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-6266. A communication from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Landowner Notification, Expanded Categorical Exclusions, and Other Environmental Review Requirements", received November 17, 1999; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-6267. A communication from the Associate Administrator for Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revisions to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's Commercial activities inventory", received November 17, 1999; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-6268. A communication from the Chief, Office of Regulatory Management and Policy, Office of Thrift Supervision, Department of the Treasury, Federal Housing Finance Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Review of the S&P 500 Index" (RIN #6476-2-1), received November 27, 1999; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with amendments and an amendment to the title:

S. 156. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to add gamma hydroxybutyric acid and ketamine to the schedules of control substances, to provide for a national awareness campaign, and for other purposes.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time, passed, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. DASCHLE (for himself, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. REID, and Mr. JOHNSON): S. 159. A bill to allow patients access to drugs and medical devices recommended and provided by health care practitioners that are not approved by the Food and Drug Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.
By Ms. SNOWE:
S. 1956. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to enhance the assurance of efficiency, quality, and patient satisfaction in the health care to veterans by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mr. ROBB, and Ms. MIKULSKI):
S. 1957. A bill to provide for the payment of compensation to the families of the Federal employees who were killed in the crash of a United States Air Force CT-43A aircraft on April 3, 1996, near Dubrovnik, Croatia, carrying the secretary of Commerce Ronald H. Brown and 34 others; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KOH:
S. 1958. A bill to amend the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make grants for startup costs of school breakfast programs; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. HARKIN:
S. 1959. A bill to provide for the fiscal responsibility of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KOHL (for himself and Mr. FENGOLD):
S. 1960. A bill to provide for the appointment of 1 additional Federal district judge for the eastern district of Wisconsin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. J OHNSON (for himself, Mr. KERREY, and Mr. WELLSTONE):
S. 1961. A bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 to expand the number of acres authorized for inclusion in the conservation reserve; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. ASHCROFT:
S. 1962. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to protect Social Security and Medicare surpluses through strengthened budgetary enforcement mechanisms; to the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Governmental Affairs, jointly, pursuant to the order of August 4, 1977, with instructions that if one Committee reports, the other Committee have thirty days to report or be discharged.

By Mr. MCCALSKY, and Mr. THOMAS:
S. 1963. A bill to authorize a study of alternatives to the current management of certain Federal lands in Arizona; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mrs. BOXER):
S. 1964. A bill to designate the United States Post Office located at 14071 Peyton Drive in Chino Hills, California, as the Joseph Ileto Post Office; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. DOMENICI (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN):
S. 1965. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior, the Bureau of Reclamation, to conduct a feasibility study on the Jicarilla Apache Reservation in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. HAGEL (for himself and Mr. ROBERTS):
S. 1966. A bill to provide for the immediate review by the Immigration and Naturalization Service of new employees hired by employers subject to Operation Vanguard or similar programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COCHRAN (for himself and Mr. LOTT):
S. 1967. A bill to make technical corrections in the statutes that concern certain land held in trust for the Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians, to take certain land into trust for that Band, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. DORGAN:
S. 1968. A bill to amend the Federal securities laws to enhance oversight over certain derivatives dealers and hedge funds, reduce the potential for such entities to increase systemic risk in the financial markets, enhance investor protections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. CRAIG (for himself, Mr. MURR a):
S. 1969. A bill to provide for improved management of, and increases accountability for, outfitted activities by which the public gains access to and use of Federal land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. SPECTER:
S. 1970. A bill to amend chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the liability of the United States for claims of military personnel for damages for certain injuries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS
The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. BAUCUS (for himself and Mr. BURNS):
S. Res. 233. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the urgent need for the department of Agriculture to resolve certain Montana civil rights discrimination cases; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DURBAN, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. KERRY, Ms. MIKULSKI, and Mrs. BOXER):
S. Con. Res. 76. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding a peaceful resolution of the conflict in the state of Chiapas, Mexico and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS
By Mr. DASCHLE (for himself, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. REID, and Mr. J OHNSON):
S. 1975. A bill to allow patients access to and occupancy and use of Federal land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BAUCUS (for himself and Mr. BURNS):
S. 1976. A bill to provide for the fiscal responsibility of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KOHL (for himself and Mr. FENGOLD):
S. 1977. A bill to provide for the appointment of 1 additional Federal district judge for the eastern district of Wisconsin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. J OHNSON (for himself, Mr. KERREY, and Mr. WELLSTONE):
S. 1978. A bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 to expand the number of acres authorized for inclusion in the conservation reserve; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. ASHCROFT:
S. 1979. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to protect Social Security and Medicare surpluses through strengthened budgetary enforcement mechanisms; to the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Governmental Affairs, jointly, pursuant to the order of August 4, 1977, with instructions that if one Committee reports, the other Committee have thirty days to report or be discharged.

By Mr. MCCALSKY, and Mr. THOMAS:
S. 1980. A bill to authorize a study of alternatives to the current management of certain Federal lands in Arizona; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mrs. BOXER):
S. 1981. A bill to designate the United States Post Office located at 14071 Peyton Drive in Chino Hills, California, as the Joseph Ileto Post Office; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. DOMENICI (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN):
S. 1982. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior, the Bureau of Reclamation, to conduct a feasibility study on the Jicarilla Apache Reservation in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. HAGEL (for himself and Mr. ROBERTS):
S. 1983. A bill to provide for the immediate review by the Immigration and Naturalization Service of new employees hired by employers subject to Operation Vanguard or similar programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COCHRAN (for himself and Mr. LOTT):
S. 1984. A bill to make technical corrections in the statutes that concern certain land held in trust for the Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians, to take certain land into trust for that Band, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. DORGAN:
S. 1985. A bill to amend the Federal securities laws to enhance oversight over certain derivatives dealers and hedge funds, reduce the potential for such entities to increase systemic risk in the financial markets, enhance investor protections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. CRAIG (for himself, Mr. MURR a):
S. 1986. A bill to provide for improved management of, and increases accountability for, outfitted activities by which the public gains access to and use of Federal land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. SPECTER:
S. 1987. A bill to amend chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the liability of the United States for claims of military personnel for damages for certain injuries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS
By Mr. DASCHLE (for himself, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. REID, and Mr. J OHNSON):
S. 1975. A bill to allow patients access to drugs and medical devices recommended and provided by health care practitioners that are not approved by the Food and Drug Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

ACCESS TO MEDICAL TREATMENT ACT
Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, today I am introducing the Access to Medical Treatment Act. I am pleased to be joined by Senators HARKIN, REID, INOUYE and JOHNSON in this effort to increase individuals' freedom of choice in health care.

At the outset, I want to extend my thanks to my friend Berkley Bedell, who formerly represented the 6th District of Iowa, for first bringing this issue to my attention and for his assistance in developing this bill. Berkley Bedell has experienced first-hand the life-saving potential of alternative treatments. His story underscores the need for the legislation I am introducing today and the importance of a national debate on ways to promote consumer choice and expand access to promising new medical treatments.

Congress has already voted for expanded access to alternative treatments with their feet and their pocket-books. The Journal of the American Medical Association recently published a study by David Eisenberg and others that found that Americans spent nearly $27 billion on alternative therapies in 1997. Americans made more visits to alternative practitioners—a total of 269 million—than to primary care doctors. Expenditures for alternative medicine professional services increased 45.2 percent between 1990 and 1997 to $21.2 billion. Some type of alternative therapy is used by 46.3 percent of the American population.

Alternative therapies are not only being incorporated into mainstream medical programs and practice. The curriculum of at least 22 of the nation's 125 medical schools include courses on alternative medicine. The National Institutes of Health now has a Center for Complementary and Alternative Medicine where work is underway to expand our knowledge of alternative therapies and their safe and effective use.

Despite the growing reliance on mainstream medicine, other therapies remain unavailable because they do not fit the categories already carved out by Congress for exemption from the requirement to gain FDA approval. My bill would increase access to treatments that would normally be regulated by the FDA, but have not yet undergone the expensive and lengthy process currently required to gain FDA approval.

Given the popularity of alternative medicine among the American public and its growing acceptance among traditional medical practitioners, it would seem logical to remove some of the access barriers that consumers face when seeking certain alternative therapies. The time and expense currently required to gain FDA approval both discourages the exploration of innovative, life-saving treatments by individual practitioners, scientists and smaller companies and limits patient access to low-cost treatments.

Mr. President, the Access to Medical Treatment Act proposes one way to expand freedom of choice for medical consumers under carefully controlled situations. It asserts that individuals—especially those who face life-threatening afflictions for which conventional treatments have proven ineffective—should have the option of trying an alternative treatment, so long as they have been fully informed of the nature of the treatment, potential side effects, and gains any other information necessary to make carefully-crafted informed consent requirements.

This is a choice that is rightly made by the consumer, and not dictated by the
Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEC. 2. ACCESS TO MEDICAL TREATMENT.

(a) In General.—Notwithstanding sections 505(a)(2)(B), 505(e) through 505(h), 502(f)(1), 505, 513, and 515 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355(a)(2)(B), 355(e) through 355(h), 352(f)(1), 355, 360c, and 360d) and section 331 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 201) or any other provision of Federal law, a patient may receive, and a health care practitioner may provide or administer, any unapproved drug or medical device that the patient desires or the legal representative of the patient authorizes if:

(1) the unapproved drug or medical device is recommended by a health care practitioner within that practitioner’s scope of practice under State law;

(2) the provision or administration of the unapproved drug or medical device is not a violation of the laws of the State or States in which the activity is carried out; and

(3) the health care practitioner abides by all of the requirements in subsection (b).

(b) Requirements.—A health care practitioner may recommend, provide, or administer any unapproved drug or medical device for a disease or condition if:

(1) does not violate State law by providing or administering the unapproved drug or medical device;

(2) does not violate the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 801 et seq.) by providing or administering the unapproved drug or medical device;

(3) has concluded based on generally accepted principles and current information that the unapproved drug or medical device, when used as directed, will not cause a danger to the patient;

(4) provides the recommendation under circumstances that give the patient sufficient opportunity to consider whether or not to use such a drug or medical device and that minimize the possibility of coercion or undue influence by the health care practitioner;

(5) discloses to the patient any financial interest that such a practitioner may have in the drug or medical device;

(6) has informed the patient in writing, prior to recommending, providing, or administering the unapproved drug or medical device—

(A) that the unapproved drug or medical device is not approved by the Secretary as safe and effective for the condition of the patient and is considered experimental;

(B) of the foreseeable potential benefits of the unapproved drug or medical device, including any risk to an embryo or fetus, and expected possible side effects or discomforts that the patient may experience and any medical treatment available if side effects occur;

(C) of any appropriate alternative procedures or courses of treatment that may involve the use of a drug or medical device that has been approved by the Food and Drug Administration, if any, that may be advantageous for the patient’s condition; and

(D) of any interactions the unapproved drug or medical device may have with other drugs, foods, or medical treatments the patient is taking;

(E) of the active and inactive ingredients of the unapproved drug and the mechanism of action of the medical device, if known; and

(f) of the health care practitioner’s professional opinion that the unapproved drug or medical device is provided, the method of administration that will be used, and the unit dose;

(g) the unapproved drug or medical device will be employed by the health care practitioner in using such a drug or medical device;
(H) of the extent, if any, to which confidentiality of records identifying the patient will be maintained;

(i) for use of such a drug or medical device involving a minimal risk, of the treatments available if injury occurs, what such treatments involve, and where additional information regarding such treatments may be obtained;

(j) of any anticipated circumstances under which the patient’s use of such a drug or medical device may be terminated by the health care practitioner without regard to the patient’s consent;

(K) that the use of such a drug or medical device is voluntary and that the patient may suspend or terminate treatment at any time;

(L) of the consequences of a patient’s decision to withdraw from the use of such a drug or medical device.

(M) if any information described in subparagraphs (A) through (L) cannot be provided by the health care practitioner because such information is not known at the time the practitioner provides or administers such drug or medical device, that such information cannot be provided by the practitioner; and

(N) of any other information or disclosures required by applicable State law for the administration of experimental drugs or medical devices on human subjects;

(7) has not made, except as provided in subsection (d), any advertising claims for the unapproved drug or medical device;

(8) does not impose a charge for the unapproved drug or medical device in excess of costs;

(9) complies with requirements for reporting a danger in section 4; and

(10) has received a signed affidavit from the patient or the patient’s legal representative confirming that the patient or the legal representative

(A) has received the written information required by this subsection and understands it; and

(B) desires treatment with the unapproved drug or medical device as recommended by the health care practitioner.

(c) MANDATORY DISCLOSURE.—Any manufacturer of an unapproved drug or medical device shall disclose, to any health care practitioner who has received such drug or medical device, all information available to such manufacturer regarding such drug or medical device to enable such practitioner to comply with the requirements of subsection (b)(3) and make a determination regarding the danger posed by such drug or medical device. Compliance with this subsection shall not constitute a violation of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 301 et seq.).

(d) ADVERTISING CLAIMS EXCEPTION.—Subsection (b) shall not apply to a health care practitioner’s dissemination of information on the results of the practitioner’s administration of the unapproved drug or medical device obtained through articles, reviews, or other means.

(e) SEC. 4. CESSATION OF USE, AND REPORTING OF, UNAPPROVED DRUGS AND MEDICAL DEVICES.

(1) I N GENERAL.—The Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, upon receipt of the information described in subsection (a), shall conduct an investigation of the unapproved drug or medical device under subsection (a) and shall, upon determining that the use of such drug or medical device is not in the best interest of the patient and that such use is likely to cause serious or unexpected adverse reactions in patients, issue a public health advisory providing a complete description of the unapproved drug or medical device and a description of the method of treatment, dosage, and duration, including the name, known method of operation, and intended use of the unapproved drug or medical device.

(2) REPORT TO SECRETARY.—The Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention shall, if the information described in paragraph (1) is received, make a determination that the use of such drug or medical device is not in the best interest of the patient and that such use is likely to cause serious or unexpected adverse reactions in patients, and shall immediately—

(A) notify the Secretary in writing that the Director has made such determination; and

(B) provide the Secretary with information necessary to allow the Secretary to make such determination.

(3) NOTIFICATION OF HEALTH CARE PRACTITIONERS.—The Director shall notify all health care practitioners to whom the manufacturer has provided the unapproved drug or medical device of the information provided to the manufacturer under subsection (a) and shall, upon determining that the use of such drug or medical device is not in the best interest of the patient and that such use is likely to cause serious or unexpected adverse reactions in patients, issue a public health advisory providing a complete description of the unapproved drug or medical device and a description of the method of treatment, dosage, and duration, including the name, known method of operation, and intended use of the unapproved drug or medical device.

(4) REVISION OF INVESTIGATION.—If the Secretary, upon receiving the information described in paragraph (1), determines that the information described in paragraph (1) is insufficient to make such determination, the Secretary shall notify the manufacturer and the health care practitioner of the information necessary for such determination and shall conduct further investigations.

(5) DELAY IN CESSATION.—If the Secretary determines that the information described in paragraph (1) is insufficient to make such determination, the Secretary shall—

(A) delay the issuance of the public health advisory described in paragraph (2); and

(B) issue a public health advisory providing a complete description of the unapproved drug or medical device and a description of the method of treatment, dosage, and duration, including the name, known method of operation, and intended use of the unapproved drug or medical device.

(6) SEC. 5. REGISTRATION OF UNAPPROVED DRUGS AND MEDICAL DEVICES.

(1) REPORTING OF RESULTS.—If a health care practitioner provides or administers an unapproved drug or medical device to a patient and determines that the use of such drug or medical device is not in the best interest of the patient and that such use is likely to cause serious or unexpected adverse reactions in patients, the health care practitioner shall provide to the manufacturer—

(A) a written evaluation of the patient’s medical condition before and after administration of the unapproved drug or medical device;

(B) any other information the health care practitioner provides or administers such unapproved drug or medical device and a description of the method of treatment, dosage, and duration of treatment; and

(C) the name of the unapproved drug or medical device.

(2) SEC. 6. REPORTS TO MANUFACTURER.—Any manufacturer of an unapproved drug or medical device—

(A) shall, if the manufacturer receives information from a health care practitioner that the manufacturer has provided such information to the manufacturer, provide the manufacturer with all information provided to the manufacturer by the health care practitioner;

(B) shall maintain such records or reports as are necessary to ensure that all statements made to the manufacturer are accurate.

SEC. 7. SEC. 7. REPORTING TO MANUFACTURER.—Any manufacturer of an unapproved drug or medical device—

(1) shall, if the manufacturer receives information from a health care practitioner that the manufacturer has provided such information to the manufacturer, provide the manufacturer with all information provided to the manufacturer by the health care practitioner;

(2) shall maintain such records or reports as are necessary to ensure that all statements made to the manufacturer are accurate.

(3) In any report described in paragraph (2), the Secretary shall promptly disseminate information concerning the dangers to all health care practitioners in the United States.

SEC. 8. SEC. 8. REPORTING TO MANUFACTURER.—Any manufacturer of an unapproved drug or medical device—

(1) shall, if the manufacturer receives information from a health care practitioner that the manufacturer has provided such information to the manufacturer, provide the manufacturer with all information provided to the manufacturer by the health care practitioner;

(2) shall maintain such records or reports as are necessary to ensure that all statements made to the manufacturer are accurate.

(3) In any report described in paragraph (2), the Secretary shall promptly disseminate information concerning the dangers to all health care practitioners in the United States.

SEC. 9. SEC. 9. REPORTING TO MANUFACTURER.—Any manufacturer of an unapproved drug or medical device—

(1) shall, if the manufacturer receives information from a health care practitioner that the manufacturer has provided such information to the manufacturer, provide the manufacturer with all information provided to the manufacturer by the health care practitioner;

(2) shall maintain such records or reports as are necessary to ensure that all statements made to the manufacturer are accurate.

(3) In any report described in paragraph (2), the Secretary shall promptly disseminate information concerning the dangers to all health care practitioners in the United States.
drug or medical device and make available, on an Internet website and in writing upon request by any individual, an annual review and analysis of such information, and include a statement that such drug or medical device is not approved by the Food and Drug Administration.

SEC. 6. OTHER LAWS NOT AFFECTED BY THIS ACT.

This Act shall not be construed to have any effect on section 503A of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 353a) nor does this Act supersede any law of a State or political subdivision of a State, including laws governing rights and duties among health care practitioners and patients. This Act also does not apply to statements or claims permitted or authorized under sections 403 and 403B of such Act (21 U.S.C. 343, 343-2). This Act shall not in any way adversely affect the distribution and marketing of vitamins and supplements.

SEC. 7. AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES OF HEALTH CARE PRACTITIONERS.

(a) INTRODUCTION IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE.—To the extent necessary to comply with this Act, a health care practitioner may—

(1) introduce an unapproved drug or medical device into interstate commerce;

(2) deliver an unapproved drug or medical device for introduction into such commerce;

(3) receive an unapproved drug or medical device in such commerce and deliver the unapproved drug or medical device in such commerce; and

(4) hold an unapproved drug or medical device for sale after shipment of the unapproved drug or medical device in such commerce.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—This Act shall not be construed to limit or interfere with any activity otherwise authorized.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to see Senator Daschle today for the introduction of the Access to Medical Treatment Act. This bill will allow greater freedom of choice and increased access in the realm of medical treatments, while preventing abuses of unscrupulous entrepreneurs. The Access to Medical Treatment Act allows individual patients and their properly licensed health care provider to use certain alternative and complementary therapies not approved by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA).

Mr. President, we have made several important changes to the legislation from last Congress.

We have improved the informed consent protections for patients by modeling them after NIH's human subject protection regulations. The patient must be fully informed, orally and in writing of: the nature, content and methods of the medical treatment; that the treatment is not approved by the FDA; the anticipated benefits and risks of the treatment; and any reasonably foreseeable side effects that may result; the results of past applications of the treatment by the health care provider and others; the comparable benefits and risks of any available FDA-approved treatment conventionally used for the patient's condition; and any financial interest the provider has in the product.

Providers and manufacturers are required to report to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) any adverse effects, and must immediately cease use and manufacture of the product, pending a CDC investigation. The CDC is required to conduct an investigation of any adverse effects, and if the product is shown to cause any danger to patients, the physician and manufacturers are required to immediately inform all providers who have been using the product of the danger.

Our legislation ensures the public's access to reliable information about complementary and alternative therapies by requiring providers and manufacturers to report the results of the evaluation of their product to the National Center for Complementary and Alternative Medicine at NIH, which is then required to compile and analyze the information for an annual report.

In addition, the provider and manufacturer may make advertising claims regarding the safety and effectiveness of the treatment of therapy, and FDA has the authority to determine that the labeling of the treatment is not false or misleading.

Mr. President, our legislation preserves the consumer's freedom to choose alternative therapies while addressing the fundamental concern of protecting patients from dangerous treatments and those who would advocate unsafe and ineffective therapies.

It wasn't long ago that William Roentgen was afraid to publish his discovery of X-rays as a diagnostic tool. He knew they would be considered an ``alternative medical practice'' and widely rejected by the medical establishment. As everyone knows, X-rays are a common diagnostic tool today. Well into this century, many scientists resisted basic antiseptic techniques as quackery because they refused to accept the germ theory of disease. I think we can all be thankful the medical profession came around on that one.

In addition, the Office of Technology Assessment reported that only about 25 percent of the practices of mainstream medicine were based on scientific evidence. And there is little evidence that has changed in the past two decades.

Today's consumers want alternatives. They want less invasive, less expensive preventive options. Americans want to stay healthy. And they are speaking with their feet and their pocketbooks. Mr. President, Americans spend $30 billion annually on unconventional therapies. According to a recent survey published in the Journal of the American Medical Association (JAMA), nearly one-half of Americans use some kind of complementary and alternative medicine. These practices, which range from acupuncture, chiropractic care, to naturopathic, herbal and homeopathic remedies, are not simply complementary and alternative, but integral to how millions of Americans manage their health and treat their illnesses.

This legislation simply provides patients the freedom to use—with strong consumer protections—the complementary and alternative therapies and treatments that have the potential to relieve pain and cure disease. I thank Senator Daschle for his leadership on this issue, and urge my colleagues to cosponsor this bill.

By Ms. SNOWE:

S. 1556. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to enhance the assurance of efficiency, quality, and patient satisfaction in the furnishing of health care to veterans by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

THE VETERANS HEALTH CARE QUALITY ASSURANCE ACT

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Veterans Health Care Quality Assurance Act of 1999.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Veterans Health Care Quality Assurance Act of 1999. This legislation contains a number of proposals designed to ensure that access to high quality medical services for our veterans is not compromised as the Department of Veterans Affairs—the VA—strives to increase efficiency and reduce costs.
and that is why I am introducing the Veterans Health Care Quality Assurance Act, legislation which seeks to ensure that no veteran's hospital is targeted unfairly for cuts, and that efforts to “streamline” and increase efficiency are not by the unintended consequence of undermining quality of care or patient satisfaction.

I believe that all veterans hospitals should be held to the same equitable VA-wide standards, and that quality and patient satisfaction must be guaranteed. Toward that end, the Veterans Health Care Quality Assurance Act calls for audits of every VA hospital every three years. This will ensure that each facility is subject to an outside, independent review of its operations on a regular basis, and each audit will include findings on how to improve services to our veterans.

The legislation will also establish an Office of Quality Assurance within the VA to ensure that steps taken to increase VA medical programs do not undermine quality or patient satisfaction. This office will collect and disseminate information on efforts that have proven to successfully increase efficiency and resource utilization and spin-growth without undermining quality or patient satisfaction. The director of this new Office of Quality Assurance should be an advocate for veterans and would be placed in the appropriate position in the VA command structure to ensure that his or her voice is consulted by the VA Secretary and Under Secretary for Veterans Health on matters that impact quality of care.

The bill would require an initial report to Congress within six months of enactment, which would include a survey of each VA regional network and a report on each network's efforts to increase efficiency, as well as an assessment of the extent to which each network and VA hospital is or is not implementing VA-wide policies to increase efficiency.

Under the bill's reporting requirement, the VA would also be required to publish—annually—an overview of VA-wide efficiency goals and quality/satisfaction standards that each veterans facility should be held to. Further, the VA would be required to report to Congress on each hospital's standing in relation to efficiency, quality, and satisfaction criteria, and how each facility compares with similar networks.

In an effort to encourage innovation in efforts to increase efficiency within the agency, the bill would encourage the dissemination and sharing of information throughout the VA in order to facilitate implementation of uniform, equitable efficiency standards. Finally, Mr. President, the bill includes provisions calling for sharing of information on efforts to maximize resources and increase efficiency without compromising quality of care and patient satisfaction; exchange and monitoring initiatives among and between networks in order to facilitate sharing of such information; incentives for networks to increase efficiency and meet uniform quality/patient satisfaction targets; and formal oversight by the VA to ensure that all networks are meeting uniform efficiency criteria and that efforts to increase efficiency are equitable between networks and medical facilities. This will ensure that the VA is ready to learn.

Last week America celebrated Veterans Day 1999—81 years after the Armistice was signed in France that silenced the guns and ended the carnage of World War I. World War I was supposed to be “the war to end all wars”...the war that made the world safe for democracy. Sadly, that was not to be, and America has been repeatedly reminded that the defense of democracy is an on-going duty.

Mr. President, keeping our promise to our veterans is also an ongoing duty. The debt of gratitude we owe to our veterans can never be fully repaid. What we can and must do for our veterans is repay the financial debt we owe to them. Central to that solemn duty is ensuring that the benefits we promised our veterans when they enlisted are there for them when they need them.

I consider it a great honor to represent veterans, these brave Americans. So many of them continue to make contributions in our communities upon their transition from military to civilian life—through youth activities and scholarship programs, homeownership initiatives, and education programs. They answered the call to duty when their country needed them, and national leadership on issues of importance to veterans and all Americans. The least we can do is make good on our promise, such as the promise of access to high quality health care.

I have nothing but the utmost respect for those who have served their country, and this legislation is but a small tribute to the men and women and their families who have served this country with courage, honor and distinction. This is the call to duty when their country needed them, and this is a component of my on-going effort to ensure that we, as elected officials, answer their call when they need us.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

By Mr. KOHL: S. 1958. A bill to amend the Child Nutrition Act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make grants for startup costs of school breakfast programs; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

LEGISLATION TO IMPROVE PARTICIPATION IN THE SCHOOL BREAKFAST PROGRAM

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I rise to introduce legislation that will go far in helping children start their school day ready to learn.

The relationship between health and academic achievement has been documented by a number of studies. Fortunately, participation of schools in the School Breakfast program has increased steadily since the program was made permanent in 1975. According to the School Breakfast Scorecard, a report recently released by the Food Research and Action Center (FRAC), a record number of schools—70,000—provided breakfast to school children last school year. While 80 percent of our states have 80 percent or more of their schools serving both lunch and breakfast under the National School Lunch and School Breakfast programs.

A good news story is that the ratio between states with the highest rates of school participation in breakfast and those with the lowest is wide. 20 percent of our states have fewer than 55 percent of their schools participating in both breakfast and lunch; that’s a full 20 points below the national average. In my home state of Wisconsin, only 30 percent of the schools that serve lunch also serve breakfast.

By another measure—participation of low-income children in both school lunch and breakfast—the results from the Scorecard are equally concerning. Nationally, only 42 percent of the kids receiving a free or reduced price lunch are also receiving breakfast; some states have fewer than 25 percent of kids receiving a free or reduced price lunch also receiving school breakfast.

The bill I am introducing today would help states provide an additional financial incentive for schools to participate in the school breakfast program. While there are a number of reasons that schools do not offer their children a school breakfast, certainly the barrier most difficult to overcome is the cost of the meals throughout the year. In short, the cost of the school breakfast program may simply be too high for some schools and school districts.

My bill authorizes, subject to appropriations, grants from the U.S. Department of Agriculture to allow states to provide schools with an additional five cent per meal reimbursement during the first year in which they provide the school breakfast program. This additional reimbursement may be used to supplement both the existing federal per meal reimbursement and any additional per meal reimbursement provided by the state. To ensure that the grants are as effective as possible they are targeted to those schools with the lowest participation rates and that also have a program in place to promote school breakfast participation. State educational agencies will have the discretion to determine, based on participation rates, which schools or school districts will receive the supplemental assistance.

Providing a nutritious breakfast is the first step in ensuring that kids are ready to learn when they sit down at their desks or lunch tables. The legislation I am introducing will go far in helping states and schools reach that goal and I encourage my colleagues to support it.
Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this legislation and letters of support for my bill from Wisconsin State Superintendent John Benson and Wisconsin School Food Service Association President Renee Slotten-Beauchamp be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

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

SECTION 1. FINANCIAL INCENTIVE GRANTS FOR SCHOOL BREAKFAST PROGRAMS.

Section 4 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1773) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(f) Startup Grants for School Breakfast Programs.—

"(1) Definition of Eligible School.—In this subsection, the term 'eligible school' means a school that agrees to operate the school breakfast program established with the assistance provided under this subsection for a period not less than 3 years.

"(2) Grants.—The Secretary may make grants to State educational agencies, from funds made available to the Secretary, for a fiscal year, to assist eligible schools in initiating school breakfast programs.

"(3) Payment Rates.—A State educational agency shall use grants made available under this subsection during the first year when an eligible school initiates a school breakfast program—

"(A) to increase by not more than 5 cents the amount specified for payment for each breakfast served by the eligible school; or

"(B) to assist eligible schools with non recurring expenses incurred in initiating school breakfast programs.

"(4) Funds Supplementary.—A grant under this subsection shall supplement any payment to which a State educational agency is entitled under subsection (b).

"(5) Plan.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this subsection, a State educational agency shall submit to the Secretary a fiscal year plan to initiate school breakfast programs conducted in the State, including a description of the manner in which the State educational agency shall provide technical assistance to eligible schools in the State to initiate the programs.

"(6) State Educational Agency Preferences.—In making a grant under this subsection, a fiscal year to initiate school breakfast programs, the Secretary shall provide a preference to a State educational agency that—

"(A) has in effect a State law that promotes the expansion of State participation in the school breakfast program during the year;

"(B) has significant public or private resources that will be used to carry out the expansion of the school breakfast program during the year;

"(C) has not more than 55 percent of schools in the State that are participating in the school lunch program also participating in the school breakfast program; or

"(D) has a significant percentage of the students in the State receiving free or reduced price lunch also receiving free or reduced price breakfasts; and

"(E) has among low-income children, as determined by the Secretary.

"(7) Reallocation.—The Secretary shall act in a manner to recover and redistribute to other State educational agencies or States any amounts made available to a State educational agency or State under this subsection that is not used by the agency or State within a reasonable period (as determined by the Secretary).

"(8) Application.—The Secretary shall allow application by State educational agencies on an annual basis for grants under this subsection.

"(9) Preferences by State Educational Agencies and States.—In allocating funds within the State, each State educational agency shall give preference for assistance under this subsection to an eligible school that demonstrates the greatest need for assistance for a school breakfast program, based on the percentage of children not participating in the school lunch program, as determined by the State educational agency.

"(10) Maintenance of Effort.—The expenditure of funds from State and local sources for the maintenance of the school breakfast program shall not be diminished as a result of grants made available under this subsection.

STATE OF WISCONSIN,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,
Madison, WI, November 5, 1999.
Hon. Herb Kohl,
US Senate, Washington, DC.
Dear Senator Kohl,

This letter is in support of your proposed amendment for Startup Grants for School Breakfast Programs. I believe this legislation will provide an essential incentive for schools to implement a School Breakfast Program (SBP). Understanding that breakfast is an important component of academic achievement as well as the health of our nation's children, I am very concerned with Wisconsin's low participation in the SBP. The federal startup grants for SBP will enhance the many public and private efforts within our state to increase the number of schools offering breakfast. Our state legislature has supported my budget initiative for an additional ten cents per breakfast reimbursement, effective in fiscal year 2001. Statewide public and nonpublic collaborative initiatives to promote the importance of breakfast include the Good Breakfast for Good Learning Coalition, now in its third year. The coalition and several hunger prevention coalitions are actively promoting school breakfast. Professional organizations, such as the Wisconsin School Food Service Association and the Dietetic Association have taken a lead in school breakfast promotion efforts.

However, the bottom line is that schools cannot absorb financial loss in the Child Nutrition Programs. Fear that the SBP will have a negative impact on the school district's general fund has been detrimental to the promotional efforts identified above. The startup grants for SBP will help alleviate those fears and allow the children in this state to have access to a nourishing breakfast at the start of the school day.

I would like to commend your efforts to help the children of Wisconsin and the nation to have access to a nourishing breakfast.

Sincerely,

JOHN T. BENSON,
State Superintendent.

By Mr. HARKIN.
S. 959, A Bill to provide for the fiscal responsibility of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Finance.

THE FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY ACT

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, today as we are debating how to protect Social Security and Medicare while making necessary investments in our nation's future, I am introducing legislation designed to provide some options for reducing spending. In an effort to promote greater fiscal responsibility within the federal government, "The Fiscal Responsibility Act" would eliminate some of the interest tax savings, reduce corporate welfare, eliminate unnecessary government programs, reduce wasteful spending, enhance government efficiency and require greater accountability.

The reforms contained in this bill would result in savings of up to $20 billion this year and up to $40 billion over the next five years. These savings could be used to pay down the federal debt, shore up Social Security and Medicare, provide more tax relief, and/or pay for needed investment in education, health care and other priorities.

While I recognize that everyone won't agree on each of the provisions of this measure, I believe it is important for us to put forward a plan to be considered. I hope that we can work together on a bipartisan basis to produce a set of reforms such as these to lay a path of fiscal responsibility as we move into the next century.

The following is a summary of the bill's major provisions:

Elimination of Unnecessary Government Programs.

November 18, 1999
A number of outdated or unnecessary programs would be eliminated, including Radio Marti, TV Marti and certain nuclear energy research initiatives. These changes would save over $150 million this year.

Reducing wasteful spending and government efficiency improvements.

By Mr. KOHL (for himself and Mr. FEINGOLD):

First, while the four full-time district court judges for the eastern district of Wisconsin currently preside in Milwaukee, for most litigants and witnesses, the eastern district of Wisconsin is well over 100 miles away. In fact, as the courts are currently arranged, the northern portion of the eastern district is more remote from a Federal court than any other major market in the United States. Thus, litigants and witnesses must incur substantial costs in traveling from northern Wisconsin to Milwaukee—costs in terms of time, money, and effort. Indeed, driving from Green Bay to Milwaukee takes nearly two hours each way. Add inclement weather or a departure point north of Green Bay—such as Oconto or Marinette—and often the driving time alone actually exceeds the amount of time witnesses spend testifying.

Second, Mr. President, the few Wisconsin Federal judges serve a disproportionately large population. Last year, a study by the General Accounting Office revealed that Wisconsin Federal judges have to serve the largest population among all federal judges. Each sitting Federal judge in Wisconsin serves an average population of 899,666, while the remaining federal judges across the country—more than 650—serve less than half that number, with an average of 417,000 per judge. For example, while Louisiana has fewer residents than Wisconsin, a Federal judge hold court in Green Bay, and gives the chief judge of the eastern district flexibility to designate which judge holds court there. And this legislation would increase the number of Federal district judges in Wisconsin for the first time since 1976. During that period, nearly 150 new Federal district judgeships have been created nationwide, but not a single one in Wisconsin.

Increased Accountability.

Tobacco companies hook children on their deadly products. One in three of these kids will be sentenced to an early death. Tobacco companies are accountable. Accordingly, a goal of reducing teen smoking by at least 15 percent each year would be set. If tobacco companies fail to meet this goal, they would have to pay a penalty. Such a system would generate approximately $6 billion this year and $20 billion over the next 5 years. It would also significantly reduce the number of young children who become addicted to tobacco.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to review the provisions in this bill and look forward to moving forward next year on a fiscally responsible budget plan.

By Mr. KOHL (for himself and Mr. FEINGOLD):

November 18, 1999

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Federal judicial efficiency improvements in the eastern district of Wisconsin.

THE FEDERAL JUDGESHIP FOR NORTHEASTERN WISCONSIN ACT

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Federal judicial efficiency improvements in the eastern district of Wisconsin.

THE FEDERAL JUDGESHIP FOR NORTHEASTERN WISCONSIN ACT

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Federal judicial efficiency improvements in the eastern district of Wisconsin.
Green Bay. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from these law enforcement officials be included in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. I also ask unanimous consent that a letter from the U.S. Attorney for the Eastern district of Wisconsin, Tom Schneider, also be included. This letter expressed the support of the entire law enforcement community in Wisconsin—including the FBI, the DEA and the BATF—for the legislation we are introducing. They needed this additional judicial resource in 1993, and certainly, Mr. President, that need has only increased over the last five years.

Perhaps most important, the people of Green Bay also agree on the need for an additional Federal Judge, as the endorsement of our proposal by the Green Bay Chamber of Commerce demonstrates.

In conclusion, Mr. President, having a Federal Judge in Green Bay will reduce the inconvenience while increasing judicial efficiency. But most important, it will help ensure that justice is more available and more affordable to the people of northeastern Wisconsin. For these sensible reasons, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, either separately or as part of an omnibus judgeship bill that I hope Congress will consider next session. The Judicial Conference has recommended the creation of over 60 new judgeships, one of which has been created since 1990. Should such a bill be considered, I will be right there to ensure that Northeastern Wisconsin is included.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and additional material be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) In General.—The President shall appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, 1 additional district judge for the eastern district of Wisconsin.

(b) TABLES.—In order that the table contained in section 133(a) of title 28, United States Code, reflects the change in the total number of permanent district judgeships authorized under subsection (a), such table is amended to read as follows:

(c) HOLDING OF COURT.—The chief judge of the eastern district of Wisconsin shall designate 1 judge who shall hold court for such district in Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

SEC. 4. APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act, including such sums as may be necessary to provide appropriate space and facilities for the judicial position created by this Act.

August 8, 1994.

U.S. Senator HERB KOHL, Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Mr. President, I am writing to urge your support for the creation of a Federal District Court in Green Bay. The Eastern District of Wisconsin includes the 28 eastern-most counties from Forest and Florence Counties in the north to Kenoshia and Walworth Counties in the south. Green Bay is central to the northern part of the district which includes approximately one-third of the district’s population. Currently, all Federal District Judges hold court in Milwaukee.

A federal court in Green Bay would make federal proceedings more accessible to the people of northern Wisconsin and would alleviate many problems for citizens and law enforcement. Travel time of 3 or 4 hours each way makes it difficult and expensive for witnesses and officers to go to court in Milwaukee. Witness travel is often inconvenient and costly.

In some cases there is no alternative. For example, the Federal government has the obligation to prosecute all felony offenses committed in Wisconsin on the Menominee Reservation. Yet the Reservation’s distance from the Federal Courts and prosecutors in Milwaukee poses serious problems. Imagine the District Attorney of Milwaukee being located in Keshena or Green Bay or Marinette and trying to coordinate witness interviews, case preparation, and testimony.

As local law enforcement officials, we try to work closely with other local, state and federal agencies, and we believe establishing a Federal District Court in Green Bay will measurably enhance these efforts. Most important, a Federal Court in Green Bay will make these courts substantially more accessible to the citizens who live here.

We urge you to support legislation to create and fund an additional Federal District Court in Green Bay.

John Des Jardins, Outagamie County District Attorney.

Douglas Drexler, Florence County District Attorney.

Guy Dutcher, Waushara County District Attorney.

E. James FitzGerald, Manitowoc County District Attorney.

Kenneth Kratz, Calumet County District Attorney.

Jackson Main, Jr., Kewaunee County District Attorney.

David Miron, Marinette County District Attorney.

Joseph Paulus, Winnebago County District Attorney.

Gary Schuster, Door County District Attorney.

Snider, Waupaca County District Attorney.

Ralph Uttke, Langlade County District Attorney.

Demetrio Verich, Forest County District Attorney.

Thank you for your letter of August 8, 1994, urging the creation of a Federal District Court in Green Bay. Y ou point out a number of facts in your letter:
(1) Although 1/3 of the population of the Eastern District of Wisconsin is in the northern half of the district, all of the Federal District Courts are located in Milwaukee.
(2) A federal court in Green Bay would be more accessible to the people of northern Wisconsin. It would substantially reduce witness travel time and expenses, and it would make federal court more accessible and less costly for local law enforcement agencies.
(3) The federal government has exclusive jurisdiction over most felonies committed on the Menominee Reservation, located approximately 3 hours from Milwaukee.

I urge you to introduce and support legislation for such a court and give additional reasons why it is needed.

Over the past several years, the FBI, DEA, and IRS have initiated a substantial number of investigations in counties from the northern part of the district. In preparation for indictments and trials, and when needed to testify before the Grand Jury or in court, officers regularly travel 4 to 6 hours of round trip travel per day, plus the actual time in court.

The people of northern Wisconsin and would
agencies’ already scarce resources are severely taxed. Several federal agencies report that many cases which are appropriate for prosecution are simply not charged federally because local law enforcement agencies do not have the resources to bring these cases and officers back and forth to Milwaukee.

Nevertheless, there have been a substantial number of successful local investigations and prosecutions from the Fox Valley area and other parts of the Northern District of Wisconsin including major drug organizations, bank frauds, tax cases, and weapons cases.

It is interesting to note that the U.S. Bankruptcy Court in the Eastern District of Wisconsin has heard many significant cases. A federal court in Green Bay is critically important in the federal government’s efforts to hold up its end of a legal obligation to enforce the law on the Reservation.

In summary, I appreciate and understand your concerns and I join you in urging the creation of a Federal District Court in Green Bay.

By Mr. JOHNSON (for himself, Mr. KERREY, and Mr. WELLSTONE):

S. 1962. A bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 to expand the number of acres authorized for inclusion in the conservation reserve, to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

THE CONSERVATION RESERVE PROGRAM ACREAGE EXPANSION ACT

Mr. J. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation which would increase acreage currently in place for the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) under the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA).

CRP continues to be a popular alternative for landowners who wish to take a portion of their land out of production for conservation purposes. While the program serves a multitude of beneficial purposes, there are items of the program that we must continue to work on in Congress. To start, I am introducing companion legislation to Congressman COLLIN PETERSON’S (D-MN) bill in the House to increase the acreage allotted in CRP up to 45 million acres.

CRP has undergone significant changes, including a portion of the 1985 Farm Bill. Wildlife benefits provided by certain grass species and conservation practices are now heavily emphasized in the Environmental Benefits Index (EBI) which sets forth eligibility into the program. While many of these changes have been welcomed because of the favorable effect they have on conservation and the environment, I have some concerns with certain requirements farmers face in relation to the EBI requirements.

First, producers with existing CRP contracts that have tracts of land accepted for re-enrollment into CRP have indicated that in certain cases, they were required to plow under at least half of the existing grass stand on those tracts in order to plant new grass seeds to meet the EBI criteria. Those participants are concerned this may lead to soil erosion instead of soil conservation on tracts that are already highly productive. Plowing up half of grass stand exposes that land to the unpredictable forces of weather. Moreover, it often requires more than one growing season for new grass species to take root and establish adequate cover in order to protect habitat. That said, both producers and conservationists have expressed concern to me that this requirement may place habitat protection in a precarious position in some instances. Finally, the costs of seed varieties, especially for native grass species, have skyrocketed to a point here it is often times cost prohibitive for producers to meet the requirements of establishing a new grass stand. These and other matters I plan to address with the input of all interested parties as we proceed with the legislation.

However, on the whole CRP remains a very popular program in my home state of South Dakota and across the country. During the twelve signups held between 1986 and 1992, 36.4 million acres were enrolled in CRP. USDA estimates that the average erosion rate on enrolled acres was reduced from 21 to less than 2 tons per acre per year. Re-tilling these lands also expanded wildlife habitat, enhanced water quality, and restored soil. The annual value of these benefits has been estimated from less than $1 billion to more than $1.5 billion; some estimates of these benefits approach or exceed annual costs, especially in heavy duty precipitation. While major changes cannot occur to CRP until we undertake a renewed effort to change the Farm Bill, I am hopeful that Congress reconsider the current Farm Bill in 2000.

In addition to supporting CRP, I have co-sponsored S. 1426, the Conservation Security Act of 1999. This bill creates a voluntary incentive program to encourage conservation activities by landowners. This bill includes a variety of soil conservation practices that landowners may choose from in order to qualify for certain incentives. Some of these conservation practices include conservation tillage, runoff control, buffer strips, wetland restoration, and wildlife management.

I believe the Conservation Security Act is a strong piece of legislation that would benefit agriculture producers, wildlife, and the environment. I will continue to support and work with Senator HARKIN in seeing this legislation move forward.

By Mr. ASHCROFT:
Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund, combined, established by title II of the Social Security Act:"

(d) Super Majority Requirement.—

(1) Point of Order.—Section 904(c)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by inserting "312(g)," after "310(d)(2),".

(2) Waiver.—Section 904(d)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 is amended by inserting "312(g)," after "310(d)(2),".


(a) In General.—Chapter 11 of subtitle II of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding after the last (1) in section 3101 the following:

"(1) Prior to enactment of this Act, the United States Government submitted by the President under this chapter shall not be subject to an on-budget deficit for any fiscal year covered by that budget.

(b) Chapter Analysis.—The chapter analysis for chapter 11 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by inserting before the item for section 1101 the following:

"1100. Protection of Social Security and Medicare Surpluses."

SEC. 5. Effective Date.

This Act shall take effect upon the date of its enactment and the amendments made by this Act shall apply to fiscal year 2001 and subsequent fiscal years.

By Mr. McCAIN: S. 1963. A bill to authorize a study of alternatives to the current management of federal lands in Arizona; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Alternatiave Land Management Study for the BARRY GOLDWATER MILITARY Training Range

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation that will require a comprehensive study of alternative land management options for areas comprising the Barry Goldwater military training range and Organ Pipe National Monument in Arizona.

Early this year, the Congress finalized the Department of Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2000 which included language to renew a land withdrawal for the Barry Goldwater training range for an additional twenty-five years to the year 2024. The final proposal transferred land management of the natural and cultural resources within the range to the Air Force and the Navy, a decision that was fully supported by both the Interior Department and the President’s Council on Environmental Quality.

In practical effect, the Air Force and Marine Corps have been performing the management functions at the Goldwater range for many years, and doing a very good job of it, according to most observers. In fact, the Department of Defense already dedicates significant resources to land and natural resource management of the Range. The decision to formally transfer management recognizes that superior fiscal and manned power is available to the military Services, who also have the most compelling interest in maintaining future training access to the range, which can only be accomplished by effectively addressing environmental concerns regarding its use.

During consideration of the legislative environmental impact statements and subsequent renewal proposals, no one argued that essential military training should continue on the range. However, several environmental groups registered concerns about the Administration's proposal for DOD management of the Range and expressed their fears that the military Services would not appropriately manage the natural resources. I took personal interest in these expressed concerns and advocated for the strongest possible language in the final withdrawal bill to address some potential problems should the land management of these areas ever be jeopardized under primary military authority.

In response to continuing apprehension about proper land management in the newly passed withdrawal bill, I worked with the concerned individuals to develop language directing the Department of the Interior to study and make recommendations for alternative land management scenarios for the range. Such a comprehensive study would provide information to guide the Administration and the Congress in taking appropriate future action to ensure that the cultural and natural resources on the range will continue to be preserved and protected in future years.

Although I was unable to convince my colleagues that studying various land management options should be added to the Defense authorization package, I am continuing to explore appropriate land management options for the long-term. I do so because it is important that we assure that the best possible protection will be provided to the unique natural and cultural resources of these areas, consistent with the primary purpose of the range.

While the Barry Goldwater Range will continue to serve its vital purpose, we have an obligation to ensure proper stewardship of our natural resources. This study will provide us with the critical information necessary to fulfill that obligation. Once an alternative management study is completed, I will ensure that any recommendations for improved management of the Goldwater Range are considered and acted on, as necessary, by the Congress.

I strongly urge my colleagues to work with me to pass this legislation to ensure that the Goldwater Range is managed by the agency most qualified to protect the public’s interest and preserve the precious land and natural resources of these pristine areas for future generations.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 1964. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to designate the United States Post Office located at 14071 Peyton Drive in Chino Hills, California, as the "Joseph Ileto Post Office." This post office would be designated in memory and in celebration of the life of Joseph Santos Ileto, the Filipino American postman who was brutally gunned down during his postal route in August by Buford Furrow, Jr., a white supremacist. Only hours earlier, this same assailant had fired his gun on the Jewish Community Center, wounding three young children, one teenager, and one elderly woman.

Joseph Ileto touched many lives. He was a kind-hearted, intelligent man who gave so much and even to those he did not know. He was known for his unselfishness and his willingness to give a helping hand to anyone in need. In fact, the day Joseph Ileto was killed, he was on his way to deliver mail to yet another mail carrier, as he had done so many times before. His life and death exemplify the ultimate sacrifice of public service, which we too often take for granted. As a U.S. Postal Service employee, he served our nation with honor and dignity and died doing his job.

My heart goes out to the Ileto family, who is grieving over the death of their son, brother, and friend. Despite the sadness of their loss, they can be proud that the spirit and life of Joseph Ileto lives on. His death only confirms the urgency in which we as a community must take a strong stand against hate crimes and racism. The number of hate crimes in the U.S. has increased during the last five years, and the time is now to have dialogue and pass meaningful legislation to address this issue. As a first step, it is my hope that we can expedite passage this bill, to remember and honor the life of Joseph Ileto.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD. There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1964

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

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION OF JOSEPH ILETO POST OFFICE.

The United States Post Office located at 14071 Peyton Drive in Chino Hills, California, shall be known and designated as the "Joseph Ileto Post Office".

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the post office referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the Joseph Ileto Post Office.

By Mr. DOMENICI (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN):

S. 1965. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior, the Bureau of Reclamation, to conduct a feasibility study on
the Jicarilla Apache Reservation in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

LEGISLATION AUTHORIZING THE BUREAU OF RECLAMATION TO CONDUCT A FEASIBILITY STUDY REGARDING WATER SUPPLY ON THE JICARILLA APACHE INDIAN RESERVATION IN NEW MEXICO

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I am pleased to be joined by Senator BINGMAN in introducing legislation authorizing the Bureau of Reclamation to conduct a feasibility study regarding water supply on the Jicarilla Apache Indian Reservation in New Mexico. There are major deficiencies with regard to safe water supplies for residents of the Jicarilla Apache Reservation, since the federally owned municipal water system is severely dilapidated.

The United States has a trust responsibility to ensure that adequate and safe water supplies are available to meet the water requirements necessary for domestic, municipal, rural, and industrial water supply, and public health needs of the Jicarilla Apache Indian Reservation. Today, the House of Representatives passed identical legislation to help resolve this problem.

The Jicarilla Apache Tribe is a federally recognized Indian nation in northern New Mexico, with over 3,000 citizens. In the 1920s, the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) constructed a water delivery system to serve federal facilities on the Reservation. In the 1960s, the system was extended to serve tribal facilities and members, but for the last 20 years this federal owned and operated water system has been deteriorating due to inadequate federal funding for regular maintenance and improvement.

No capital improvements have been made to the system for at least ten years. Currently, the system is not in compliance with Federal safe drinking water standards or pollutant discharge standards for the residents of the Reservation.

In October of 1988, the inlet system collapsed and caused a devastating five-day water outage on the Reservation. That catastrophe required emergency assistance from the National Guard. A home burned to the ground without necessary water to fight the fire. After that experience, the Tribe expended its own funds to make some repairs, and began a large-scale evaluation of the system. The Tribe has discovered serious problems with the system.

Line breaks are common and frequent, and existing supply facilities are near or at maximum capacity. The Jicarilla Apaches have had to ration water for the last seven summers. According to a recent EPA report, the water system on the Jicarilla Reservation is the third worst system operating in a six-state region. In addition to being out of compliance with federal water quality standards, the sewage plant has been operating without a federal discharge permit, exposing the BIA to fines up to $25,000 per day.

Sewage lagoons are operating at 200% capacity, and wastewater spillage threatens not only the Jicarilla Apaches, but down-stream communities in New Mexico and beyond. The Jicarilla Apache Tribal Council has declared a state of emergency due to the continued operation of these unsafe water systems.

The Tribe has been forced to expend their own funds due to the serious health threats posed by the unsafe systems. These health threats that these systems pose, their inadequate and unsafe condition has virtually suspended social and economic development on the Reservation. The water deficiencies have forced the Tribe to place a moratorium on new projects, including housing, school, senior center, post office, and health care facility construction. These projects cannot be completed, even though many are already funded, due to the unsafe and non-compliance infrastructure cannot support any further development. While the federal government is entirely responsible to maintain and operate the federal water systems which serve the Reservation, the BIA lacks the resources to improve the system.

The water system on the Jicarilla Apache Reservation is one of only two or three such systems still being maintained by the BIA. The BIA does not even own equipment necessary for routine sewer cleaning. While the BIA has continued federal responsibility for these systems, BIA no longer budgets water delivery systems.

In fact, Kevin Gover of the BIA referred the Tribe to the Bureau of Reclamation for assistance. The Bureau of Reclamation has the needed expertise to help, having experience in providing water to Native Americans through irrigation projects, as well as providing water supplies to other rural communities.

The Tribe wants to eventually own and operate the water system, and the BIA wishes to be reimbursed by the Bureau of Reclamation for completion of rehabilitation of this project. This legislation will allow the Bureau of Reclamation to conduct a feasibility study to determine the best method for developing a safe and adequate municipal, rural, and industrial water supply for the residents of the Jicarilla Apache Indian Reservation in the State of New Mexico.

We want to help the Jicarilla Apaches end their water crisis, and secure congressional authorization for the necessary studies the Bureau of Reclamation has the expertise to conduct. I ask unanimous consent that our proposed legislation and the Jicarilla Apache Council Resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,
the members of the tribe and on matters relating to particular individuals, officials or circumstances; and

Whereas, the Jicarilla Apache Tribal Council has the power to authorize tribal officials to act on its behalf for regulatory and other purposes; and

Whereas, the lack of adequate and safe drinking water facilities on the Jicarilla Apache Reservation leads to serious health problems among tribal members and other residents, including an increased risk of loss of life and morbidity and diseases; and

Whereas, the current water treatment plant, water delivery infrastructure and sewage system on the Jicarilla Apache Reservation are owned and operated by the United States, through the Jicarilla Agency Bureaus of Indian Affairs ("BIA"); and

Whereas, the Federal Government has a trust responsibility to provide safe drinking water to the Jicarilla Apache people and the United States has failed to carry out this responsibility by not providing the BIA adequate resources to properly maintain and operate the water systems; and

Whereas, on October 1998, due to the lack of adequate Federal resources to properly maintain and operate the water systems, the inlet system that diverts water from the Navajo River, collapsed causing a catastrophic five-day water outage on the Jicarilla Apache Reservation, which necessitated emergency relief by the National Guard; and

Whereas, the Jicarilla Apache Tribe worked around the clock to restore water and expended tribal funds to do so, and as a result of the water outage, the Jicarilla Apache Tribe began investigating and evaluating the operation of the water systems and discovered numerous additional problems; and

Whereas, the water treatment plant, which treats water diverted from the Navajo River prior to being released for public consumption in Dulce, New Mexico, has been the subject of various notices of environmental non-compliance by the United States Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA");

Whereas, the sewage facilities that serve the Jicarilla Apache Reservation are not in compliance with Federal law and are operating without a federal discharge permit, which exposes the BIA to fines up to $25,000 a day, and to meet the national requirements, a new waste water plant must be constructed; and

Whereas, although the Federal Government is responsible for maintaining and operating the water systems that serve the Jicarilla Apache Reservation, the Tribe has been forced to take action out of its own funds due to the serious health threats the deficient and unsafe systems have on the people within and near the Reservation; and

Whereas, based on the analysis and recommendation of the Tribe's engineers and consultants, the Tribal Council has authorized the construction of a new inlet system, waste water treatment plant, and sewage facilities, and the rehabilitation of the water delivery infrastructure; and

Whereas, Congress amended the Safe Drinking Water Act, in 1996 and found, among other things, that:

1. safe drinking water is essential to the protection of public health;

2. the current legislation of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300f et seq.) now exceed the financial and technical capacity of some public water systems, especially in tribal water systems, the Federal Government needs to provide assistance to communities to help the communities meet Federal drinking water requirements.

3. more effective protection of public health requires prevention of drinking water contamination through well-trained system operators, water systems with adequate managerial, technical and financial capacity and enhanced protection of source waters of public water systems;

4. compliance with the requirements of the Safe Drinking Water Act continues to be a concern at public water systems experiencing technical limitations, and Federal, State and local governments need more resources and more effective authority to attain the objectives of the Safe Drinking Water Act;

5. Federal health services to maintain and improve the health of the Indians are consistent with and required by the Federal Government’s trust relationship with the American Indian people;

Whereas, the repair and replacement authority by the Tribal Council is consistent with the Congressional purposes of ensuring safe drinking water to the public;

Whereas, Indian tribes are recognized as domestic nations under the protection of the United States Government and possessed with the inherent powers of government; and

Whereas, pursuant to the Federal trust relationship with the Indian tribes arising from the United States Constitution, United States Supreme Court case law, treaties, statutes and regulations, the Federal Government had fiduciary duties to Indian tribes to protect tribal self-government and to provide and ensure adequate and safe drinking water; and

Whereas, in accordance with the Federal policy of Indian Self-Determination, the Federal government has pledged to assist Indian tribes in making reservations permanent homes from Indian people; and

Whereas, The Federal Indian policy of Self-Determination and the Federal trust relationship to Indian tribes require that the Federal government conduct government-to-government consultations with Indian tribes on matters affecting tribal interests and to promote tribal economic development, tribal governments, tribal self-sufficiency, which includes proper and adequate and safe drinking water facilities.

Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, by the Tribal Council of the Jicarilla Apache Tribe that the Tribal Council hereby declares that the Jicarilla Apache Reservation is in a state of critical emergency due to the continued operation of the unsafe water systems that serve the Jicarilla Apache Reservation. Be It Further Resolved, by the Tribal Council of the Jicarilla Apache Tribe that the Tribal Council, hereby authorizes the Vice-President and his staff to do all acts immediate and necessary to address this emergency, including but not limited to, executing contracts, consulting on a government-to-government basis with Congressional members and the Executive Branch, including the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Education and Human Services and the United States Environmental Protection Agency, to exercise their Federal trust responsibility with the Jicarilla Apache Tribe on a government-to-government basis to address this emergency.

By Mr. COCHRAN (for himself and Mr. LOTT):

S. 1967. A bill to make technical corrections to the status of certain land held in trust for the Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians, to take certain land into trust for that Band, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

MISSISSIPPI BAND OF CHOCTAW INDIANS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, today I am introducing a bill to make technical corrections to the status of certain land held in trust for the Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians, and to take certain land into trust for the Band.

Mr. President, the lands involved in this bill are lands currently owned by the tribe. Over the last 20 years, the tribe has attempted to transfer the land to reservation land, through the regular processes of the Department of Interior and the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The land transfer applications have the support of the State of Mississippi and the local neighboring governments.

Countless times over the years, the tribe has been told by the Department that land transfer applications have been lost and that action would occur soon. Bushing, a school and a medical clinic are among the construction plans that are detained because of the inaction by the Department and BIA. Mr. President, this tribe is simply out of time. The school waiting to be replaced has over two pages of safety violations from the BIA. The medical clinic will not pass its next inspection. Thousands of Mississippi Choctaw citizens have substandard living conditions because of the lack of available housing. Mr. President, the Choctaws are held up as the best example of self determination. Yet, the federal government seems determined to throw obstacles in the course of their success. The history of these land acquisition applications and the treatment of the tribe is intolerable.

The Congressional Budget Office has reviewed the bill and advises it has no budgetary impact. I urge the Senate to pass this bill.

By Mr. CRAIG (for himself, Mr. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. THOMAS):

S. 1259. A bill to provide for improved management of, and increased accountability for, outfitted activities by which the public gains access to and occupancy and use of Federal land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

THE OUTFITTER POLICY ACT OF 1999

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce today in conjunction with my colleagues Senator MURKOWSKI and Senator THOMAS the Outfitter Policy Act of 1999. The legislation is very similar to legislation I introduced in the past congress. As that legislation did, this bill would put into law many of the management practices by which federal land managers have successfully managed the outfitter and guide industry on National Forests, National Parks and other federal lands over many decades.
The bill recognizes that many Americans want and seek out the skills and experience of commercial outfitters and guides to help them enjoy a safe and pleasant journey through our forests and deserts and over the rivers and lakes that are the spectacular destinations for many visitors to our federal lands.

The Outfitter Policy Act would assure the public continued opportunities for reasonable and safe access to the recreational opportunities found throughout our public lands. It establishes high standards that will be met for the health and welfare of visitors who choose outfitted services. It will help guarantee that quality professional services will be available for their recreational and educational experiences on federal land.

This legislation is needed because the management of outfitting and guiding services by this Administration had created problems that threaten to destabilize many of these typically small, independent outfitter and guide businesses. In addressing these problems, this legislation relies heavily on practices that have historically worked well for outfitters, visitors, and other users groups, as well as for federal land managers in the field. When the bill is enacted, it will assure that these past levels of service are continued and enhanced.

Previous hearings and discussions on prior versions of this legislation helped to refine the bill I am introducing today. This process provided the intended opportunity for discussion. It allowed time for consideration of the historical practices that have offered consistent, reliable outfitter services to the public. The legislation I am now introducing is a result of that process.

I look forward to considering this legislation in the coming session of the 106th Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the Record.

The being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the Record.

S. 1999

Became 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 "Outfitter Policy Act of 1999".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) the experience, skills, trained staff, and investment in equipment that are provided by authorized outfitters are necessary to provide access to Federal land to members of the public that need or desire commercial outfitted activities to facilitate their use and enjoyment of recreational or educational opportunities on Federal land;

(2) such activities constitute an important contribution toward meeting the recreation agency's objectives of off-source management plans approved and administered by agencies of the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior;

(3) an effective relationship between those agencies and authorized outfitters requires implementation of agency policies and programs that provide for—

(A) a reasonable opportunity for an authorized outfitter to realize a profit;

(B) a fair and reasonable return to the United States through appropriate fees;

(C) renewal of outfitter permits based on a performance evaluation system that rewards outfitters that meet required performance standards and discontinues outfitters that fail to meet those standards; and

(D) transfer of an outfitter permit to the qualified purchaser of the operation of an authorized outfitter, an heir or assign, or another qualified person or entity; and

(4) the provision of opportunities for outfitted visitors to Federal land to engage in fishing and hunting is best served by continued recognition that the States retain primary authority over the taking of fish and wildlife on Federal land.

SEC. 3. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to establish terms and conditions of access to, and occupancy and use of, Federal land by visitors who require or desire the assistance of an authorized outfitter; and

(2) to establish a stable climate that encourages a qualified person or entity to provide, and to continue to invest in the ability to provide, outfitted visitors with access to, and occupancy and use of, Federal land.

SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ACTUAL USE. The term "actual use" means the portion of a principal allocation of outfitter use that an authorized outfitter uses in conducting commercial outfitted activities during a period, for a location, or in terms of another measurement of the term or outfitted activities covered by an outfitter permit.

(2) ALLOCATION OF USE.

(A) IN GENERAL. The term "allocation of use" means a method or measurement of access that—

(i) is granted by the Secretary to an authorized outfitter for the purpose of facilitating the occupancy and use of Federal land by an authorized outfitter;

(ii) takes the form of—

(I) an amount or type of commercial outfitted activity resulting from an apportionment of the total recreation capacity of a resource area; or

(II) in the case of a resource area for which recreation capacity has not been apportioned, a type of commercial outfitted activity conducted in a manner that is not inconsistent with or incompatible with an approved resource management plan; and

(iii) is calibrated in terms of amount of use, type of use, or location of a commercial outfitted activity, including user days or portions of user days, seasons or other periods of operation, launch dates, assigned camps, or other formulations of the type or amount of authorized activity.

(B) INCLUSION. The term "allocation of use" includes the designation of a geographic area, zone, or district in which a limited number of authorized outfitters are authorized to operate.

(3) AUTHORIZED OUTFITTER.

(A) IN GENERAL. The term "authorized outfitter" means a person that conducts a commercial outfitted activity on Federal land under an outfitter authorization.

(B) INCLUSION. The term "authorized outfitter" includes an outfitter that conducts a commercial outfitted activity on Federal land under an outfitter authorization awarded under an agreement between the Secretary and a State or local government that is in compliance with the requirements of a State or local agency of commercial outfitted activities on Federal land.

(4) COMMERCIAL OUTFITTED ACTIVITY. The term "commercial outfitted activity" means an authorized outfitted activity—

(A) that is available to the public; and

(B) that is conducted under the direction of paid staff; and

(C) for which an outfitted visitor is required to pay more than shared expenses (including payment to an authorized outfitter that is a nonprofit organization).

(5) FEDERAL AGENCY. The term "Federal agency" means—

(A) the Forest Service;

(B) the Bureau of Land Management;

(C) the United States Fish and Wildlife Service; and

(D) the Bureau of Reclamation.

(6) FEDERAL LAND. The term "Federal land" means all land and interests in land administered by a Federal agency.

(8) LIVELIVERY. The term "livery" means the dropping off or picking up of visitors, supplies, or equipment on Federal land.

(9) OUTFITTER AUTHORIZATION. The term "authorized outfitter authorization" means an outfitter authorization under section 6(f).

(10) OUTFITTER ACTIVITY. The term "outcome activity" means an activity—

(i) such as outfitting, guiding, supervision, education, interpretation, skills training, assistance, or livery operation conducted for a member of the public in an outdoor environment; and

(ii) that uses the recreational, natural, historical, or cultural resources of Federal land.

(11) OUTFITTER VISITOR. The term "authorized outfitter" means a person that relies on an authorized outfitter for access to and occupancy and use of Federal land.

(12) OUTFITTER. The term "outfitter" means a person that conducts a commercial outfitted activity, including a person that, by local custom or tradition, is known as a "guide".

(13) OUTFITTER AUTHORIZATION. The term "outfitter authorization" means—

(A) an outfitter permit; or

(B) a limited outfitter authorization.

(14) OUTFITTER PERMIT. The term "outfitter permit" means an outfitter permit under section 6.

(15) PRINCIPAL ALLOCATION OF OUTFITTER USE. The term "principal allocation of outfitter use" means a principal allocation of outfitter use that—

(A) is consistent, reliable; and

(B) that relies on an authorized outfitter for access to, and occupancy and use of, Federal land.
(16) RESOURCE AREA.—The term "resource area" means a management unit that is described by or contained within the boundaries of—
(A) a national forest;
(B) an area of public land;
(C) a wildlife refuge;
(D) a congressionally designated area;
(E) a wilderness or scenic area; or
(F) any other Federal planning unit (including an area in which outfitted activities are regulated by more than 1 Federal agency).

(17) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means—
(A) with respect to Federal land administered by the Forest Service, the Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Chief of the Forest Service or a designee;
(B) with respect to Federal land administered by the Bureau of Land Management, the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Land Management or a designee;
(C) with respect to Federal land administered by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Acting Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service or a designee; and
(D) with respect to Federal land administered by the Bureau of Reclamation, the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Commissioner of Reclamation or a designee.

(18) TEMPORARY ALLOCATION OF USE.—The term "allocation of use" means an allocation of use to an authorized outfitter in accordance with section 9.

SEC. 5. NONOUTFITTER USE AND ENJOYMENT.

Nothing in this Act enlarges or diminishes the right of public use and enjoyment of Federal land under any applicable law (including planning process rules and any administrative or noncommercial individual or entity that is not an authorized outfitter or outfitted visitor.

SEC. 6. OUTFITTER AUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—
(1) PROHIBITION.—No person or entity, except an authorized outfitter, shall conduct a commercial outfitted activity on Federal land.
(2) CONDUCT OF OUTFITTED ACTIVITIES.—An authorized outfitter shall not conduct an outfitted activity on Federal land except in accordance with an outfitter authorization.
(3) SPECIAL RULE FOR ALASKA.—With respect to a commercial outfitted activity conducted in the State of Alaska, the Secretary shall not establish or impose a limitation on access by an authorized outfitter that is inconsistent with the access ensured under subsections (a) and (b) of section 1101 of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 3170).
(4) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—An outfitter authorization shall specify—
(I) the rights and obligations of the authorized outfitter and the Secretary; and
(J) other terms and conditions of the authorization.
(c) CRITERIA FOR AWARD OF AN outfitter PERMIT.—The Secretary shall establish criteria for award of an outfitter permit that—
(I) identify skilled, experienced, and financially capable persons or entities with knowledge of the resource area to offer and conduct commercial outfitted activities;
(ii) provide a stable regulatory climate in accordance with this Act and other law (including regulations) that encourages a qualified person to provide, and continue to invest in the ability to provide, commercial outfitted activities;
(iii) provide for a reasonable opportunity for an authorized outfitter to realize a profit;
(iv) subordinate considerations of revenue to the United States to the objectives of—
(I) providing recreational or educational opportunities for the outfitted visitor;
(II) providing for the health and welfare of the public; and
(III) conserving resources.
(d) AWARD.—
(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may award an outfitter permit if—
(I) the commercial outfitted activity to be authorized is not inconsistent with or incompatible with an approved resource management plan applicable to the resource area in which the commercial outfitted activity is to be conducted; and
(II) the authorized outfitter meets the criteria established by the Secretary.
(2) USE OF COMPETITIVE PROCESS.—
(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided by this Act, the Secretary shall use a competitive process to select an authorized outfitter to which an outfitter permit is to be awarded.
(B) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary may award an outfitter permit to an applicant without conducting a competitive selection process if the Secretary determines that—
(i) the applicant meets criteria established by the Secretary under subsection (c); and
(ii) there is no competitive interest in the commercial outfitted activity to be conducted.
(C) EXCEPTION FOR RENEWALS AND TRANSFERS.—The Secretary shall award an outfitter permit to an applicant without conducting a competitive selection process if the authorization is a renewal or transfer of an existing outfitter permit under section 11 or 12.
(e) PROVISIONS OF OUTFITTER PERMITS.—
(1) IN GENERAL.—An outfitter permit shall provide for—
(I) the health and welfare of the public;
(II) conservation of resource values;
(III) a fair and reasonable return to the United States through an authorization fee in accordance with section 7;
(IV) a term of 10 years; and
(V) the obligation of an authorized outfitter to defend and indemnify the United States for the reasonable cost of any action taken by the United States through an authorization fee.
(2) REQUIREMENTS. —The amount of the authorization fee shall be based on—
(i) the gross receipts of the authorized outfitter for actual use of Federal land; or
(ii) if calculated as a percentage of revenue, shall be determined based on adjusted gross receipts.

(3) ADJUSTED GROSS RECEIPTS.—For the purpose of paragraphs (2)(A)(i) and (ii), the Secretary shall—
(A) take into consideration revenue from the gross receipts of the authorized outfitter from commercial outfitted activities conducted on Federal land and
(B) exclude from consideration any revenue that is derived from—
(i) fees paid by the authorized outfitter to an agent of Federal, State, or local government for—
(I) hunting or fishing licenses;
(II) entrance or recreation fees; or
(III) other purposes (other than commercial outfitted activities conducted on Federal land); and
(ii) operations on non-Federal land.

(d) SUBSTANTIALLY SIMILAR SERVICES IN A SPECIFIC GEOGRAPHIC AREA.—
(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), if more than 1 outfitter is awarded to conduct or similar commercial outfitted activities in the same resource area, the Secretary shall establish an identical fee for all such outfitter permits.
(B) EXCEPTION.—The terms and conditions of an existing outfitter permit shall not be subject to modification or open to renegotiation at any time during the term of an outfitter permit.

(e) PROVISIONS OF OUTFITTER PERMITS. —An outfitter permit shall—
(1) IN GENERAL.—An outfitter permit shall provide for—
(I) fees paid by the authorized outfitter to the United States for the reasonable cost of any action taken by the United States through an authorization fee;
(II) terms and conditions of the authorization fee;
(III) payment of the authorization fee to reflect material changes from the authorization fee specified by or contained within the boundaries of the resource area for the same or similar commercial outfitted activities conducted on Federal land.
(2) RENEWAL OR TERMINATION OF AN OUTFITTER PERMIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—An outfitter permit shall be renewed or terminated by the Secretary.

(b) TERMINATION. —The Secretary may terminate an outfitter permit if—
(I) the authorized outfitter fails to comply with the terms of the outfitter permit; or
(II) the authorized outfitter fails to pay the authorization fee.

(c) REISSUANCE OR RENEWAL.—A limited outfitter permit may be renewed or reissued by the Secretary for a term of not to exceed 2 years.

(d) AWARD.—The Secretary may award an outfitter permit if—
(1) the authorized outfitter meets the criteria established by the Secretary under this Act; and
(2) the authorized outfitter is in compliance with all the terms and conditions of the outfitter permit.
activities at more than 1 resource area shall be no greater than the equivalent fee charged for 1 full user day.

(B) RECONSIDERATION OF FEE.—The authorization fee may be reconsidered during the term of the outfitter permit in accordance with paragraph (6) or section 9(c)(3) at the request of the Secretary or the authorized outfitter.

(6) ADJUSTMENT OF FEES.—The amount of an authorization fee shall be determined as of the date of the outfitter permit; and may be modified to reflect—

(i) changes relating to the terms and conditions of the outfitter permit, including 1 or more outfitter permits described in paragraph (5);

(ii) extraordinary unanticipated changes affecting operating conditions, such as natural disasters, economic conditions, or other material adverse changes from the terms and conditions specified in the outfitter permit;

(iii) changes affecting operating or economic conditions determined by other governing entities, such as the availability of State fish or game licenses; or

(iv) the imposition of new or higher fees assessed under other law.

(c) ESTABLISHMENT OF AMOUNT APPLICABLE TO A LIMITED OUTFITTER AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary shall determine the amount of an authorization fee for any, under a limited outfitter authorization.

SEC. 8. LIABILITY AND INDEMNIFICATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—An authorized outfitter shall defend and indemnify the United States, its agents, employees, or contractors, or third parties for costs or expenses associated with injury, death, or damage to any person or property caused by the authorized outfitter’s negligence, carelessness, or willful and wanton disregard for persons or property arising directly out of the authorized outfitter’s conduct of a commercial outfitted activity under an outfitter authorization.

(b) NO LIABILITY.—An authorized outfitter—

(1) shall have no responsibility to defend or indemnify the United States, its agents, employees, or contractors, or third parties for costs or expenses associated with injury, death, or damage to any person or property resulting from the inherent risks of the commercial outfitted activity conducted by the authorized outfitter under the outfitter authorization or the inherent risks present on Federal land;

(2) may provide a temporary allocation of outfitter use to the current authorized outfitter that—

(1) in the case of the renewal of an outfitter permit, is not inconsistent with or incompatible with the terms and conditions of an approved resource management plan applicable to the resource area in which the commercial outfitted activity occurs; or

(2) in the case of a transfer or temporary extension of an outfitter permit, is the same amount of principal allocation of outfitter use provided to the current authorized outfitter;

(3) WAIVER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—At the request of an authorized outfitter, the Secretary may waive any obligation of the authorized outfitter to use all or part of the amount of allocation of use provided under the outfitter permit, if the request is made in sufficient time to allow the Secretary to temporarily reallocate the unused portion of the allocation of use in that season or calendar year.

(2) RECLAIMING OF ALLOCATION OF USE.—Unless the Secretary has reallocated the unused portion of an allocation of use in accordance with paragraph (1), the authorized outfitter may reclaim any part of the unused portion in that season or calendar year.

(3) NO FEE OBLIGATION.—An outfitter permit fee may not be charged for any amount of allocation of use subject to a waiver under paragraph (1).

(d) ADJUSTMENT TO ALLOCATION OF USE.—The Secretary—

(1) may adjust an allocation of use assigned to an authorized outfitter to reflect—

(A) material change arising from approval of a change in the resource management plan for the area of operation; or

(B) requirements arising under another law; and

(2) shall provide an authorized outfitter with documentation supporting the basis for any adjustment in the principal allocation of outfitter use, including new terms and conditions that result from the adjustment.

(e) TEMPORARY ALLOCATION OF USE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A temporary allocation of use may be provided to an authorized outfitter at the discretion of the Secretary for a period not to exceed 2 years.

(2) RENEWALS, TRANSFERS, AND EXTENSIONS.—A temporary allocation of use may be renewed, transferred, or extended at the discretion of the Secretary.

SEC. 9. ALLOCATION OF USE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In a manner that is not inconsistent with or incompatible with an approved resource management plan applicable to the resource area in which a commercial outfitted activity occurs, the Secretary—

(1) shall provide a principal allocation of outfitter use, under an outfitter permit; and

(2) may provide a temporary allocation of use to an authorized outfitter under an outfitter permit.

(b) RENEWALS, TRANSFERS, AND EXTENSIONS.—The Secretary shall provide a principal allocation of outfitter use to an authorized outfitter that—

(1) in the case of the renewal of an outfitter permit, is not inconsistent with or incompatible with the terms and conditions of the outfitter permit; and

(2) in the case of a transfer or temporary extension of an outfitter permit, is the same amount of principal allocation of outfitter use provided to the current authorized outfitter.

(c) WAIVER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—At the request of an authorized outfitter, the Secretary may waive any obligation of the authorized outfitter to use all or part of the amount of allocation of use provided under the outfitter permit, if the request is made in sufficient time to allow the Secretary to temporarily reallocate the unused portion of the allocation of use in that season or calendar year.

(2) RECLAIMING OF ALLOCATION OF USE.—Unless the Secretary has reallocated the unused portion of an allocation of use in accordance with paragraph (1), the authorized outfitter may reclaim any part of the unused portion in that season or calendar year.

(3) NO FEE OBLIGATION.—An outfitter permit fee may not be charged for any amount of allocation of use subject to a waiver under paragraph (1).

(d) ADJUSTMENT TO ALLOCATION OF USE.—The Secretary—

(1) may adjust an allocation of use assigned to an authorized outfitter to reflect—

(A) material change arising from approval of a change in the resource management plan for the area of operation; or

(B) requirements arising under another law; and

(2) shall provide an authorized outfitter with documentation supporting the basis for any adjustment in the principal allocation of outfitter use, including new terms and conditions that result from the adjustment.

(e) TEMPORARY ALLOCATION OF USE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A temporary allocation of use may be provided to an authorized outfitter at the discretion of the Secretary for a period not to exceed 2 years.

(2) RENEWALS, TRANSFERS, AND EXTENSIONS.—A temporary allocation of use may be renewed, transferred, or extended at the discretion of the Secretary.

(f) DETERMINATION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR RENEWAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The results of all annual performance evaluations of an authorized outfitter shall be reviewed by the Secretary in the year preceding the year in which the outfitter permit expires to determine whether the authorized outfitter’s overall performance during the term has met the requirements for renewal under section 11.

(2) FAILURE TO EVALUATE.—If, in any year of the term of an outfitter authorization, the Secretary fails to evaluate the performance of the authorized outfitter by the date that is
60 days after the conclusion of the authorized outfitter’s operating season, the performance of the authorized outfitter in that year shall be considered to have been good.

(3) More than 60 days after the end of the year preceding the year in which an outfitter permit expires, the Secretary shall renew the authorization in accordance with paragraph (2).

(4) A determination based on annual performance rating. The Secretary shall renew the authorization in accordance with paragraph (1) at the request of the authorized outfitter and subject to the requirements of this Act if the Secretary determines that the authorized outfitter has received not more than 1 unsatisfactory annual performance rating under section 10 during the term of the outfitter permit.

(5) The authorized outfitter's conduct demonstrates repeated and willful disregard for—

(A) the health and welfare of outfitted visitors; and

(B) the conservation of resources on which the commercial outfitted activities are conducted.

SEC. 12. TRANSFERABILITY OF OUTFITTER PERMITS.

(a) Renewal at Expiration of Term.—

(1) In General.—On the expiration of the term of an outfitter authorization, the Secretary shall renew the authorization in accordance with paragraph (2).

(2) Determination Based on Annual Performance Rating.—The Secretary shall renew the authorization in accordance with paragraph (1) if the Secretary determines that the authorized outfitter has received not more than 1 unsatisfactory annual performance rating under section 10 during the term of the outfitter permit.

(b) Termination.—An outfitter permit may be terminated only if the Secretary determines that—

(1) the authorized outfitter has failed to correct a violation of this Act, or other violation for which the authorized outfitter received notice under section 10(c)(2)(B) and the condition is considered by the Secretary to be significant with respect to the health and safety of visitors or the conservation of resources; or

(2) the authorized outfitter is repeatedly in arrears in the payment of fees under section 10(c)(2)(B) and the condition is considered by the Secretary to determine that all the terms of the outfitter authorization have been and are being satisfactorily fulfilled.

(c) Burden on Authorized Outfitter.—The recordkeeping requirements established by the Secretary shall incorporate simplified procedures that do not impose an undue burden on an authorized outfitter.

(d) Access to Records.—The Secretary, or an authorized representative of the Secretary, shall, at the end of the fifth calendar year beginning after the end of the business year of an authorized outfitter, have access to and the right to examine any reports, records, and documents of the authorized outfitter relating to each outfitter authorization held by the authorized outfitter during the business year.

(e) Appeals Procedure.—The Secretary shall by regulation—

(1) grant an authorized outfitter full access to all information under the Secretary's authority at the time of an appeal, and

(2) establish a simplified procedure for consideration of appeals of Federal agency decisions to deny, suspend, fail to renew, or terminate an outfitter permit.

(f) Judicial Review.—An authorized outfitter has standing to file a lawsuit in a Federal district court.

SEC. 13. RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENTS.

(a) In General.—An authorized outfitter shall maintain records as the Secretary may require to enable the Secretary to determine that all the terms of the outfitter authorization have been and are being satisfactorily fulfilled.

(b) Access to Records.—The Secretary, or an authorized representative of the Secretary, shall, at the end of the fifth calendar year beginning after the end of the business year of an authorized outfitter, have access to and the right to examine any reports, records, and documents of the authorized outfitter relating to each outfitter authorization held by the authorized outfitter during the business year.

(c) Appeals and Judicial Review.

(1) Appeal Procedure.—The Secretary shall by regulation—

(A) establish a simplified procedure for consideration of appeals of Federal agency decisions to deny, suspend, fail to renew, or terminate an outfitter permit; and

(B) establish a simplified procedure for consideration of appeals of Federal agency decisions to deny, suspend, fail to renew, or terminate an outfitter permit.

(2) Judicial Review.—An authorized outfitter may file a lawsuit in a Federal district court.

SEC. 14. APPEALS AND JUDICIAL REVIEW.

(a) Appeals Procedure.—The Secretary shall by regulation—

(1) grant an authorized outfitter full access to all information under the Secretary's authority at the time of an appeal, and

(2) establish a simplified procedure for consideration of appeals of Federal agency decisions to deny, suspend, fail to renew, or terminate an outfitter permit.

(b) Judicial Review.—An authorized outfitter may file a lawsuit in a Federal district court.

SEC. 15. CONSERVATION WITH OTHER LAW.

(a) Off-Road Vehicle Management Plan.—The plans for the conservation of resources on which the commercial outfitted activities are conducted shall be consistent with the plans for the conservation of resources on Federal land.

(b) Other Laws.—The plans for the conservation of resources on which the commercial outfitted activities are conducted shall be consistent with all laws (including regulations) applicable to the outfitted activities, including those under title IV of the National Park Omnibus Management Act of 1998 (16 U.S.C. 5951 et seq.).

(c) State Outfitter Licensing Law.—This Act does not preempt any outfitter or guide licensing law (including any regulation) of any State or territory.

SEC. 19. TRANSITION PROVISIONS.

(a) In General.—

(1) Outfitters with Satisfactory Ratings.—An outfitter that holds a permit, contract, or other authorization for commercial outfitted activities or (an extension of such a permit, contract, or other authorization) in effect on the date of enactment of this Act shall be entitled, on request or on expiration of the authorization, to the issuance of an outfitter permit under this Act unless the Secretary determines that the outfitter's aggregate performance under the permit, contract, or other authorization was good or was the result of sufficient professional, financial, and other owner of an interest in the operation of the authorized outfitter; or

(b) Effect of Issuance of Outfitter Permit.—The issuance of an outfitter permit under subsection (a) shall not adversely affect any right or obligation that existed under the permit, contract, or other authorization on the date of enactment of this Act.

By Mr. SPECTER:

S. 1970. A bill to amend chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the liability of the United States for claims of military personnel for damages for certain injuries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FERES DOCTRINE REVERSAL LEGISLATION

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I seek recognition to introduce a bill which will overturn what has come to be known as the 'Feres doctrine.' In the 1950 case of Feres v. United States, the Supreme Court held that the United States Government is not liable under the Federal Tort Claims Act for injuries to military personnel where the injuries are sustained 'incident to service.' Under the Feres doctrine, therefore, a soldier would not be able to seek compensation from the government for injuries sustained due to government negligence unless the soldier happened to be on leave or furlough at the time he or she sustained the injuries.

Over the years, we have seen the Feres doctrine produce anomalous results which reflect neither the will of Congress nor the intent of the Federal Tort Claims Act. Over the years, we have seen the Feres doctrine produce anomalous results which reflect neither the will of Congress nor the intent of the Federal Tort Claims Act.
the Congress nor basic common sense. For instance, under Feres, a soldier who is the victim of medical malpractice at an army hospital cannot sue the government for compensation. Likewise, his family cannot sue for compensation for his death because of an error in treating his injury. A civilian who suffers from the same malpractice would be entitled to file suit against the government. Likewise, if a soldier driving home from work on an army base hits a negligently driven army truck, he is barred from suing the government for compensation. If the soldier dies in the accident, his family will be barred from suing for compensation.

Meanwhile, we can see why a civilian hit by the same truck would have a cause of action against the United States. Unfortunately, the individuals hurt by the Feres doctrine are the men and women of our armed forces—people whom we should protect and reward, not punish.

The recent decision of the Third Circuit Court of Appeals in O’Neill v. United States illustrates the troubling problem presented by the Feres doctrine.

In O’Neill, the family of slain Naval officer Kerryn O’Neil was barred from pursuing a wrongful death claim against the government under the Feres doctrine. O’Neil was murdered by her former fiancé, George Smith, a Navy ensign. The two met at the U.S. Naval Academy and were stationed at the same Naval base in California. After Ms. O’Neil broke off their engagement, Mr. Smith began to stalk her. One day, O’Neil watched a movie with a friend, Smith came to her building and killed her, her friend, and then himself.

After the murders, Kerryn O’Neil’s family learned that Mr. Smith had scored in the 99.99th percentile for aggressive/destructive behavior in Navy psychological tests. Under Naval procedures, these results should have been forwarded to the Department of Psychiatry at the Naval Hospital for a full psychological evaluation. Had their claim not been barred, the O’Neils would have argued that the Navy was negligent in failing to follow up on these extreme test results. I do not know whether the O’Neils’ deserved to be compensated under the Act—this depends on the specific facts and the case law in this area. But it does seem clear to me that the O’Neils should not have been pursuing their claim because their daughter’s fatal injuries were sustained “incident to service.”

Of course, there are situations in which soldiers should not be allowed to sue the government in tort. For example, a combat situation, countless judgment calls are made which result in death or injuries to soldiers. We cannot have lawyers and judges second guessing the decisions made by field commanders if the combatants are in the heat of battle. But such considerations do not necessitate that military personnel should lose the right to sue the government in any context.

The bill I introduce today will reverse the court-created Feres doctrine and return the law to the way it was originally intended by Congress. My bill is very short and simple. It amends the Federal Tort Claims Act to specifically state that the Feres doctrine applies to military personnel on active duty the same as it applies to anyone else. My bill further specifies that military personnel will be limited by the exceptions to government liability already included in the Act, including the bar on liability for injuries sustained in combat and the bar on liability for claims which arise in a foreign country. In short, my bill will ensure that members of our armed forces will be entitled to damages they deserve when injured through negligence or wrongful actions of the Federal government or its agents, except for certain limited cases contemplated by Congress when it originally passed the Act.

Congress passed the Federal Tort Claims Act in 1946 to give the general consent of the government to be sued in tort, subject to several specific restrictions. Under the common law doctrine of sovereign immunity, the United States could not be sued without such specific consent. The Act provides that the government will be held liable “in the same manner and to the same extent as a private individual under like circumstances.” Thus, the Act makes the United States liable for the wrongs of its employees and agents to the extent that private employers are liable under state law for the torts of their employees and agents.

The Act contains many exceptions to government liability, but it does not contain an explicit exception for injuries sustained by military personnel incident to service. In fact, one of the Act’s exceptions prevents “any claim arising out of the combat activities of military forces, or the Coast Guard during time of war.” By including this exception, Congress clearly contemplated the special case of military personnel and decided that certain limits must be placed on government liability in this context. But by drawing this exception narrowly and limiting it to combat situations, Congress rejected any broad exception for injuries sustained “incident to service.” The Supreme Court did far more when it interpreted the Feres doctrine to significantly broaden the limited combat exception provided by Congress. This bill leaves intact the government’s exemption for injuries sustained in combat.

The bill I introduce has been the subject of harsh criticism by some of the leading jurists in the nation. In the 1987 case of United States v. Johnson, a 5 to 4 majority of the Supreme Court held that the Feres doctrine bars suits on behalf of military personnel for injuries incident to service even in cases of torts committed by employees of civilian agencies. Justice Scalia wrote a scathing dissent in Johnson, in which he was joined by Justices Brennan, Marshall, and Stevens. Scalia wrote that Feres was “wrongly decided and heartily deserves the widespread, almost universal criticism it has received.”

In an opinion for the court, Justice Edward Becker, the Chief Judge of the Third Circuit Court of Appeals, has also spoken out strongly against the Feres doctrine. He has noted that “the scholarly criticism of the doctrine is legion” and has urged the Supreme Court to grant cert. to reconsider Feres. Judge Becker has written to me that given the failure of the Court to overturn Feres thus far, I should introduce legislation doing so.

Even in the Feres opinion itself, the Supreme Court expressed an uncharacteristic doubt about its decision. The justices recognized that they may be misinterpreting the Federal Tort Claims Act. They called upon Congress to correct their mistake if this were the case. The Court wrote:

There are few guiding materials for our task of statutory construction. No committee reports or floor debates disclose what effect the statute was intended to have on the problem before us, or that it even was in mind. Under these circumstances, no conclusion can be above challenge, but if we misinterpret the Act, at least Congress possesses a ready remedy.

Congress does possess a ready remedy, and I call upon my colleagues to exercise it. The bill I introduce today will eliminate the judicially created Feres doctrine and provide the original framework of the Federal Tort Claims Act.

There is no reason to deny compensation to the men and women of our armed services who are injured or killed in domestic accidents or violence outside the heat of combat. I hope that when we resume our business next year my colleagues will join me in supporting and passing this legislation.

### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

**S. 211**

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 211, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the exclusion for employer-provided educational assistance programs, and for other purposes.

**S. 279**

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. Frist) was added as a cosponsor of S. 279, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the earnings test for individuals who have attained retirement age.

**S. 360**

At the request of Mr. ALLARD, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. Grams) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. Byrd) were added as cosponsors of S. 345, a bill to amend the Atomic Weapons Test Litigation Act of 1990 so that it permits interstate movement of live birds, for the purpose of fighting, to States in which animal fighting is lawful.
At the request of Mr. Edwards, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 486, a bill to provide for the punishment of methamphetamine laboratory operators, provide additional resources to combat methamphetamine production, trafficking, and abuse in the United States, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. Hatch, his name, and the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. Biden) were added as cosponsors of S. 486, supra.

At the request of Mr. Grassley, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. Baucus) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1020, a bill to amend chapter 1 of title 9, United States Code, to provide for greater fairness in the arbitration process relating to motor vehicle franchise contracts.

At the request of Mr. McConnell, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. Kyl) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. Bond) were added as cosponsors of S. 1109, a bill to conserve global bear populations by prohibiting the importation, exportation, and interstate trade of bear visceras and items, products, or substances containing, or labeled or advertised as containing, bear visceras, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. Roth, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Durbin) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1197, a bill to prohibit the importation of products made with dog or cat fur, to prohibit the sale, manufacture, offer for sale, transportation, and distribution of products made with dog or cat fur in the United States, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. Hatch, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. Kohl) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1257, a bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to provide for greater digital rights management.

At the request of Mr. McCain, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. Nickles), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. Thompson), and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. Steventon) were added as cosponsors of S. 1419, a bill to amend title 36, United States Code, to designate May as "National Military Appreciation Month."

At the request of Mr. Wellstone, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. Specter) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1447, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act, Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for nondiscriminatory coverage for substance abuse treatment service under private group and individual health coverage.

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. Enzi) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1500, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for an additional payment for services provided to certain high-cost individuals under the prospective payment system for skilled nursing facility services, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. Mikulski) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1590, a bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to modify the authority of the Surface Transportation Board, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. Moynihan) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1668, a bill to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to establish provisions with respect to religious accommodation in employment, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. Dodd) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1706, a bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require plans which adopt amendments that significantly reduce future benefit accruals to provide participants with adequate notice of the changes made by such amendments.

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. Hagel), the Senator from New York (Mr. Moynihan), the Senator from Maine (Ms. Snowe), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. Smith), and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. Lieberman) were added as cosponsors of S. 1812, a bill to establish a commission on a nuclear testing treaty, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. DeWINE, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. Grassley) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1823, a bill to require and extend the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act of 1994.

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. Reid), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. Feingold), and the Senator from Washington (Ms. Murray) were added as cosponsors of S. 1900, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit to holders of qualified bonds issued by Amtrak, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. Bingaman, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. Frist) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1954, a bill to establish a compensation program for employees of the Department of Energy, its contractors, subcontractors, and beryllium vendors, who sustained beryllium-related illness while performing their duty; to establish a compensation program for certain workers at the Paducah, Kentucky, gaseous diffusion plant; to establish a pilot program for examining the possible relationship between workplace exposure to radiation and hazardous materials and illnesses or health conditions; and for other purposes.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 53
At the request of Mrs. Feinstein, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mr. Gorton) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Concurrent Resolution 53, a concurrent resolution condemning all prejudice against individuals of Asian and Pacific Island ancestry in the United States and supporting political and civic participation by such individuals throughout the United States.

At the request of Mr. Nickles, his name was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 91, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that Jim Thorpe should be recognized as the "Athlete of the Century."

At the request of Mr. Reid, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mrs. Lincoln) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 118, a resolution designating December 12, 1999, as "National Children's Memorial Day."

At the request of Mr. Cochran, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Robb) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. Reid) were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 128, a resolution designating March 2000, as "Arts Education Month."

At the request of Mr. Leahy (for himself, Mr. Kennedy, Mrs. Feinstein, Mr. Jeffords, Mr. Torricelli, Mrs. Murray, Mr. Durbin, Mr. Wellstone, Mr. Feingold, Mr. Harkin, Mr. Kerry, Ms. Mikulski, and Mrs. Boxer) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. CON. RES. 76
Whereas the United States and Mexico have a long history of close relations and share a wide range of interests; whereas a democratic, peaceful and prosperous Mexico is of vital importance to the security of the United States; whereas the United States Government provides assistance and licenses exports of military equipment to Mexican security forces for counter-narcotics purposes;
Whereas the Department of State's 1998 Country Report on Human Rights Practices in Mexico stated that a "culture of impunity pervades the security forces" and documented violations, including arbitrary detention, torture, extrajudicial killings, and disappearances, by these forces;

Whereas confrontations in August 1999 between members of the Mexican military and supporters of the Zapatista National Liberation Army (EZLN) in Chiapas, Mexico are representative of the political tension and violence that has plagued the region for years;

Whereas the conflict has its roots in the poverty and injustice suffered by the indigenous people of Chiapas, and shared by the poor in the neighboring states of Oaxaca and Guerrero;

Whereas the lack of progress in implementing a preliminary peace agreement signed in 1996 and the intimidating level of militarization by the Mexican army, paramilitary groups and the EZLN has resulted in the forced displacement of thousands of indigenous people and exacerbated the impoverished conditions in Chiapas;

Whereas on September 14, 1999, the Commission for Peace and Reconciliation in Chiapas of the Conference of Mexican Catholic Bishops urged the Government of Mexico to continue military operations in Chiapas to only those positions absolutely necessary to maintaining the integrity and security of Mexico;

Whereas the Government of Mexico has devoted resources to reduce poverty in Chiapas, but the breakdown in peace negotiations and the lack of trust between the Mexican Government and some indigenous communities have limited the impact of that assistance;

Whereas on September 7, 1999, the Government of Mexico pledged to renew dialogue with the EZLN, support the formation of a new mediation team, and investigate human rights abuses in Chiapas;

Whereas the EZLN has not yet accepted the Government of Mexico's overtures to resume negotiations; and

Whereas the summary expulsions of American citizens and human rights monitors from Mexico are inconsistent with the freedoms of movement, association and expression:

It is hereby resolved

(1) take effective measures to ensure that United States assistance and exports of equipment to Mexican security forces are used primarily for counter-narcotics purposes; and

(2) not provide to units of security forces that have been implicated in human rights violations the equipment purchased with American funds (A) are used primarily for counter-narcotics purposes; and

(3) are not contributing to the political violence that has plagued the region for years.

This resolution does not attempt to take sides or to dictate an outcome of that conflict. It is not meant to embarrass or interfere in Mexico's internal affairs. The situation in Chiapas is a complex one that has social, ethnic, economic and political dimensions. It is a manifestation of years of Mexican history. It is for the Mexican people to resolve.

But despite its complexities, there is no doubt that the indigenous people of Chiapas have been the victims of injustice for centuries. Most do not own any land and they live—as their parents and grandparents did—in abject poverty. The 1994 Zapatista uprising, in which some 150 people died, was a reflection of that injustice and despair, and the political tension and violence of recent years has only exacerbated their plight.

Its most credit, President Zedillo has devoted considerable financial resources to address the poverty and lack of basic services in Chiapas. On September 7, 1999, he pledged to renew dialogue with the Zapatistas and investigate human rights abuses there. The open hearing of July 29th to discuss human rights in Mexico by Mary Robinson, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, is an important and welcome development. I am hopeful that the Mexican officials who will engage in dialogue with Ms. Robinson in July will engage in a peaceful and lasting resolution of the conflict, and to vigorously pursue such negotiations;

(3) commend the Government of Mexico for its renewed commitment to negotiations and for establishing a date for the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights to visit Mexico to discuss human rights concerns there; and

(4) give a higher priority in discussions with the Government of Mexico to criminal justice, which protect human rights, emphasizing United States concerns about arbitrary detention, torture, extra judicial killings, and disappearances, and the failure to prosecute individuals responsible for these crimes; and

(5) urge the Government of Mexico to implement the recommendations of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, particularly with regard to American citizens and other foreigners who have been expelled from Mexico in violation of Mexican law and international law.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am today submitting a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the need for peaceful and lasting resolution of the conflict in the state of Chiapas, Mexico.

This resolution is cosponsored by Senators KENNEDY, FEINSTEIN, EFORDS, TORRICELLI, MURRAY, DURBIN, WELLSTONE, FEINGOLD, HARKIN, KERRY, MIKULSKI, and BOXER.

Congresswoman NANCY PELOSI is introducing an identical resolution today in the House of Representatives.

The purpose of this resolution is to convey our support for a peaceful settlement of the conflict in Chiapas that has been simmering since the Zapatista uprising in 1994. Since then, and despite the recent steps to resume negotiations, the situation remains tense and prospects for productive dialogue remain remote. In August, armed confrontations between members of the Mexican military and Zapatista supporters in Chiapas was a reminder of the political violence that has plagued the region for years. I submitted a similar resolution just over a year ago and, unfortunately, the situation remains largely unchanged.

This resolution does not attempt to take sides or to dictate an outcome of that conflict. It is not meant to embarrass or interfere in Mexico's internal affairs. The situation in Chiapas is a complex one that has social, ethnic, economic and political dimensions. It is a manifestation of years of Mexican history. It is for the Mexican people to resolve.

But despite its complexities, there is no doubt that the indigenous people of Chiapas have been the victims of injustice for centuries. Most do not own any land and they live—as their parents and grandparents did—in abject poverty. The 1994 Zapatista uprising, in which some 150 people died, was a reflection of that injustice and despair, and the political tension and violence of recent years has only exacerbated their plight.

Its most credit, President Zedillo has devoted considerable financial resources to address the poverty and lack of basic services in Chiapas. On September 7, 1999, he pledged to renew dialogue with the Zapatistas and investigate human rights abuses there. The open hearing of July 29th to discuss human rights in Mexico by Mary Robinson, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, is an important and welcome development. I am hopeful that the Mexican officials who will engage in dialogue with Ms. Robinson in July will engage in a peaceful and lasting resolution of the conflict, and to vigorously pursue such negotiations;

(3) commend the Government of Mexico for its renewed commitment to negotiations and for establishing a date for the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights to visit Mexico to discuss human rights concerns there; and

(4) give a higher priority in discussions with the Government of Mexico to criminal justice, which protect human rights, emphasizing United States concerns about arbitrary detention, torture, extra judicial killings, and disappearances, and the failure to prosecute individuals responsible for these crimes; and

(5) urge the Government of Mexico to implement the recommendations of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, particularly with regard to American citizens and other foreigners who have been expelled from Mexico in violation of Mexican law and international law.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am today submitting a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the need for peaceful and lasting resolution of the conflict in the state of Chiapas, Mexico.

This resolution is cosponsored by Senators KENNEDY, FEINSTEIN, EFORDS, TORRICELLI, MURRAY, DURBIN, WELLSTONE, FEINGOLD, HARKIN, KERRY, MIKULSKI, and BOXER.

Congresswoman NANCY PELOSI is introducing an identical resolution today in the House of Representatives.

The purpose of this resolution is to convey our support for a peaceful settlement of the conflict in Chiapas that has been simmering since the Zapatista uprising in 1994. Since then, and despite the recent steps to resume negotiations, the situation remains tense and prospects for productive dialogue remain remote. In August, armed confrontations between members of the Mexican military and Zapatista supporters in Chiapas was a reminder of the political violence that has plagued the region for years. I submitted a similar resolution just over a year ago and, unfortunately, the situation remains largely unchanged.

This resolution does not attempt to take sides or to dictate an outcome of that conflict. It is not meant to embarrass or interfere in Mexico's internal affairs. The situation in Chiapas is a complex one that has social, ethnic, economic and political dimensions. It is a manifestation of years of Mexican history. It is for the Mexican people to resolve.

But despite its complexities, there is no doubt that the indigenous people of Chiapas have been the victims of injustice for centuries. Most do not own any land and they live—as their parents and grandparents did—in abject poverty. The 1994 Zapatista uprising, in which some 150 people died, was a reflection of that injustice and despair, and the political tension and violence of recent years has only exacerbated their plight.

Its most credit, President Zedillo has devoted considerable financial resources to address the poverty and lack of basic services in Chiapas. On September 7, 1999, he pledged to renew dialogue with the Zapatistas and investigate human rights abuses there. The open hearing of July 29th to discuss human rights in Mexico by Mary Robinson, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, is an important and welcome development. I am hopeful that the Mexican officials who will engage in dialogue with Ms. Robinson in July will engage in a peaceful and lasting resolution of the conflict, and to vigorously pursue such negotiations;

(3) commend the Government of Mexico for its renewed commitment to negotiations and for establishing a date for the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights to visit Mexico to discuss human rights concerns there; and

(4) give a higher priority in discussions with the Government of Mexico to criminal justice, which protect human rights, emphasizing United States concerns about arbitrary detention, torture, extra judicial killings, and disappearances, and the failure to prosecute individuals responsible for these crimes; and

(5) urge the Government of Mexico to implement the recommendations of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, particularly with regard to American citizens and other foreigners who have been expelled from Mexico in violation of Mexican law and international law.
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who are primarily involved in counter-narcotics activities and who do not commit human rights abuses. In order to ensure that the law is faithfully implemented, the State Department needs to know who we train and who receives equipment.

It calls on the Mexican Government to respect the freedoms of movement, association and expression by implementing the recommendations of the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, particularly with regard to Amadeo Zapata, and others who have been summarily expelled from Mexico in violation of Mexican law and international law.

And it urges both sides to take initiatives for peace.

Mr. President, some may ask why we are submitting this resolution today, when this conflict has been simmering for years. It is my hope that in conjunction with Mary Robinson's visit next week, this Resolution will send a strong message to the Mexican Government, the Zapataistas, our own administration and the international community that an intensified effort is needed urgently to resolve the conflict peacefully.

SENATE RESOLUTION 233—EXRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE URGENT NEED FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE TO RESOLVE CERTAIN MONTANA CIVIL RIGHTS DISCRIMINATION CASES

Mr. BAUCUS (for himself and Mr. BURNS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry:

S. Res. 233

Whereas there exists a strong public policy against discrimination against minority groups, whether the discrimination is committed by private individuals or by the Federal Government in the operation of its programs;

Whereas, whenever discrimination occurs in the conduct of a Federal Government program, the responsible Federal Government agency should take quick and aggressive action to remedy the discrimination;

Whereas, last year, the Department of Agriculture was held accountable for certain civil rights violations against United States agricultural producers in connection with their attempted participation in lending programs offered by the Department;

Whereas, a significant number of Montana civil rights petitioners have not received a timely, and equitable resolution of their complaints;

Whereas the agricultural community has faced a series of hardships, including record low prices, extreme weather disasters, and a shortage of farm loan opportunities;

Whereas additional frustration and financial difficulties perpetuated by the inadequate review process has further imposed undue hardship on the Montana civil rights petitioners;

Whereas the mission of the Office of Civil Rights of the Department of Agriculture requires the Office to facilitate the fair and equitable treatment of customers and employees of the Department while ensuring the delivery and enforcement of civil rights programs and activities;

Whereas the Department of Agriculture should be committed to the policy of treating its customers with dignity and respect as well as to providing high quality and timely products and services; and

Whereas an urgent need exists for the Department of Agriculture to resolve certain Montana civil rights discrimination cases, many backlogged, by a date certain in furtherance of that policy: Now, therefore, be it Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that, not later than March 1, 2000, the Secretary of Agriculture should resolve, or take other action to resolve, all cases pending on the date of this resolution of alleged civil rights discrimination by the Department of Agriculture against agricultural producers located in the State of Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I rise today to submit a sense-of-the-Senate Resolution regarding the urgent need for the U.S. Department of Agriculture to resolve its civil rights discrimination cases. On behalf of Senator Burns, the bill's cosponsor, and myself, I urge the Senate to recognize the urgency of this situation.

Mr. President, there exists a strong public policy against discrimination against minority groups, whether the discrimination is committed by private individuals or by the Federal Government in the operation of its programs, and it is our firmly held belief that whenever discrimination occurs in the conduct of Government programs, the responsible Government agencies should take quick and aggressive action to remedy such discrimination.

I am most concerned that over the past year, such action has not been taken by the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Office of Civil Rights. In fact, many Montana civil rights cases that my office and that of Senator's Burns have been working with are seriously backlogged in the system and have consequently remained unsatisfactorily addressed.

We have pressed hard with the Montana Department of Agriculture's Farm Agency to resolve these cases. The Director of the FSA and the State FSA Committee has worked hard to resolve any outstanding problems concerning its programs and has made certain that these kinds of problems to not occur in Montana. I commend their outreach efforts in ensuring the equitable delivery of the Agency's programs to all eligible Montana recipients.

We need a better working relationship with the USDA's Office of Civil Rights to bring the outstanding cases to resolution in a timely manner. Repeated phone calls and requests have yielded few answers. For that reason, I am offering this resolution which binds the agency to its mission of facilitating the fair and equitable treatment of USDA customers and employees while ensuring the delivery and enforcement of civil rights programs and activities. Further, I urge the USDA to commit to remedying the situation.

This resolution expresses the sense of the Senate that USDA's delays must stop. These cases must be resolved soon. It is our intent that they be resolved by March 1, 2000. These producers have suffered too much already. They cannot afford to wait any longer. We look forward to working with members of other states affected by this abuse of the civil rights program to resolve these complaints as quickly as possible.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

FURTHER CONTINUING RESOLUTION, 2000

BYRD (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 2780

Mr. BYRD (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. REID, Mr. CRAIG, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. MURKOWSKI, Mr. CRapo, Mr. ENZI, Mr. BURNS, Mr.
SEC. 1. DISPOSAL OF EXCESS SPoil AND COAL MINE WASTE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law (including any regulation or court ruling), hereafter—

(1) in rendering permit decisions for discharges and coal mining activities into waters of the United States from surface coal mining and reclamation operations, the permitting authority shall apply section 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344) and the section 404(b) guidelines pursuant to section 404(b)(1) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344(b)(1)) and implementing regulations set forth in part 230 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on October 19, 1999);

(2) the permitted disposal of such spoil or waste meeting the requirements of the section 404(b)(1) guidelines referred to in paragraph (1) shall be deemed to satisfy the criteria for authorization of discharges under regulations set forth in sections 114.507 and 114.517 of title 30, Code of Federal Regulations, and applicable State regulations; and

(3) Federal and State water quality standards shall not apply to the portions of waters other than those filled by discharges permitted pursuant to the procedures set forth in paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection provided that the water quality standards shall apply to all portions of waters other than those filled by discharges permitted pursuant to the procedures set forth in paragraphs (1) and (2).

(b) DURATION OF EFFECTIVENESS.—The permitting procedures specified in subsection (a) shall remain in effect until the later of—

(1) the date that is 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act; or

(2) the effective date of regulations promulgated to implement recommendations made by the National Research Council to amend that subpart if the regulations adopt the recommendations as required by section 357 of title III of H.R. 3423 of the 106th Congress, as introduced on November 7, 1999, by the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344), and implementing regulations set forth in part 230 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, in lieu of section 357 of title III of H.R. 3423 of the 106th Congress, as introduced on November 7, 1999, regarding the millisites opinion, the following shall apply:

(1) MILL SITES OPINION.—No funds shall be expended by the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture, for fiscal years 2000 and 2001, to limit the number or acreage of millisites based on the ratio between the number or acreage of millisites and the number or acreage of associated lode or placer claims with respect to—

(A) any patent application excluded from the operation of section 112 of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1995, by section 113 of that Act (108 Stat. 2519); or

(B) any operation or property for which a plan of operations has been approved before the date of enactment of this Act; or

(C) any operation or property for which a plan of operations or modification to an existing plan, was submitted to the Bureau of Land Management or the Forest Service before May 21, 1999.

(2) NO RATING IN THIS ACT.—This section or the 1999 Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act (Public Law 106-31) shall be construed as an explicit or tacit adoption, endorsement, approval, rejection, or disapproval of the opinion dated November 7, 1997, by the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior concerning millisites.

(b) PERIOD OF EFFECTIVENESS.—This section—

(1) takes effect 1 day after the date of enactment of the Act enacting H.R. 3194 referred to in subsection (a); and

(2) notwithstanding any other provision of law repealing or terminating the effectiveness of this Act, shall remain in effect unless repealed by Act of Congress that makes specific reference to this section.

HELMS (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 2781

Mr. LOTT (for Mr. HELMS (for himself, Mr. Edwards, and Mr. Robb)) proposed an amendment to the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 82, supra; as follows:

At the appropriate place insert:

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION PRODUCER-OWNED MARKETING ASSOCIATIONS FORGIVENESS

SEC. 1. The Secretary of Agriculture shall reduce the amount of any principal due on a loan made or insured pursuant to section 1125 of the Federal Agricultural Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 1925m) to an association owned by or on behalf of a family for the purpose of providing a source of capital for the association. The Secretary shall make any such forgiveness in the manner specified in section 4.25 of the regulations issued by the Federal Agricultural Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 1925m-3).
J ohnson Academy, in 1938, and remained on the faculty for nine years. From 1945 to 1982 he taught history at Lyndon State College full-time. After "retiring" in 1982, he returned to the Academy to teach Latin, where you will still find him today. He has continued to teach one or two history classes a semester at Lyndon State College until 1996.

Most people consider Latin a dead language, but if you were to enter Graham's classroom today you would find it to be as alive and enjoyable as ever. So Graham's teaching skills was demonstrated at the Academy in 1997, when 47 of his 52 Latin students, over 90 percent, made honors on the National Latin Exam, an extremely challenging test taken by over 90,000 students across the United States.

Graham's contributions to education do not end in the classroom. While teaching, he also served in the Vermont Legislature for over 25 years. He was a member and chair of the State Agency and Education Committee during the 1960s, helping to create Vermont's education laws. Indeed, the self-proclaimed Ambassador of the Northeast Kingdom has positively affected every single student in the state of Vermont over the last 30 years. In fact, his influence has even reached students outside of Vermont, due to his tenure on the New England Board of Higher Education. But Graham always remained supremely faithful to the students in his classroom, once even teaching class over the phone from the Vermont Statehouse.

One can look at Graham's education accomplishments alone and see a lifetime of work and success. However, his influence has touched many in other areas as well. As President of the Vermont Historical Society from 1965 to 1969, his many successes included securing a permanent home for the organization in the historic Pavilion Office Building in Montpelier. He has also served on a number of commissions, including the Commission on Interstate Cooperation, the Historic Sites Commission, the Commission to Study State Government (or "Little Hoover" as we called it), the Vermont Civil War Centennial Commission, the board of managers of the Council of State Governments, and the Education Commission of the States. In addition, the thousands of people who check into the Northeastern Vermont Regional Hospital each year should be thankful to Graham as he is largely responsible for its existence. I could go on, but I'm afraid it would take the remainder of this session of congress to do so.

I am thankful for the opportunity to provide my colleagues with a shining example of a real Vermont renaissance man. I join my fellow Vermonters in offering my heartfelt congratulations and gratitude to Graham Stiles Newell for his many years of hard work and dedication to the citizens of Vermont.

TRIBUTE TO BARB RABE
- Mr. KOHL, Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the work of Barb Rabe, who retired after 29 years of service in the Oshkosh School District. She began her career in the Oshkosh School District in 1970 at the Perry Tipler Middle School as a Teachers Assistant and then transferred to Oakwood Elementary School where she served for the next 27 years. During her years of service, Barb worked for six principals, adapting to each new principal's style, and was always actively involved as the staff grew from 12 to 42 and the student population grew from 200 to 500. She worked hard at creating partnerships with staff, students and families that would foster collaboration, cooperation and allegiance. Barb's strong work ethic, energy and enthusiasm will be missed.

While mastering the key elements of organization and flexibility, giving of her time and talent in serving the faculty and students of Oakwood School, and showing love and appreciation for her students, Barb remained supremely faithful to the students in her classroom, once even teaching class over the phone from the Vermont Statehouse.

Although his first commitment was to education, his enthusiasm for cross-country and track kept an enduring legacy at Ocean City High School. Mr. Naples' cross-country record over the past 21 years is 209 victories and 28 losses. His track record is 133 wins and only 8 losses. During his tenure as a track coach, Mr. Naples led the Raiders to two state titles and coached 9 individual state champions.

His greatest moment as a coach came during the 1989 cross-country season, when he inspired his girls' team to capture the first state title for an Ocean City High School team in 24 years!

Mr. President, it is often difficult to say goodbye to a teacher who has touched the lives of so many people. This is a teacher whose former students are continually coming back to thank him for inspiring them, educating them and, most importantly, caring about them. My deepest respects go to this inductee of the New Jersey Interscholastic Athletic Association Hall of Fame. He has left a lasting legacy of high academic standards and excellence in sports.

TRIBUTE TO MR. MICHAEL J. NAPLES
- Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Mr. Michael J. Naples. "Napes," as he is affectionately called by all who know him, is retiring after 29 years of teaching at Ocean City High School in New Jersey. He has earned great respect from students and peers alike. Each year the students Mr. Naples' taught and the athletes he coached attest to his dedication to excellence.

Although his first commitment was to education, his enthusiasm for cross-country and track kept an enduring legacy at Ocean City High School. Mr. Naples' cross-country record over the past 21 years is 209 victories and 28 losses. His track record is 133 wins and only 8 losses. During his tenure as a track coach, Mr. Naples led the Raiders to two state titles and coached 9 individual state champions.

His greatest moment as a coach came during the 1989 cross-country season, when he inspired his girls' team to capture the first state title for an Ocean City High School team in 24 years!

Mr. President, it is often difficult to say goodbye to a teacher who has touched the lives of so many people. This is a teacher whose former students are continually coming back to thank him for inspiring them, educating them and, most importantly, caring about them. My deepest respects go to this inductee of the New Jersey Interscholastic Athletic Association Hall of Fame. He has left a lasting legacy of high academic standards and excellence in sports.

NATIONAL ADOPTION MONTH HONORS WEST VIRGINIA ADOPTION ANGELS
- Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I rise today to honor three West Virginia individuals who have recently been awarded "Adoption Angel" awards by the Congressional Coalition on Adoption, Larry and Jane Leech and Judge Gary Johnson are truly 'angels' in adoption.

President Clinton recently proclaimed November "National Adoption Month". It is a good time to re-commit ourselves to doing all we can to ensure that all children have the opportunity to grow up in safe, stable and permanent homes.

During Adoption Month in 1997, the Adoption and Safe Families Act, a bill I sponsored, was signed into law. This act, for the first time ever, made children's safety, health and opportunity for loving, stable families the paramount factors to consider when planning for children in foster care. The act provided incentive bonuses for states successful in increasing adoptions.

The state of West Virginia has made a lot of progress in moving kids out of foster care and into permanent homes. When the adoption bonuses for 1999 were announced, I was proud that West
Oregon, because three of our state's children, Brian, Shawn and Sarah Keane, had the honor of introducing President Clinton the day the bonuses were announced. The 3 Keane children along with 208 more West Virginia foster children marched in with their adoptive families in 1998.

Our State is working hard to increase public awareness of adoption and children needing homes. A quarterly newsletter, "Open Your Heart, Open Your Home," features stories of waiting children and successful adoptive families. In May, Dave Thomas came to West Virginia for the third annual Foster and Adoptive Parent Recognition Day, to recognize adoptive parents who provide homes for children with special needs.

We have been able to make this progress largely as a result of the efforts of the individuals who were honored by the Congressional Coalition on Adoption, and other dedicated and hard-working West Virginians like them. Let me tell you a little about these "angels".

Larry and Jane Leech have been foster parents for many years, opening their hearts to children in need of both. Working with the West Virginia Department of Health and Human Resources, the Leeches adopted a sibling group of three young boys, twins age 4 and an older brother, age 6, in 1996. Two years later the Leeches were again in the final stages of adopting another sibling group—this time, three older girls. Mr. and Mrs. Leech also have three biological children. They have a tremendous amount of love and a strong commitment to all nine of their children. Recently, the Leeches and their children visited the West Virginia Governor's mansion where they were honored by First Lady Hovah Underwood, for their commitment to children in need.

Judge Johnson believes that all children in the foster care system deserve permanent homes. As the 28th Judicial circuit judge, elected in 1992, Judge Johnson has worked closely with the West Virginia Department of Health and Human Resources. He meets with them quarterly to review problems or identify issues that prevent children in West Virginia from achieving permanent in their lives. Judge Johnson continually increases his own knowledge of the issues by attending conferences on child welfare.

The progress we have made since the passage of the 1997 Adoption Act is significant. Certainly the 211 West Virginia children who found families last year, including the six children who now call Larry and Jane Leech "Mom" and "Dad" know that. But over 400 West Virginia children are still waiting and hoping to be adopted—over 100,000 children in our nation are still waiting and hoping to be adopted. Too many of these children were growing up in the insecurity of foster care. Too many of them are becoming teenagers without a permanent family.

And that is why we need "National Adoption Month". We need opportunities to honor the angels in adoption like the Leeches and Judge Johnson. And we need the opportunity to publicly re-new our commitment to ensuring that all children have the opportunity for permanence in a loving home.

I am pleased to join the other members of the Congressional Coalition on Adoption in honoring more than 50 "Angels of Adoption" from around the country. I am doubly pleased that 3 of those angels are West Virginia.

Virginia Governor's mansion also have three biological children.

Leech children now have, the chance to grow up in a permanent, loving family. I urge my colleagues to dedicate themselves to this effort as well.

JEWISH HISTORY IN GREECE

Mr. SARBANES, Mr. President, in recent years there has been renewed interest in the early history of the Jewish community in Greece. The Hellenic and Jewish peoples have had a long and constructive relationship, and that interaction has been one of the foundations of Western civilization.

An important part of this historical movement is the renewed research on historic Jewish sites in Greece. There is now an active and impressive Jewish museum in Athens which has served as a focal point for tourism. These efforts have spawned a number of individuals to do their own family and group research; and I am pleased to report that one of my constituents, Dr. Judith Mazza, has written an excellent account of her visit to Greece entitled, "First-Time Traveler's Impressions of Jewish Sites in Greece," which was published in the spring 1999 issue of Kol haKEHILA. Dr. Mazza is descended from a Romaniote Jewish family from Greece, and her article depicts successfully the living Jewish cultural and religious legacy in Greece. I recommend it to all those interested in the history of the Jewish people and Jewish sites in Greece. My interest had been stimulated by the book Jewish Sites and Jewish History in Greece. I did not have the opportunity that the Leech children now have, the chance to grow up in a permanent, loving family. I urge my colleagues to dedicate themselves to this effort as well.

JEWISH SITES IN GREECE

A FIRST-TIME TRAVELER'S IMPRESSIONS OF JEWISH SITES IN GREECE

(By Dr. Judith Mazza)

I first saw mention of the Jewish Museum of Greece, located in Athens, about twenty years ago in a geography history book. I joined the Museum as an "American Friend." Upon joining, I received a letter from the founder (now Director Emeritus) of the museum, Nicholas Stavroulakis, concerning my family name (Mazza, Matas, Matza, etc.). I learned from that letter that my family most probably was a Romaniote Jewish family, and was related to the Synagogues of Greece (Athens, 1992) by Nicholas Stavroulakis and Timothy DeVinney. Prior to reading this book, I knew little about the communities that had existed in Greece prior to World War II. I did not have the opportunity to travel to Greece until November 1998.

As soon as I knew I would be in Athens, I attempted to contact the Jewish Museum of Greece. Kol haKEHILA, was the first source to give me a way to contact the museum by e-mail. By e-mail, I asked the museum's curator, Janet Battinou, to help find us a knowledgeable guide for our day in Athens. The museum recommended Odelly Asser. In addition to visiting ancient sites in Athens that day, Ms. Asser also took us to the Jewish Museum of Greece, and to the two modern synagogues in Athens.

ATHENS

We began our day at the Museum. It had recently relocated and now occupies an entire building in the Plaka neighborhood. The museum has a number of floors, each with a different focus. As a first-time visitor, I was particularly interested in the facts, documents, clothing and a wide variety of religious and domestic objects. There is a research library on the top floor. School children arrived as we apparently paid a special visit to the Jewish Museum of Greece has become a part of the public school curriculum.

After we left the museum, we visited the two synagogues. They are located on Melidoni Street, immediately across the street from one another. The street is gated and guarded by an armed curfew as a precaution against potential terrorist incidents. We first went to the Beth Shalom synagogue, which is the only currently active synagogue in Greece. The 3500 Jews in Athens today. Ms. Asser introduced us to Rabbi Jacob Arar, who studied in France and Israel, inasmuch as there are no rabbinical schools in Greece. The exterior of the building has simple lines and is faced in white marble. The interior of the synagogue is mostly wood paneled and has a warm and comfortable feel.

Directly across the street is the Laniotiki synagogue, which was built by Romaniate Jews from Ionnina. It is located on the second floor of The lower floor houses the Athens Jewish community offices. We obtained the key to the synagogue from the office staff and walked through the hallway into the courtyard. The courtyard was fully paved except for a small area from which one large palm tree grew. We walked up the narrow exterior stairs to a walkway, and unlocked the door. This synagogue was smaller and seemed older than the synagogue across the street. We later learned that it is mostly used for special occasions. It is elegant in its simplicity.

RHODES

We had the opportunity to see one other Jewish site in Greece when we stopped in Rhodes a few days later. We had seen a website for the Jewish Museum of Rhodes before our travels began at www.Rhodesjewishmuseum.org. We sought out the island's synagogue and adjacent museum. Finding the small walled city of Rhodes was not too difficult, as it was clearly labeled and the synagogue is noted on tourist maps. As we walked toward the site, we noticed that the streets were in what had been once the Jewish quarter of the city. We could see Hebrew inscriptions above some of the doorways, signifying the synagogues built by previous communities. However, many of these buildings appeared to be in a state of disrepair. Unfortunately,
IN RECOGNITION OF THE FOURTH BIRTHDAY OF THE PROVIDENCE GAY MEN'S CHORUS

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to the Providence Gay Men’s Chorus, which celebrated its fourth anniversary on November 14, 1999. I would like to thank the Chorus for its four years of community involvement, during which time the members have shared not only their melodious voices with the citizens of Rhode Island, but also their hopes and ambitions for a better world.

The Providence Gay Men’s Chorus, which began in 1995 as a group of eight, now has 50 members. In addition to their musical talent, one of the attributes that is most unique about the Chorus, and most appreciated, is the group’s mission to promote tolerance. As we know, the real work of fostering understanding, and the support of diverse backgrounds and lifestyles usually happens slowly, and within the context of shared activities and community.

The Providence Gay Men’s Chorus reaches out with its concerts to expand the bounds of community, helping to communicate the values of tolerance and understanding, their work benefits not only the citizens of Rhode Island, but ultimately the entire nation.

I am pleased to make it known that November 14, 1999 was not only the fourth anniversary of the Chorus, but also was declared Providence Gay Men’s Chorus Day in the State of Rhode Island. Mr. President, I ask that a gubernatorial proclamation from the Governor of my home state of Rhode Island proclaiming November 14th as “Providence Gay Men’s Chorus Day” be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I join in the chorus of voices supporting the Providence Gay Men’s Chorus’ dual mission of creating beautiful music and promoting mutual respect and understanding. I know this talented musical group will continue its good work and I wish them many, many more birthdays.

The proclamation follows:

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS—GUBERNATORIAL PROCLAMATION

Whereas, the Providence Gay Men’s Chorus was first conceived in a karaoke bar in Providence in October 1995; the founding of its original eight members from Rhode Island and Massachusetts was held in November 1995, in a home in Pawtucket. The name Providence Gay Men’s Chorus (PGMC) was decided on after some deliberation and the group was then underway with a music director and an accompanist; and,

Whereas, the mission of the PGMC is to provide and foster continuing growth of men’s voices. Through the sharing of song concerts, the PGMC hopes to foster mutual understanding, tolerance and support of people with diverse backgrounds and lifestyles; and,

Whereas, the membership started to blossom during the first year and moved to St. James Episcopal Church in North Providence during this year, the first board was also formed and the first concert was held in Wachusett, Massachusetts with 12 members; and,

Whereas, the chorus kept growing and moved again. This time to the Bell Street Chapel in Providence, where the now 35-member chorus was performing concerts per year with three concerts per season. It was at the Bell Street Chapel that the PGMC achieved their first sell out audience; and,

Whereas, as members, the chorus had 40 members; the chorus moved once again to the First Unitarian Church in Providence. During this time, the PGMC joined the national choral organization for gay and lesbians called GALA and received its first corporate sponsorship; and,

Whereas, the chorus is now approaching its fourth birthday, has a membership of 50 and is back at the Bell Street Chapel. The members will be performing series of concerts in November, singing at First Night 2000, and initiating a scholarship program. Future plans for the chorus are to bring a program to the Hasbro’s Children’s Hospital, perform to mainstream audiences throughout the city and state and attend the national GALA conferences; and,

Whereas, on November 14, 1999 the chorus will hold a concert at the Newport Congregational Church, under the direction of Charles Parno and the accompaniment of Bruce Ruby;

Now, therefore, I, Lincoln Almond, Governor of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations, do hereby proclaim November 14th as Providence Gay Men’s Chorus Day.

November 18, 1999
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BRETT WAGNER ON RUSSIAN NUCLEAR MATERIALS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, it is important that we remember how vital our nuclear nonproliferation programs with Russia are to our national security. That’s why I was pleased, in recent weeks, to see two articles by Brett Wagner in the San Francisco Chronicle and in the Wall Street Journal, which I would like to submit for the RECORD.

Mr. Wagner is the president of the California Center for Strategic Studies, and his articles bring much needed attention to the potential dangers to our non-nuclear nonproliferation policy—to ensure that Russian weapons-grade, highly-enriched uranium does not fall into the wrong hands. We need to live up to our agreement with Russia and strengthen our nuclear, chemical and biological nonproliferation program with that nation. Our future could well depend on it.

I believe that Mr. Wagner’s articles will be of interest to all of us in Congress who care about these issues, and I ask that they be printed in the RECORD.

The articles follow.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Oct. 22, 1999]

U.S. MUST MOVE QUICKLY TO BUY RUSSIA’S EXCESS NUKEs

(by Brett Wagner)

Without a doubt, what’s been most frustrating about being a national security specialist in the 1990s is the requirement of the United States to be the only nation in the world that’s willing to pay dollars that rogue states and terrorist groups might not have to be counted as an expense—arguably the most significant foreign policy accomplishment of the Clinton administration.

I believe that Mr. Wagner’s articles are soundly reflective of Vermont sentiment.

As the son of an art teacher, I have always held a deep respect for the arts and for those who are able to inspire creativity in our nation’s young people. My wife has taught art at elementary, secondary, and higher education institutions in the central Vermont region. Her dedication to art and education led her to volunteer positions on the local school board in Montpelier, as well as on the board of the Vermont Arts Council, where, incidentally, I now hold the annual Congressional Arts Competition.

Bill and Olene Doyle raised three wonderful children. However, they have never stopped teaching as evidenced by their ongoing community service and involvement in their local church and non-profit organizations. Given the countless hours they dedicate to community service, it is noteworthy that the couple finds the time to pursue personal hobbies such as golf and gardening. And while I have never had the privilege of seeing the Doyle gardens, I have been told they are a vibrant reflection of the dedication which Bill and Olene Doyle have so positively influenced the people of Washington County, Vermont over the course of their lives. William and Olene Doyle will be honored as the Washington County Citizens of the Year by the Green Mountain Council of Boy Scouts on November 22nd, 1999.

My friend Bill Doyle has navigated a well rounded career as a teacher, politician, and author. Since 1958, he has been teaching history and government at Johnson State College. In 1968, he was elected to serve as one of Washington County’s three State Senators, a role which he has held for over three decades. As a skilled teacher and a master of parliamentary rules, Bill has been an invaluable mentor and mediator in the Vermont State House. Bill has written two books, including The Vermont Political Tradition, which he was awarded the Governor’s award for writing what is considered to be a “must read” on Vermont political history. He has also taken his passion for government and politics and created the annual “Doyle Poll,” our yearly gauge of public opinion on the hottest and sometimes most controversial issues facing Vermonters. While admittedly unscientific, the poll’s results are soundly reflective of Vermont sentiment.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I am proud to stand before my colleagues today and pay tribute to a couple who have so positively influenced the people of Washington County, Vermont over the course of their lives. William and Olene Doyle will be honored as the Washington County Citizens of the Year by the Green Mountain Council of Boy Scouts on November 22nd, 1999.

The Vermont Political Tradition, 1919-1968, he was elected to serve as one of Washington County’s three State Senators, a role which he has held for over three decades. As a skilled teacher and a master of parliamentary rules, Bill has been an invaluable mentor and mediator in the Vermont State House. Bill has written two books, including The Vermont Political Tradition, which he was awarded the Governor’s award for writing what is considered to be a “must read” on Vermont political history. He has also taken his passion for government and politics and created the annual “Doyle Poll,” our yearly gauge of public opinion on the hottest and sometimes most controversial issues facing Vermonters. While admittedly unscientific, the poll’s results are soundly reflective of Vermont sentiment.

As the son of an art teacher, I have always held a deep respect for the arts and for those who are able to inspire creativity in our nation’s young people. My wife has taught art at elementary, secondary, and higher education institutions in the central Vermont region. Her dedication to art and education led her to volunteer positions on the local school board in Montpelier, as well as on the board of the Vermont Arts Council, where, incidentally, I now hold the annual Congressional Arts Competition.

Bill and Olene Doyle raised three wonderful children. However, they have never stopped teaching as evidenced by their ongoing community service and involvement in their local church and non-profit organizations. Given the countless hours they dedicate to community service, it is noteworthy that the couple finds the time to pursue personal hobbies such as golf and gardening. And while I have never had the privilege of seeing the Doyle gardens, I have been told they are a vibrant reflection of the dedication which Bill and Olene Doyle have so positively influenced the people of Washington County, Vermont over the course of their lives. William and Olene Doyle will be honored as the Washington County Citizens of the Year by the Green Mountain Council of Boy Scouts on November 22nd, 1999.

My friend Bill Doyle has navigated a well rounded career as a teacher, politician, and author. Since 1958, he has been teaching history and government at Johnson State College. In 1968, he was elected to serve as one of Washington County’s three State Senators, a role which he has held for over three decades. As a skilled teacher and a master of parliamentary rules, Bill has been an invaluable mentor and mediator in the Vermont State House. Bill has written two books, including The Vermont Political Tradition, which he was awarded the Governor’s award for writing what is considered to be a “must read” on Vermont political history. He has also taken his passion for government and politics and created the annual “Doyle Poll,” our yearly gauge of public opinion on the hottest and sometimes most controversial issues facing Vermonters. While admittedly unscientific, the poll’s results are soundly reflective of Vermont sentiment.

As the son of an art teacher, I have always held a deep respect for the arts and for those who are able to inspire creativity in our nation’s young people. My wife has taught art at elementary, secondary, and higher education institutions in the central Vermont region. Her dedication to art and education led her to volunteer positions on the local school board in Montpelier, as well as on the board of the Vermont Arts Council, where, incidentally, I now hold the annual Congressional Arts Competition.

Bill and Olene Doyle raised three wonderful children. However, they have never stopped teaching as evidenced by their ongoing community service and involvement in their local church and non-profit organizations. Given the countless hours they dedicate to community service, it is noteworthy that the couple finds the time to pursue personal hobbies such as golf and gardening. And while I have never had the privilege of seeing the Doyle gardens, I have been told they are a vibrant reflection of the dedication which Bill and Olene Doyle give to everything they do.

I am thankful for the opportunity to express my heartfelt praise. I can think of few couples more worthy of this award. Years of partnership and devotion to each other have inevitably spilled over into the Vermont community, where Bill and Olene have truly made their mark as two of Vermont’s most influential and giving people.
Strangely absent from the debate over how to spend Washington's projected $1 trillion surplus has been any discussion of Russia's longstanding need to sell its stockpiles of unsecured weapon-grade uranium. The time has come to take Russia up on this offer.

Russia has never developed a reliable system for handling enormous stockpiles of weapon-grade uranium and plutonium it inherited from the Soviet Union. These stockpiles are often stored in makeshift warehouses controlled by vague abbreviation laws and soldiers who occasionally desert their posts in search of food. Small caches of these nuclear materials have already begun leaking out of Russia. It would only take 20 or 30 pounds of highly enriched uranium to arm a device capable of leveling a city the size of lower Manhattan.

In February 1993 Presidents Clinton and Boris Yeltsin signed an agreement for Russia to sell the U.S. highly enriched uranium extracted from its dismantled nuclear warheads in exchange for hard currency. Russia is currently dismantling thousands of warheads. Unfortunately, this unprecedented opportunity to advance U.S. and international security has fallen behind schedule at nearly every turn, primarily because Washington is constantly distracted by less important issues. Moscow has shipped only 45 tons of highly enriched uranium—almost 30 tons short of the agreement's stated goal by this point.

One major holdup has been the U.S. enrichment Corp., a recently privatized company selected by the U.S. government to implement the American side of the accord. It has resisted accepting delivery of Russia's enriched uranium because, among other reasons, it claims that the materials are not pure enough for U.S. nuclear plants. But the corporation has a fundamental conflict of interest. Since it also produces enriched uranium, it wants to limit Russian competition in the international market.

The question is: How long do we have before we run out of luck? How long before some of Russia's uranium winds up in the hands of terrorists like Osama bin Laden or regime allied terrorists?

Washington should switch the power of executive authority from the U.S. enrichment Corp. to the Department of Energy. Given the likely future demand for protecting the enormous stockpiles of weapon-grade uranium and plutonium it wants to limit Russian competition. The time has come to take Russia up on this offer to advance U.S. and international security.

President, I ask unanimous consent to print AAA's letter of support for S. 655 in the RECORD.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I ask consent that there be no objection to the printing of this letter, as follows:


Hon. TRENT LOTT, Majority Leader, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR LOTT: As a representative of AAA motorists, AAA provides an important way to identify damaged or flood vehicles. AAA also recommends that consumers use cards for safety and reliability by a reputable auto mechanic before they purchase the vehicle.

Minimum standards for titling salvage, rebuilt salvage, non-repairable and flood-damaged vehicles will help prevent the fraudulent sale of damaged vehicles and protect consumers from unknowingly purchasing them. However, because states often have unique and various problems relating specifically to salvage vehicles, AAA believes states should be provided flexibility in enacting stricter standards that address individual state concerns as your bill allows.

AAA represents an important step toward addressing the problem, while recognizing the legitimate role states have in motor vehicle licensing and titling laws. AAA recommends your leadership in working with all parties to craft a workable solution and is pleased to support your bill.

Sincerely,

SUSAN G. PIKRALLIDAS, Interim Vice President, Public & Government Relations.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, my goal from the outset has been to protect used car buyers from title fraud. The legislation I proposed was simple, straightforward, and modeled after the recommendations of the Motor Vehicle Titling, Registration, and Salvage Advisory Committee. S. 655 merely establishes model uniform definitions and disclosure requirements for basic terms: salvage; rebuilt salvage; flood; and nonrepairable vehicles. Under the legislation reported out by the Senate Commerce Committee, states would be free to utilize additional terms and to provide additional disclosures beyond those provided for in the bill. States that choose to adopt the four uniform terms and related provisions would be eligible for incentive grants. No state
would be penalized for non-participation or for retaining different standards.

While there is substantial and broad support for this much needed legislation, there continues to be resistance to moving forward with this legislation in the Senate. Unfortunately, this resistance has the effect of allowing unsuspecting consumers to continue to purchase and drive potentially life-threatening vehicles. Delaying this legislation will cost used car buyers only other $4 billion this year and place millions of structurally unsafe vehicles back on America's roads and highways. Roads that our family, friends, and neighbors share every day.

Even though S. 655 has widespread support and follows the recommendations of the Congressionally-chartered Salvage Advisory Committee, a few groups have attempted to undermine this measure at every stage of the process. Unfortunately, these groups seemed to have convinced some of my colleagues that it is better to delay the implementation of clearly needed consumer protections and continue to press for the imposition of untried, untested and in many cases only nonpartisan initiatives. My only interest has been to protect consumers and, by encouraging the use of minimal uniform standards, foster the states, undermining the very purpose of this legislation. These groups claim to have the interests of consumers in mind, yet the best representative of car-buying consumers, the American Automobile Association, has rejected their approach and supports passage of S. 655.

As I am sure my colleagues will agree, advancing titling definitions and standards that states have rejected, and will continue to reject, will exacerbate title fraud. Such an approach only benefits those who prey on unsuspecting car buyers and would jeopardize the minimum standards required to make the program work, unnecessarily harm many vehicle owners and buyers by needlessly reducing the value of their vehicles, create unreasonable or untested standards, foster unnecessary litigation, impinge on states rights, and promote a scheme that states will reject.

During the 104th and 105th Congresses, this was a bipartisan, better yet nonpartisan, initiative. My only interest has been to protect consumers by encouraging the use of minimal uniform disclosure standards for severely damaged vehicles—those involved in a serious accident, severely damaged by falling objects, or vehicles that have sustained significant and lingering water damage. Whether the used car buyer in California, Nevada, or in any other state, he or she needs the pre-purchase disclosure information that S. 655 would provide.

I have made every effort to reach consensus on this legislation. In that vein, a number of changes were incorporated throughout the legislative process to address the concerns of State attorneys general, certain consumer groups, and many of my colleagues. The final version of this legislation incorporates the full range of changes that DMV administrators, including California's Administrator, believe are practicable. The substitute makes it very clear that there is no preemption of state law. The substitute also mirrors much of the State of California's current titling requirements, ensuring that minimal change will be required by our largest state should it choose to apply for the bill's grant money.

Mr. President, even though I have made numerous compromises on this legislation, the goal post continues to move further away. Instead of gaining acceptance, I was recently presented with yet another round of proposed modifications. AAMVA reviewed these proposed changes and determined they would eviscerate the purpose of this legislation. AAMVA opposes these additional changes because they could potentially harm the very people this legislation aims to protect; create a mountain of unnecessary paperwork, and would create a substantial amount of bureaucracy with no added value.

It makes no sense to adopt provisions that the experts on titling matters believe would harm car consumers, the very people this balanced legislation aims to protect. AAMVA, Secretaries of State, local and state law enforcement, state legislators, and the automotive and insurance industries have repeatedly pronounced their support for S. 655. AAA and the California DMV also agree that my substitute bill is the right legislative solution.

Mr. President, if we do not pass this legislation, the real loser is the unfortunate used car buyer in these and other states who unknowingly purchases a wreck on wheels, perhaps a previously totaled government crash test vehicle. Every day that Congress fails to act on this prudent titling legislation, thousands of individuals are harmed and millions of dollars are lost to the unscrupulous practice of title laundering. Let's pass this bill now.

S. 1949

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill, S. 1949, the "Clean Power Plant and Modernization Act," introduced on November 18, 1999, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1949

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,
the United States is 33 percent, 67 percent of the heat generated by burning the fuel is wasted;

(6) technology exists to increase the combustion heat rate efficiency of coal combustion from 35 percent to 50 percent above current levels, and technological advances are possible that would boost the net combustion heat rate efficiency even more;

(7) coal-fired power plants are the leading source of mercury emissions in the United States, releasing an estimated 52 tons of this potent neurotoxin each year;

(8) in 1996, fossil-fueled power plants in the United States produced over 2,000,000,000 tons of carbon dioxide, the primary greenhouse gas;

(9) on average—
   (A) fossil fuel-fired power plants emit 1,999 pounds of carbon dioxide for every megawatt hour of electricity produced; and
   (B) coal-fired power plants emit 2,110 pounds of carbon dioxide for every megawatt hour of electricity produced; and

(c) coal-fired power plants emit 205 pounds of carbon dioxide for every megawatt hour of electricity produced; and

(d) coal-fired power plants emit 2,110 pounds of carbon dioxide for every megawatt hour of electricity produced.

6. emission reductions that the generating unit enters into an agreement with the Administrator to offset by a factor of 1.5 to 1, the emission reductions that the generating unit does not achieve because of the necessary level of financial commitment, the technology exists to increase the combustion heat rate efficiency of fossil fuel-fired generating units to levels achievable through—

(A) use of commercially available combustion technology, including clean coal technologies such as pressurized fluidized bed combustion and an integrated gasification combined cycle system;

(B) installation of pollution controls;

(C) expanded use of renewable and clean energy sources such as biomass, geothermal, solar, wind, and fuel cells;

(D) promotion of application of combined heat and power technologies;

(4) to create financial and regulatory incentives to retire thermally inefficient generating units and replace them with new units that employ high-thermal-efficiency combustion technology and;

(5) to increase the use of renewable and clean energy sources such as biomass, geothermal, solar, wind, and fuel cells;

(6) to establish the Clean Air Trust Fund to fund the training, economic development, carbon sequestration, and research, development, and demonstration programs established under this Act;

(7) to express the sense of Congress that permanent reductions in emissions of greenhouse gases that are accomplished through the retirement of old units and replacement by new units that meet the combustion heat rate efficiency and emission standards specified in this Act should be credited to the utility sector and the owner or operator of the generating unit in any climate change implementation program;

(8) to promote permanent and safe disposal of mercury; and

(9) to increase public knowledge of the sources of mercury exposure and the threat to public health from mercury, particularly the threat to the health of pregnant women and their fetuses, women of childbearing age, and children;

(10) to decrease significantly the threat to human health and the environment posed by mercury;

(11) to provide worker retraining for workers adversely affected by reduced consumption of coal; and

(12) to provide economic development incentives for communities adversely affected by reduced consumption of coal.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term “Administrator” means the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(2) GENERATING UNIT.—The term “generating unit” means an electric utility generating unit.

SEC. 4. COMBUSTION HEAT RATE EFFICIENCY STANDARDS FOR FOSSIL FUEL-FIRED GENERATING UNITS.

(a) STANDARDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than the day that is 10 years after the date of enactment of this Act, each fossil fuel-fired generating unit that commences operation on or before that date shall achieve and maintain, at all operating levels, a combustion heat rate efficiency of not less than 50 percent (based on the higher heating value of the fuel).

(2) FUTURE GENERATING UNITS.—Each fossil fuel-fired generating unit that commences operation more than 10 years after the date of enactment of this Act shall achieve and maintain, at all operating levels, a combustion heat rate efficiency of not less than 50 percent (based on the higher heating value of the fuel), unless granted a waiver under subsection (d).

(b) TEST METHODS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, shall promulgate methods for determining initial and continuing compliance with this section.

(c) PERMIT REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 10 years after the date of enactment of this Act, each generating unit for which a permit issued under title V of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7661 et seq.) that requires compliance with this section.

(d) COMBUSTION HEAT RATE EFFICIENCY STANDARD.—

(1) APPLICATION.—The owner or operator of a generating unit that commences operation more than 10 years after the date of enactment of this Act may apply to the Administrator for a waiver of the combustion heat rate efficiency standard specified in subsection (a)(2) that is applicable to that type of generating unit.

(2) ISSUANCE.—The Administrator may grant the waiver only if—

(A) the owner or operator of the generating unit demonstrates that the technology to meet the combustion heat rate efficiency standard is not commercially available; or

(B) the owner or operator of the generating unit enters into an agreement with the Administrator to offset the factor of 1.5 to 1, using a method approved by the Administrator, the emission reductions that the generating unit does not achieve because of the combustion heat rate efficiency standard specified in subsection (a)(2).
(3) Effect of waiver.—If the Administrator grants a waiver under paragraph (1), the generating unit shall be required to achieve and maintain, at all operating levels, the heat rate efficiency standard specified in subsection (a)(1).

SEC. 5. AIR EMISSION STANDARDS FOR FOSSIL FUEL-FIRED GENERATING UNITS.

(a) All fossil fuel-fired generating units.—Not later than 10 years after the date of enactment of this Act, each fossil fuel-fired generating unit, regardless of its date of construction or commencement of operation, shall be subject to, and operating in physical and operational compliance with, the new source review requirements under section 111 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7411).

(b) EMISSION RATES FOR SOURCES REQUIRED TO MAINTAIN 45 PERCENT EFFICIENCY.—Not later than 10 years after the date of enactment of this Act, each fossil fuel-fired generating unit subject to section 4(a)(2) shall be in compliance with the following emission limitations:

(1) MERCURY.—Each coal-fired or oil-fired generating unit shall be required to remove 90 percent of the mercury contained in the fuel, calculated in accordance with subsection (e).

(2) CARBON DIOXIDE.—(A) NATURAL GAS-FIRED GENERATING UNITS.—Each natural gas-fired generating unit shall be required to achieve an emission rate of not more than 1.3 pounds of carbon dioxide per kilowatt hour of net electric power output.

(B) FUEL OIL-FIRED GENERATING UNITS.—Each fuel oil-fired generating unit shall be required to achieve an emission rate of not more than 0.9 pounds of carbon dioxide per kilowatt hour of net electric power output.

(C) Coal-Fired Generating Units—Each coal-fired generating unit shall be required to achieve an emission rate of not more than 1.55 pounds of carbon dioxide per kilowatt hour of net electric power output.

(3) SULFUR DIOXIDE.—Each fossil fuel-fired generating unit shall be required—

(A) to remove 95 percent of the sulfur dioxide that would otherwise be present in the flue gas; and

(B) to achieve an emission rate of not more than 0.3 pounds of sulfur dioxide per million British thermal units of fuel consumed.

(4) NITROGEN OXIDES.—Each fossil fuel-fired generating unit shall be required—

(A) to remove 90 percent of the nitrogen oxides that would otherwise be present in the flue gas; and

(B) to achieve an emission rate of not more than 0.15 pounds of nitrogen oxides per million British thermal units of fuel consumed.

(d) PERMIT REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, each generating unit shall have a permit issued under title V of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7666 et seq.) that requires compliance with this section.

(e) COMPLIANCE DETERMINATION AND MONITORING.—

(1) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, shall promulgate methods for determining initial and continuing compliance with this section.

(2) CALCULATION OF MERCURY EMISSION REDUCTIONS.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall promulgate sampling techniques and emission monitoring techniques for use by generating units in calculating mercury emission reductions for the purposes of this section.

(f) DISPOSAL OF MERCURY CAPTURED OR RECOVERED THROUGH EMISSION CONTROLS.—

(1) CAPTURED OR RECOVERED MERCURY.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall promulgate regulations requiring each owner or operator of a generating unit to disclose to residential consumers of electricity generated by the unit, on a regular basis (but not less often than annually) and in a manner convenient to the consumers, data concerning the level of emission reductions for each pollutant covered by this section and each air pollutant covered by section 111 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7411).

(2) MERCURY CAPTURED OR RECOVERED THROUGH EMISSION CONTROLS.—

(A) CAPTURED OR RECOVERED MERCURY.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall promulgate regulations to ensure that mercury that is captured or recovered through the use of an emission control, coal cleaning, or another method is disposed of in a manner that ensures that—

(A) the hazards from mercury are not transferred from 1 environmental medium to another; and

(B) there is no release of mercury into the environment.

(B) MERCURY-CONTAINING SLUDES AND WASTES.—The regulations promulgated by the Administrator under paragraph (1) shall ensure that mercury-containing sludges and wastes are handled and disposed of in accordance with all applicable Federal and State laws (including regulations).

(g) PUBLIC REPORTING.—FACILITY-SPECIFIC EMISSION DATA.—

(1) In general.—The Administrator shall annually make available to the public, or another method is disposed of in a manner that ensures that—

(A) the hazards from mercury are not transferred from 1 environmental medium to another; and

(B) there is no release of mercury into the environment.

(B) MERCURY-CONTAINING SLUDES AND WASTES.—The regulations promulgated by the Administrator under paragraph (1) shall ensure that mercury-containing sludges and wastes are handled and disposed of in accordance with all applicable Federal and State laws (including regulations).

(g) PUBLIC REPORTING.—FACILITY-SPECIFIC EMISSION DATA.—

(1) In general.—The Administrator shall annually make available to the public, or another method is disposed of in a manner that ensures that—

(A) the hazards from mercury are not transferred from 1 environmental medium to another; and

(B) there is no release of mercury into the environment.

(B) MERCURY-CONTAINING SLUDES AND WASTES.—The regulations promulgated by the Administrator under paragraph (1) shall ensure that mercury-containing sludges and wastes are handled and disposed of in accordance with all applicable Federal and State laws (including regulations).
SEC. 8. CLEAN AIR TRUST FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter A of chapter 98 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to trust fund code) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 9851. CLEAN AIR TRUST FUND."

"(a) Creation of Trust Fund.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a trust fund to be known as the 'Clean Air Trust Fund' (hereafter referred to in this section as the 'Trust Fund'), consisting of such sums as may be appropriated or credited to the Trust Fund as provided in this section or section 9620(b).

"(b) Transfers to Trust Fund.—There are hereby transferred to the Trust Fund amounts equivalent to the taxes received in the Treasury under section 4681.

"(c) Clean Air Trust Fund.—Amounts in the Trust Fund shall be available, without further Act of appropriation, upon request by the head of the appropriate Federal agency in such amounts as the agency head determines are necessary—

"(1) to provide funding under section 12 of the Clean Power Plant and Modernization Act of 1999, as in effect on the date of enactment of this section; and

"(2) to provide funding for the demonstration program under section 13 of such Act, as in effect on the date of enactment of this section.

"(d) Effective Date.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to property after the item relating to 10-year property under the following:

"12-year property ......................... 12 years'.

SEC. 9. ACCELERATED DEPRECIATION FOR INVESTOR-OWNED GENERATING UNITS.

(a) In General.—Section 168(e)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to classification of certain property) is amended—

"(1) in subparagraph (E) (relating to 15-year property), by striking 'and' at the end of clause (ii), by striking the period at the end of clause (iii) and inserting 'and', and, and by adding at the end the following:

"(iv) any 45-percent efficient fossil-fueled generating unit'; and

"(2) in paragraph (5) (relating to 12-year property).—The term '12-year property' includes any 50-percent efficient fossil-fueled generating unit.

(b) Conforming Amendment.—The table of sections of chapter 1 of subchapter A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following:

"Sec. 951L. Clean Air Trust Fund.''

SEC. 10. GRANTS FOR PUBLICLY OWNED GENERATING UNITS.

Any capital expenditure made after the date of enactment of this Act to purchase, install, and bring into commercial operation any new publicly owned generating unit that—

"(1) is in compliance with sections 4(a)(1) and 5(b) shall, for a 15-year period, be eligible for partial reimbursement through annual grants made by the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Administrator, in an amount equal to the monetary value of the depreciation deduction that would be realized by reason of section 168(c)(9)(E) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 by a similarly-situated investor-owned generating unit over that period; and

"(2) is in compliance with sections 4(a)(2) and 5(c) shall over a 12-year period, be eligible for partial reimbursement through annual grants made by the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Administrator, in an amount equal to the monetary value of the depreciation deduction that would be realized by reason of section 168(c)(3)(D) of such Code by a similarly-situated publically-owned generating unit over that period.

SEC. 11. RECOGNITION OF PERMANENT EMISSION REDUCTIONS IN FUTURE CLIMATE CHANGE IMPLEMENTATION PROGRAMS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

"(1) permanent reductions in emissions of carbon dioxide and nitrogen oxides that are accomplished through the retirement of old generating units and replacement by new generating units that meet the combustion heat rate efficiency and emission standards specified in this Act, or through replacement of old generating units with nonpolluting renewable technologies, should be credited to the utility sector, and to the owner or operator that retires or replaces the old generating unit, in any climate change implementation program enacted by Congress;

"(2) the base year for calculating reductions under a program described in paragraph (1) should be the calendar year preceding the calendar year in which this Act is enacted; and

"(3) a reasonable portion of any monetary value that may be received from a project as a result of the crediting described in paragraph (1) should be passed on to utility customers.

SEC. 12. RENEWABLE AND CLEAN POWER GENERATION.

(a) In General.—Under the Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency Technology Act of 1989 (42 U.S.C. 5801 et seq.), the Secretary of Energy shall fund research and development programs and commercial demonstration projects and partnerships to demonstrate the commercial viability and environmental benefits of electric power generation from—

"(1) biomass (excluding unseparated municipal solid waste), geothermal, solar, and wind technologies; and

"(2) fuel cells.

(b) Types of Projects.—Demonstration projects may include solar power tower projects, co-firing of biomass with coal, biomass modular systems, next-generation wind turbines and wind turbine verification projects, geothermal energy conversion, and fuel cells.

SEC. 13. CLEAN COAL, ADVANCED GAS TURBINE, AND COMBINED HEAT AND POWER DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS.

(a) In General.—Under subdivision (b) of title XXI of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 13271 et seq.), the Secretary of Energy shall establish a program to fund projects and partnerships designed to demonstrate the efficiency and environmental benefits of electric power generation from—

"(1) coal technologies such as pressurized fluidized bed combustion and an integrated gasification combined cycle system;

"(2) advanced gas turbine technologies, such as flexible mid-sized gas turbines and base-load utility scale applications; and

"(3) combined heat and power technologies.

(b) Selection Criteria.—It is the sense of Congress that—

"(1) in general.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Energy shall promulgate criteria and procedures for selection of demonstration projects and partnerships to be funded under subsection (a).

"(2) required criteria.—At a minimum, the selection criteria shall include—

"(A) the potential of a proposed demonstration project or partnership to reduce or avoid emissions of pollutants covered by section 5 and air pollution control techniques;

"(B) the total cost of the proposed demonstration project or partnership, including the share of such costs contributed by the Federal Government or any State or local government that may be paid under section 5 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7405); and

"(C) the potential commercial viability of the proposed demonstration project or partnership.

(c) Authorization of Appropriations.—

"(1) in general.—In addition to amounts made available under any other law, there is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section $75,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2010.

"(2) distribution.—The Secretary shall make reasonable efforts to ensure that, under the program established under this section, the same amount of funding is provided for demonstration projects and partnerships under each of paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a).

SEC. 14. EVALUATION OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THIS ACT AND OTHER STATUTES.

(a) In General.—Not later than 111 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Energy, in consultation with the Chairman of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Chairman of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, shall submit to Congress a report on the implementation of this Act.


(c) Recommendations.—The report shall include recommendations from the Secretary of Energy, the Chairman of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, and the Administrator for legislative or administrative measures to harmonize and streamline the statutes specified in subsection (b) and the regulations implementing those statutes.

SEC. 15. ASSISTANCE FOR WORKERS AFFECTED BY REDUCED CONSUMPTION.

In addition to amounts made available under any other law, there is authorized to
be appropriated $75,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2015 to provide assistance, under the economic dislocation and worker adjustment assistance program of the Department of Commerce, authorized by the Job Training Partnership Act (29 U.S.C. 1661 et seq.), to coal industry workers who are terminated from employment as a result of reduced consumption of coal by the electric power generation industry.

SEC. 16. COMMUNITY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT INCENTIVES FOR COMMUNITIES ADVERSELY AFFECTED BY REDUCED CONSUMPTION OF COAL.

In addition to amounts made available under any other law, there is authorized to be appropriated $75,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2015 to provide assistance, under the economic adjustment program of the Department of Commerce authorized by the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3211 et seq.), to assist communities adversely affected by reduced consumption of coal by the electric power generation industry.

SEC. 17. CARBON SEQUESTRATION.

(a) CARBON SEQUESTRATION STRATEGY.—In addition to amounts made available under any other law, there is authorized to be appropriated to the Environmental Protection Agency and the Department of Energy for each fiscal year 2003 through 2010 a total of $15,000,000 to conduct research and development activities in basic and applied science in support of development by September 30, 2005 of a carbon sequestration strategy that is designed to offset all growth in carbon dioxide emissions in the United States after 2010.

(b) METHODS FOR BIOLOGICALLY SEQUESTRING CARBON DIOXIDE.—In addition to amounts made available under any other law, there is authorized to be appropriated to the Environmental Protection Agency and the Department of Agriculture for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2010 a total of $30,000,000 to conduct research and development to develop and implement methods for biologically sequestering carbon dioxide.

(c) LIMITATION.—A project carried out using funds made available under this section shall not be used to offset any emission reduction required under any other provision of this Act.

THE RUSSIAN LEadersHIP PROGRAM

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I am pleased to announce that Congress included $10 million in the Foreign Operations Appropriations bill to continue the Russian Leadership Program in Fiscal Year 2000.

The Russian Leadership Program was created earlier this year in the FY 1999 Supplemental Appropriations bill in order to bring emerging Russian leaders to the United States to see first hand how democracy and the American free market economic system function. The program was successful in bringing over 2,100 emerging leaders from 83 of the 89 states and republics in the Russian Federation during July, August, and September of this year. Dr. Billington, the Librarian of Congress, and one of the world’s leading historians of Russian culture was asked to administer this program. Our thanks go to Dr. Billington for doing an excellent job implementing this program in a short period of time.

The program was modeled after the Marshall Plan which was implemented after World War II. Between 1946-1956, the U.S. Government brought over 10,000 Germans citizens to the United States to learn ways to rebuild their economy, implement social assistance as well as cultural and political contacts. The Marshall Plan was one of the most successful foreign aid programs of the last century.

Similar to the Marshall Plan, participants in the Russian Leadership Program visited more than 400 communities in 46 states and the District of Columbia observing democracy in action at all levels of government. They talked and discussed the American system of government with current and former U.S. Presidents, Members of the U.S. Senate and U.S. House, Governors, state legislators, state supreme court justices, mayors, and members of city and town councils, etc.

Some of the participants also campaigned door-to-door with political candidates, visited police and fire stations, met with students in schools, visited hospitals, research facilities, businesses, libraries, theaters, parks, and other experienced firsthand the partnership among government, and the private sector.

This program was unique because more than 800 American families hosted our Russian visitors, welcoming them into their homes and communities, and spending the time to answer questions about and show our guests the American way of life. Vadim Baikov, one of those who visited Alaska, the State I represent, wrote after the program that, “In my opinion, the best cultural aspect is that we stayed with the families, because in this way one can actually gain insight of the genuine American lifestyle. I think that is what counts the most.”

Organizations such as Rotary International, the United Methodist Church, Freedom Force, and the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints played a key role in organizing the participants in the program both in Russia and the United States. In addition to volunteering their time, these families and hosting communities generously supplemented the government’s $10 million appropriations by providing approximately $1.5 million worth of meals, cultural activities, additional transportation and medical care.

Beyond any obvious hospitality that developed between guests and hosts, it is clear that the Russian Leadership Program fundamentally changed how these Russian guests see America. They constitute the largest single group ever to travel from Russia to the U.S. They return to Russia with clear ideas and strong commitment to positive change. A mayor from Tomsk spend time with the mayor of Cleveland and said: “If we were to meet more often, there would be more peaceful relations.”

The Russian Leadership Program has had a tremendous impact in one year. It is a good program and I am pleased that we were able to provide the necessary funding to continue this program into the new millennium.

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AND COMMUNICATIONS OMNIBUS REFORM ACT OF 1999

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the revised “Intellectual Property and Communications Omnibus Reform Act of 1999” (H.R. 1554). As a Member of the Judiciary Committee, I am particularly pleased that this legislation includes as Title IV, the “American Inventors Protection Act of 1999.” This important patent reform measure includes a series of initiatives intended to protect the rights of inventors, enhance patent protections and reduce patent litigations.

Perhaps most importantly, subtitle C of title IV contains the so-called “First Inventor Defense.” This defense provides a first inventor (or “prior user”) with a defense in patent infringement lawsuits, whenever an inventor of a business method (i.e., a practice process or system) uses the invention but does not patent it. Currently, patent law does not provide original inventors with any protections when a subsequent user, who patents the method at a later date, files a lawsuit for infringement against the real creator of the invention.

The first inventor defense will provide incentives for financial services industry with important, needed protections in the face of the uncertainty presented by the Federal Circuit’s decision in the State Street case. State Street Bank and Trust Company v. Signature Financial Group, Inc. 149 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir., 1998). In State Street, the Court did away with the so-called “business methods” exception to statutory patentable subject matter. Consequently, this decision has raised questions about what types of business methods may now be eligible for patent protection. In the financial services sector, this has prompted serious legal and practical concerns. It has created doubt regarding whether or not particular business methods used by the industry—including processes, practices, and systems—might now suddenly become subject to new claims under the patent law. In terms of everyday business practice, these types of systems and methods were previously protected as trade secrets and were not viewed as patentable material.

The first inventor defense strikes a fair balance between patent and trade secret law. Specifically, this provision creates a defense for inventors who (1) acting in good faith have reduced the subject matter to practice in the United States at least one year prior to the patent filing date (“effective filing date”) of another (typically later) inventor; and (2) commercially used the subject matter in the United States before the filing date of the patent. Commercial use does not require that the
As used in this legislation, the term "method" is intended to be construed broadly. The term "method" is defined as meaning "a method of doing or conducting business." Thus, "method" includes any internal method of doing business, a method used in the course of doing or conducting business, or a method for conducting business in the public marketplace. It includes a practice, process, activity, or system that is used in the design, formulation, testing, or manufacture of any product or service. The defense will be applicable against method claims, as well as the claims involving machines or articles the manufacturer used to practice such methods (i.e., apparatus claims). New technologies are being developed every day, which include technology that employs both methods of doing business and physical apparatus designed to carry out a method of doing business. The first inventor defense is intended to protect both method claims and apparatus claims.

When viewed specifically from the standpoint of the financial services industry, the term "method" includes financial instruments, financial products, financial transactions, the ordering of financial information, and any system or process that transmits or transforms information with respect to investments or other types of financial transactions. In this context, it is important to point out the beneficial effects that such methods have brought to our society. These include the encouragement of home ownership, the broadened availability of capital for small businesses, and the development of a variety of pension and investment opportunities for millions of Americans.

As the joint explanatory statement of the Conference Committee on H.R. 1554 notes, the provision "focuses on methods for doing and conducting business, including methods used in connection with internal commercial operations as well as those used in connection with the sale or transfer of useful end results—whether in the form of physical products, or in the form of services, or in the form of some other useful results; for example, results produced to the manipulation of data or other imports to produce a useful result." H. Rept. 106- , p. 31.

The language of the provision states that the defense is not available if the person has actually abandoned commercial use of the subject matter. As used in the legislation, abandonment refers to the cessation of use with no intent to resume. Intervals of non-use between such periodic or cyclical activities such as seasonable factors or reasonable intervals between contracts, however, should not be considered to be abandonment.

As noted earlier, in the wake of State Street, thousands of methods and processes that have been and are used internally are now subject to the possibility of being claimed as patented inventions. Previously, the businesses that developed and used such methods and processes thought that secrecy was the only protection available. As the conference report on H.R. 1554 states: "(U)nder established law, any of these inventions which have been in commercial use—public or secret—for more than one year cannot now be the subject of a valid U.S. patent." H. Rept. 106- , p. 31.

Mr. President, patent law should encourage innovation, not create barriers to the development of innovative financial products, credit vehicles, and e-commerce generally. The patent law was never intended to prevent people from doing what they are already doing. While I am very pleased that the first inventors defense is included in H.R. 1554, it should be viewed as just the first step in defining the appropriate limits and boundaries of the State Street decision. This legal defense will provide important protections for companies against unfair and unjustified patent infringement actions. But, at the same time, I believe that it is time for Congress to take a closer look at the potentially broad and, perhaps, adverse consequences of the State Street decision. I hope that beginning early next year the Judiciary Committee will hold hearings on the State Street issue, so Senators can carefully evaluate its economic and competitive consequences.

Mr. TORRICELLI. My colleague is correct. The State Street decision may have unintended consequences for the financial services community. By explicitly holding that business methods are patentable, financial service companies are finding that the techniques and ideas, that were in wide use, are now being patented by others.

The Prior Inventor Defense of H.R. 1554 is an important step towards protecting the financial services industry. By protecting early developers and users of a business method, the defense allows U.S. companies to commit resources to the commercialization of their inventions with confidence that a subsequent patent holder will prevail in a patent infringement suit. Without this defense, financial services companies face unfair patent-infringement suits over the use of techniques and ideas (methods) they developed and have used for years.

While I support the Prior Inventor Defense, as a member of the Judiciary Committee, I hope we will revisit this issue next year. More must be done to address the boundaries of the State Street decision with the realities of the constantly changing and developing financial services industry.

I look forward to working with Senator SCHUMER and my colleagues on the committee on this important issue.

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 1999

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until the hour of 10 a.m. on Friday, November 19. I further ask consent that on Friday, immediately following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and that the Senate then proceed to morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. MURKOWSKI. For the information of all Senators, when the Senate convenes, it will begin consideration of a number of legislative items that have been cleared for action and need to be considered in the House prior to adjournment. Following the consideration of these bills, the Senate will resume debate on the final appropriations bill. Further, as a reminder, cloture was filed today on the appropriations conference report, and there is still hope that the Wisconsin delegation will allow the cloture vote to occur at a reasonable hour during tomorrow's session. However, if no agreement is made, the cloture vote will occur at 1:01 a.m. on Saturday morning, and abbreviated postcloture debate is anticipated. Therefore, Senators can expect a vote to occur a few hours after the cloture vote.

In addition, the Senate may consider the Work Incentives conference report prior to the pending adjournment.
Mr. MURKOWSKI. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask unanimous consent the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Is there a unanimous consent request pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Reserving the right to object, I ask unanimous consent with regard to the cloture vote which the Senator from Alaska described, that the vote take place at 10 a.m. on Saturday; and that should cloture be invoked, no more than 21 hours of debate remain.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Reserving the right to object, I simply want to indicate, as one member from the Wisconsin delegation, there is an effort to be reasonable with respect to the hour of the vote and to limit our rights with respect to the 30 hours respectively. Our goal is certainly not to cause people to vote at a very extreme hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in adjournment until 10 a.m., Friday, November 19, 1999.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 10:44 p.m., adjourned until Friday, November 19, 1999, at 10 a.m.
EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 2420

HON. RICHARD H. BAKER
OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 17, 1999

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, we need to make sure that America’s schools, libraries, and rural clinics are allowed to capitalize on the newest computer and data communications technology.

In 1996, Congress and the Clinton Administration joined together to establish a program to extend the Internet to all our schools. That effort is underway—at a cost of about $2.45 billion a year, incidentally. But in this field, just like everywhere else, it is the weakest link in the chain that matters. And, the “weak link” here is the data communications network—or, more accurately, the lack of such a network.

Mr. Speaker, instead of trying to expand these networks by harnessing the power of competition, economic freedom, and individual choice, the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) seems to be relying on yesterday’s tools—heavy handed and restrictive regulation.

That’s not my estimate, it’s the considered judgment of two of this country’s experts—Congressman John Dingell and his colleague, the Chairman of the House Telecommunications Subcommittee, Congressman Tauzin.

Their appraisal of the situation is that we need to modernize and reform FCC regulation—because, otherwise, the data links which this country needs, are just not going to be available. That is the philosophy reflected in their bill, H.R. 2420. And, it is a pro-growth, pro-progress view which I want to embrace.

Mr. Speaker, if we can accomplish reform in this field, all of the experts are predicting that there can be a rapid expansion of our communications networks. That expansion, in turn, will help connect our schools, libraries, and clinics faster. And that will yield substantial public policy dividends.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE TEXAS REALTOR OF THE YEAR

HON. RALPH M. HALL
OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 17, 1999

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my congratulations to Barbara Russell of Denton, Texas, who this year was named the 1998 Realtor of the Year by the Texas Association of Realtors.

Barbara has served on the Texas Association of Realtors Board of Directors and is a former regional vice president and chairman of the legislative and economic development committees. She also served two-three year terms on the National Association of Realtors Board of Directors.

In Denton, Barbara has earned many honors, including the Greater Denton/Wise County Association of Realtors President’s Award, Women’s Council of Realtors Gold Rule Award, Realtor of the Year and Associate of the Year. In addition, she is active in various civic and charitable organizations, including serving as former chairman of the board of the Denton Chamber of Commerce and serving four years on the Denton Planning and Zoning Commission.

Barbara has nearly 30 years of experience in the real estate business, and this recent award is a testament to her professional accomplishments and her hard work. She is married to Benny Russell, and they have two daughters and four grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I also did not pay tribute to the late Mary Claude Gay, a prominent realtor in Denton and associate of Barbara’s. Mary Claude’s contributions to her profession also have been significant, and she, too, was very influential in Denton’s community life.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize Barbara Russell and Mary Claude Gay for their accomplishments in their profession and for their contributions to their community. The Texas Association of Realtors could not have accomplished their mission without the leadership of these two remarkable women.

Mr. Speaker, this bill makes a number of important changes to veteran’s health care programs.

H.R. 2116—Veterans Millennium Health Care and Benefits Act

SPEECH OF
HON. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE
OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 16, 1999

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2116. This bill makes a number of important changes to veteran’s health care programs.

H.R. 2116—Veterans Millennium Health Care Act makes comprehensive reforms to improve access to, as well as the timeliness and quality of the Veterans Administration health care system. Reforms to improve veterans’ access to care include requiring the VA to increase home and community based options for veterans needing extended care; requiring the VA to provide nursing home care to certain veterans through 2003; establishing means to enhance revenues for the VA; lifting the six-month limit on VA adult day health care; authorizing the VA to enhance mental health care services; and establishing a pilot program to make contract arrangements for assisted living services.

Although the calendar year indicates that we honor these men and women on Memorial Day and Veterans Day, I believe that we should pause everyday to thank them for their sacrifice. The collective experience of our 25 million living veterans encompasses the turbulence and progress America has experienced throughout the twentieth century. This nation’s veterans have written much of the history of the last hundred years. They have served this nation without reservation or hesitation during its darker moments.

Their unwavering devotion to duty and country has brought this nation through two World Wars and numerous costly struggles against aggression. From World War I to the Gulf War, America’s veterans have been leading this nation against those who have threatened the values and interests of our nation.

Only today are the accomplishments and sacrifices of our veterans being fully appreciated by historians and the public. These genuine heroes have often been ignored and denied their proper place in America’s melting pot. We need to remember that America owes these men and women the best it can offer because they have given us the best they could when America was in need.

Mr. Speaker, I am fortunate to have The Houston Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center located in my congressional district. Having just celebrated fifty years of service to the veterans in the Houston community. Some 1,646,700 veterans live in the State of Texas alone. The House VA Medical Center expects to receive and serve over 50,000 veterans in this year alone. I expect this measure to improve the quality of life for all our veterans who so proudly served our nation.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is important not only because it provides for the needs of our veterans today but because it sends an important signal to the men and women serving our nation in places like Bosnia, Kosovo, Germany, Korea, Japan and other far off places around the world. That message is simple, that when you serve our nation we will answer the plea of President Lincoln “to care for him who shall have borne the battle.” I urge my colleague to vote “yes” on H.R. 2116 and care for the men and women who have borne the battle.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN DORRENBACKER—A GREAT AMERICAN

HON. SCOTT MCINNIS
OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 17, 1999

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I wish to take this moment to recognize the remarkable life and significant achievements of a leading civic servant, John Dorrenbacher. Tragically, John died in his home Monday, November 8, 1999. While family, friends and colleagues remember the truly exceptional life of John, I, too, would like to pay tribute to this remarkable man.

● This “bullet” symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.
For the last 18 years, John ran the computers and books for the Colorado Republican Party. In his time at the party, he was a pioneer of the mailing list. In the earliest days of computers, he mastered integrating information to create better mailing lists. With this advancement, those who John served were able to do targeted mailings, therefore better contacting constituents and ultimately, better serving the people. There may not be a Colorado Republican in legislative or statewide office today who wasn’t helped by a mailing list generated by John. Amazingly, John managed to serve five very different Republican chairmen. In addition, he once served as Boulder County GOP chairman.

Although his professional accomplishments will long be remembered and admired, most who knew him will remember John Dorrenbacher, above all else, as someone who loved his country and had a deep faith in our democracy. It is clear that the multitude of those who, like me, have come to know John as a friend will be worse off in his absence. However, Mr. Speaker, I am confident that, in spite of this loss, the family and friends of John Dorrenbacher can take solace in the knowledge that each is a better person for having known him.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. DAISY BATES

HON. EARL F. HILLIARD
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 17, 1999

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to with a great sense of twoness—one as an African American and another as an American to honor death of my mentor and friend, Mrs. Daisy Bates. Her death last Friday came prematurely as we honor Congressional Gold Medals to the men and women, known as the Little Rock Nine, that she shepherded into Central High School against the will of a racist Governor and white neighbors. She worked for many years in the NAACP and with the Democratic National Committee to educate and register voters. In 1987, the City of Little Rock paid tribute to her work by naming an elementary school in her honor. Her life is a celebration of progress and shows us how man in his quest for justice, is determined and cannot be deterred. Her sacrifices to tear down the walls of prejudice and injustice through education and voter registration will go ahead, whether we accept it or not. Daisy Bates’ life, along with the life of other Civil Rights Movement heroes, showcases how overcoming racism in this country has become one of the greatest adventures of all time. But, it is an adventure that must be overcome.

Today as I lift up Daisy Bates, I acknowledge that there is new knowledge to be gained, new rights to be won for the progress of not just African Americans, but all Americans. Whether this country likes it or not, there will come a day when the position of pre-eminence for the United States will not rest on the human rights it has obtained for others across the world, but the rights and dignity she has bestowed upon her own citizens.

Our forefathers made certain that this country would ride the first waves of the industrial revolution, the first waves of modern invention, the first waves of nuclear power, and the first waves of equality under the law. Unfortunately, we have not yet ridden the wave for equal justice and must struggle to once again be a part of it and lead it. The eyes of the world now look unto us for the banner of freedom and peace.

So, today, as I honor my mentor for her work, and undying courage, I challenge my brothers and sisters across the world to begin establishing their lives, like Daisy Bates as instruments of knowledge and understanding.

EXPRESSING GRAVE CONCERN REGARDING ARMED CONFLICT IN NORTH CAUCASUS REGION OF RUSSIAN FEDERATION

SPEECH OF
HON. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 16, 1999

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 206. This resolution expresses the views of the Congress urging all parties involved in the conflict, to cease the indiscriminate use of force against civilian population in Chechnya. In addition this measure calls on all sides in this conflict to enter into a constructive dialogue under the auspicious of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe. This group was successful in brokering a settlement to end the 1994–1996 war.

Mr. Speaker, this region as once before experienced the horrors of war. As the 1994–1996 Russo-Chechen war resulted in the massive use of force against civilians, causing immense human casualties, human rights violations, large-scale displacement of individuals, and the destruction of property. In recent months this conflict has been renewed as forces in Chechnya have mounted armed incursions into the Russian Federation of Dagestan and have committed bombing in Moscow.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress must insist that all parties in this conflict resolve this situation peacefully, with complete respect to the human rights of all the citizens of the Russian Federation. We must also insist that all parties commit themselves to allowing humanitarian assistance to the victims caught in the middle of this conflict.

I urge my colleagues to lend their support and the considerable weight of this body on all sides involved in this conflict.

EXPRESSING GRAVE CONCERN REGARDING ARMED CONFLICT IN NORTH CAUCASUS REGION OF RUSSIAN FEDERATION

SPEECH OF
HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 17, 1999

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to announce the grand opening of the Czech Cultural Center of Sokol Greater Cleveland’s new athletic, a state-of-the-art expansion to the historic Bohemian National Hall.

After considerable planning and construction, the new facility opening this month will provide a variety of health, fitness, leisure, and cultural activities to everyone in the community. In the tradition of the American Sokol Organization, the Czech Cultural Center of Sokol Greater Cleveland’s new athletic facility will provide Cleveland citizens with the opportunity to strengthen both their physical and mental character allowing them to enhance their celebration of life and vitality. As a member of the community open to the community, this new facility is sure to provide Cleveland citizens with an opportunity to cultivate a harmonious and total person.

The Czech Cultural Center of Sokol Greater Cleveland’s new athletic facility promises to be a popular place for fitness enthusiasts who will enjoy the volleyball, gymnasium, cardio-conditioning area and strength training center. Additionally, the facility will serve as a center for community development where both young and older generations can display their abilities and knowledge in dance and gymnastic performances. In short, the health and quality of life for everyone in Cleveland will improve greatly with the opening of this new facility.

My fellow colleagues, please join me in recognizing dedication of the Czech Cultural Center of Sokol Greater Cleveland for building this new athletic facility for the benefit of the Cleveland community.

EXPRESSING GRATITUDE TO WORK AND DEDICATION OF THE U.S. EMBASSY IN MOSCOW

SPEECH OF
HON. RALPH M. HALL
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 17, 1999

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to rise today in recognition of Don W. Scoggins, president of the Texas Eastman Division of Eastman Chemical Company in Lexington, Texas, who is retiring this year after 37 years of service at Texas Eastman.

Mr. Scoggins joined Texas Eastman in 1962 as a Mechanical Engineer in the Plastics Laboratory. He has served as a supervisor, assistant supervisor, assistant to the general superintendent, senior mechanical engineer, and assistant superintendent of various divisions at Texas Eastman. He also served Eastman Chemical in Kingsport, Tennessee, in a variety of capacities before returning to Texas Eastman as director of Administration. He was named manager of Operations in 1989, became a vice president in 1990 and was named president in 1998.

Mr. Scoggins received a bachelor’s degree in mechanical engineering from the University of Texas and is a Registered Professional Engineer in Texas. He serves on the Texas Chemical Council’s Board of Directors and on the Board of Trustees at Good Shepherd Medical Center.

Texas Eastman’s influence on economic development and community causes in Longview has been enormous, and the employees and administrators at Texas Eastman—like Don Scoggins—have played a significant role in those accomplishments. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize Don Scoggins for his contributions to Texas Eastman Division and to his community—and to wish him well in his retirement.

I am especially privileged in that Don’s mother and father live in my hometown of Rockwall. They are, like Don, strong and loved members of the First United Methodist
Church. They teach, direct, entertain, and lead us in both the Sunday School class and in the overall direction of our religious activities.

As we adjourn today—the last day of this century that the United States House of Representatives is in session—let us adjourn on this signal day in respect and admiration for Don Scoggins.

INTRODUCTION OF TWO BILLS TO REDUCE TAXES ON SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

HON. JERROLD NADLER
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 17, 1999

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join with Representative NITA LOWEY to announce the introduction of two bills to reduce taxes on Social Security benefits. The first bill would repeal the 1993 tax increase on Social Security benefits. I have always opposed this provision, and I believe that it is now time to repeal this tax on our Nation’s seniors. The 1993 economic plan imposed additional taxation on the benefits of single social security recipients with incomes over $34,000, and on married recipients with joint incomes over $44,000 by including, in each case, 85 percent of Social Security benefits in taxable income. At the time, proponents of the tax increase said it was necessary to reduce to deficit. Remember the atrocious national debt had risen from $800 billion in 1981 to more than $4 trillion in 1993. The annual deficit, which was almost $300 billion a year in 1992, was projected to increase to $500 billion a year later in the decade. We passed a tough economic plan, the economy improved, and the deficit was eliminated.

I believe it was unfair to tax seniors on their social security benefits to reduce the deficit, and, therefore, I joined with Representative NITA LOWEY in offering a bill which would have repealed the provision immediately and taken other steps to reduce the deficit. We demonstrated that you could still reduce the deficit without increasing taxes on social security benefits. Now that 6 years have passed and the deficit has been transformed into a surplus, it is more important than ever that we demonstrate that you could still reduce the deficit without increasing taxes on Social Security benefits. The first bill would declare the income levels that were set in 1993 permanently less income every year. Under current law, the income levels that were set in 1993 were not adjusted for cost of living increases. At the time, proponents of the tax increase argued that the provision would expire in 1997. As we adjourn today—the last day of this century that the United States House of Representatives is in session—let us adjourn on this signal day in respect and admiration for Don Scoggins.

INTRODUCTION OF EXPEDITED RESCission LEGISLATION

HON. CHARLES W. STENHOLM
OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 17, 1999

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today that will give the President an important tool to control spending by identifying low priority and wasteful spending that can be eliminated. The legislation I am introducing today, known as modified line item veto or expedited rescission legislation, would strengthen the ability of Presidents to identify and eliminate low-priority budget items with the support of a majority in Congress.

Under this legislation the President would be able to single out individual items in tax or spending legislation and send a rescission package to Congress. The President would have the option of earmarking savings from proposed rescissions to deficit reduction by Congress. Congress could vote to accept or reject a rescission bill. The President would have the option of vetoing or signing the legislation. Congress would be required to vote up or down on the package under an expedited procedure. Members could offer motions to remove individual items from the package by vote if their measure was supported by a majority of members. The spending items would be eliminated or the tax item would be repealed if a majority of Congress approves the rescission package. If the rescission bill is defeated in either House the funds for any proposed rescission would be spent or the tax item would take effect.

This legislation embodies an idea which many Members, both Democrats and Republicans, have worked on for several years. Dan Quayle first introduced expedited rescission legislation in 1985. Tom Carper and Dick Armey did yeomen’s work in pushing this legislation for several years. On the Democratic side, Tim JOHNSON, Dan Glickman, Tim Penny and L.F. Payne were particularly effective advocates of this legislation for years. Numerous Representatives, including Lynn Martin, Bill Frenzel, Gerald Solomon, Harris Fawell and others made meaningful contributions to expedited rescission legislation as it has developed.

Thanks to the efforts of these and other members, the House overwhelmingly passed expedited rescission legislation in the 102nd Congress. In the 103rd Congress, JOHN SPRATT and Butler Derrick worked with me to refine the legislation. This revised legislation was passed by the House in 1993. In 1994, Representatives JOHN KASICH and Tom Carper joined the effort and helped pass a strengthened version of this legislation. In 1995, Representatives Bob Wise, Rob Andrews and others have advocated this approach. Today, I am joined by David Minge, Rob Andrews, Collin Peterson, Marion Berry, Max Sandlin, Ralph Hall and Allen Boyd in introducing this legislation.

We have heard a lot of talk about eliminating waste and pork barrel spending, but little serious action to actually eliminate pork barrel spending. In fact, the appropriations bills passed by the House includes hundreds of earmarks for spending items that were not requested by the administration and have not been subject to hearings or review. Senator John McCain has identified more than $14 billion of spending items buried in appropriations...
bills that have not been subjected to the proper review. Other private organizations have identified even more earmarked spending in the appropriations bills passed by Congress which they believe can be eliminated. Instead of subjecting these spending items buried in the appropriations bills to scrutiny, the Majority has protected the board spending that would cut good programs just as much as we cut low priority and wasteful programs.

Forcing votes on individual items in tax and spending bills will bring a little more accountability to the budget process. I hope that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who are serious about controlling spending and eliminating wasteful spending and special interest tax breaks that cannot withstand public scrutiny, will join me in cosponsoring this legislation.

**SUMMARY OF EXPEDITED RESCISSION LEGISLATION**

The legislation would amend the Budget Control and Impoundment Act of 1974 to require Congress to consider Presidential rescission of appropriations or tax items by a majority vote.

The President could propose to cut or eliminate individual spending items in appropriations bills or to repeal targeted tax breaks (tax breaks which benefit a particular taxpayer or class of taxpayers, except benefits based on demographic conditions). The President would be required to submit proposed rescissions of tax items within ten days of signing the tax bill. Proposed rescissions of spending items could be submitted at any time during the fiscal year.

The President could propose that the discretionary spending limits be reduced or eliminated, or the tax items in the rescission package are repealed or reduced, or the tax items in the rescission package are repealed.

**TRIBUTE TO FRANCES L. MURPHY**

**HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON**

**OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

Wednesday, November 17, 1999

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Frances L. Murphy, Sr., publisher of the AFRO-American Newspapers from 1918 until his death in 1967. But, Ms. Murphy did not start at the top. She learned her business inside out, starting as a library assistant, and moved up the ladder to reporter, then editor, magazine editor, and managing editor before becoming publisher.

In addition to her work as publisher of the AFRO, Ms. Murphy has spent much of her time as an educator. She started in the Baltimore schools in 1958, where she stayed until 1964, when she took her first position in higher education at Morgan State College. Until then, Dr. Murphy did not start at the top. She learned her business inside out, starting as a library assistant, and moved up the ladder to reporter, then editor, magazine editor, and managing editor before becoming publisher.

Ms. Murphy is well known for her contributions to her community, having served as a member of the National Board of Directors of the NAACP and of the Board of Trustees of both the State Colleges of Maryland and the University of the District of Columbia. She is also active in the Episcopal Church Women. All this from a woman who has been a distinguished journalist and publisher, and managed, as well, to raise three children, and now to be grandmother to fourteen grandchildren, and great-grandmother to two.

If the President’s rescission package is approved by a simple majority of the House, the bill would be sent to the Senate for consideration under the same expedited procedure. Fifteen Senators may request a separate vote on an individual item.

If a simple majority in either the House or Senate defeats the President’s rescission proposal, the funds for programs covered by the proposal would be released for obligation in accord with the previously enacted appropriation, or the tax provision would take effect.

If a bill rescinding spending or eliminating tax benefits is approved by the House and Senate, it would be sent to the President for his signature. Upon the Presidential signature, the spending items in the rescission package are reduced or eliminated, or the tax items in the rescission package are repealed.
many soldiers returned from the hardships during the war, seeing friends or relatives die in battle, many Americans did not support them and many soldiers felt very unappreciated. Veterans are now beginning to be recognized by other foreign war heroes. Veterans gather at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial in Washington, DC to place gifts and signs that pay tribute to their friends and relatives who fell in the Vietnam War. Families have lost sons and/or daughters in wars. Their thoughts and many others are toward peace and the avoidance of future wars.

Today, let us give thanks to these Vietnam veterans and all the brave men and women who fought in our nation’s wars. Their thoughts and many other veterans and all the brave men and women who fought in wars.

Veterans Day is a very important day to all. Men and women from all over the world have fought for their countries in many different ways, and we honor them on this very special day. We celebrate their accomplishments and sacrifices. Veterans Day is a great way to honor all who have died and all who are still living that have served their nation in the military. All of the men and women who are presently serving in our military that God will keep them out of harm’s way.

Mr. Speaker, I wish all of these fine authors the best of luck in their future studies.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on October 25, JOHN DUNCAN of Tennesse and I introduced H.R. 3142, the College Student Credit Card Protection Act. Madison Avenue and the credit card companies have convinced our college students that getting a credit card is necessary for a fun college experience. But upon graduation, many of these young people find themselves buried in debt. Just recently, the House recognized the need to educate young people on this issue by passing a bill to encourage high schools to teach financial literacy, including credit education. College by college, state by state, this issue is being recognized as a serious problem that needs to be addressed.

A recent report found that one-fifth of the Nation’s college students are carrying credit card debts of more than $5000. Seventy percent of undergraduates at 4-year colleges possess at least one credit card. One 19-year-old sophomore student in the Rochester, NY area who had no income recently attempted to declare bankruptcy; he had accumulated a stack of credit cards and owed the credit card companies $22,000! In Knoxville, TN, one college student ran up $30,000 in credit card debt in just 2 years. Students are snowballing into debt through the extension of unaffordable credit lines, peer pressure to spend, and financial naiveté. Low minimum monthly payments and routine credit limits hikes add to the seductiveness of plastic.

Even though many students with credit cards have no income to pay the bills, credit card companies are aggressively marketing their cards to college students. Credit card companies pay for a fun college experience. But upon graduation, many of these young people find themselves buried in debt. Just recently, the House recognized the need to educate young people on this issue by passing a bill to encourage high schools to teach financial literacy, including credit education. College by college, state by state, this issue is being recognized as a serious problem that needs to be addressed.

A recent report found that one-fifth of the Nation’s college students are carrying credit card debts of more than $5000. Seventy percent of undergraduates at 4-year colleges possess at least one credit card. One 19-year-old sophomore student in the Rochester, NY area who had no income recently attempted to declare bankruptcy; he had accumulated a stack of credit cards and owed the credit card companies $22,000! In Knoxville, TN, one college student ran up $30,000 in credit card debt in just 2 years. Students are snowballing into debt through the extension of unaffordable credit lines, peer pressure to spend, and financial naiveté. Low minimum monthly payments and routine credit limits hikes add to the seductiveness of plastic.
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He can’t play golf because of the bad left hip. He won’t play checkers anymore because that’s what he was doing when the world started spinning, and he walked into a restroom and couldn’t find his way out. A stroke, the doctors told him. A woman came to get him in the restroom and asked him to step back with his right foot. He tried to comply but his leg stepped forward instead, right into the toilet.

Checkers was fun, and he was good at it, but it’s not worth it if it reminds him of that. Now the only hobby he has left is football.

This is what can happen to you if you coach.

Or maybe this is what happens if you’re Gordon Wood, the greatest coach in the history of Texas high school football.

A Dallas Morning News panel of college coaches and sports writers chose Wood over a group that included Waco’s Paul Tyson, who won four state championships in the 1970s; Austin’s Darrell Royal, who calls Wood “one of the all-time greats, and one of the best under the level.”; and Terry and Shae Southall, the only assistant over elected president of the Texas High School Coaches Association, worked for him 31 of his last 38 years in coaching.

After one of his summer trips north, Katherine, his wife of 56 years, asked him what it was like working with professional players.

“They’re just overgrown boys,” he said. He only had a few players who went on to play professional football. The best probably was Lawrence Elkins, the Baylor receiver, who is currently the NFL’s running back coach.

The little things might surprise you. He never lost his enthusiasm for the game, never thought he knew so much that he couldn’t learn more, never won so much that he got enough of it.

When he retired 14 years ago, he was sitting in the press box of the stadium named after him, talking about his old man where he was from.

He is the only coach to win 100 games in three different decades, and the only coach who won state titles in three decades, as well.
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Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3261. I am pleased that today we will pass on suspension bipartisan fashion our satellite reform and privatization legislation, H.R. 3261. The fact that we will pass this decisively and that no one has indicated he or she will vote against this bill indicates the widespread support in the House for this legislation. It is high time to end the current cartel-like ownership and management structure of INTELSAT and Inmarsat. They must not only be privatized, they must be privatized in a pro-competitive market. We must eliminate their privileges and immunities, warehoused orbital locations or frequencies, and limit their ability to use their governmental privileges to expand their services and assets pending privatization. There is no reason for government to be providing commercial communications services. We must also replace monopoly control with competition and provide full direct access in the United States to INTELSAT and Inmarsat.

As the author and manager of this legislation, I think it is important to specify what will be the legislative history for H.R. 3261. With the exception of section 641, the deletion of old section 642, the addition of section 649, and several date related changes, H.R. 3261 is identical to the bill the House passed on May 6, 1998, H.R. 1872. We have put this legislation on the suspension calendar because Members already voted for the same text by a margin of 403 to 16. Because most of the bill is identical to last year’s bill, it is unnecessary to go through the Committee hearing and report process again this year. Thus, no report will be filed with H.R. 3261. Instead, we intend that the Committee report for H.R. 1872 (See House Rpt. 105–494), the record for the legislative hearing held on September 30, 1997, and the floor debate on H.R. 1872, in relevant part, be used as legislative history for H.R. 3261.

What follows is a specific discussion of changes that have been made in H.R. 3261 when compared to H.R. 1872, which, when taken together with the H.R. 1872 legislative history discussed above, will serve as the legislative history for H.R. 3261. Section 601(b)(1) advances the dates for the privatization of INTELSAT and Inmarsat, respectively, from January 1, 2002 to April 1, 2001, for INTELSAT, and from January 1, 2001 to April 1, 2000, for Inmarsat. The reason for this change is that it has become clear that the long transition periods provided in H.R. 1872 are no longer necessary. Both organizations have taken some steps toward a form of privatization. For example, Inmarsat moved to end its intergovernmental status, although it still has not proceeded with an initial public offering of its stock. Moreover, the INTELSAT Assembly of Parties announced some steps which could move INTELSAT in the direction of privatization. Sections 601(b)(1) advances the dates for the privatization of INTELSAT and Inmarsat, respectively, from January 1, 2002 to April 1, 2001, for INTELSAT, and from January 1, 2001 to April 1, 2000, for Inmarsat. The reason for this change is that it has become clear that the long transition periods provided in H.R. 1872 are no longer necessary. Both organizations have taken some steps toward a form of privatization. For example, Inmarsat moved to end its intergovernmental status, although it still has not proceeded with an initial public offering of its stock. Moreover, the INTELSAT Assembly of Parties announced some steps which could move INTELSAT in the direction of privatization.
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Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the 5th Annual Covenant House Washington Candlelight Vigil, where I will speak on Tuesday, December 4, 1999. The Vigil is a national event held every year in early December in some 20 cities across the country. The Candlelight Vigil symbolizes community hope for the well being of all our children and highlights the plight of homeless, runaway, and at-risk children.

The Vigil in Washington alone has 3,000 concerned adults and youth marching, bearing candles and flashlights in support of youth. They will march shoulder to shoulder for a quarter of a mile to the Covenant House Washington Community Services Center, setting a tone of joy, solidarity, commitment, and hope. Similar rallies are held simultaneously at Covenant House sites across the country.

Since its inception in 1995, Covenant House Washington has invested over $13 million of private funding in our youth. They have given hundreds of youth a hand up by providing food, shelter, tutoring, life skills, job training, legal representation, and positive recreational opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all my colleagues to join me in honoring Covenant House Washington and their commitment to our most vulnerable young people and in recognizing the 1999 Covenant House Washington Candlelight Vigil.
Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mike Woods and his more than 25 years of work as city clerk for the town of Smyrna, Tennessee. Mike's tenure will soon come to an end. He has decided to retire on November 30.

As clerk, Mike has seen Smyrna grow from a small community with an annual budget of $500,000 dollars and 27 employees to being one of Tennessee's fastest growing cities with a population of more than 20,000, a current budget of more than $25 million dollars and over 300 employees.

Mike worked hard, along with former Mayor Sam Ridley, to make Smyrna the home of Nissan Motor Manufacturing U.S.A., which has almost 6,000 workers. His vision and invaluable experience have served Smyrna well, and the city has been recognized with numerous state and national awards. Mike truly exemplifies the best of public service and will be sorely missed in city government.

I have known Mike since he first began his tenure in Smyrna and consider him a close friend. He has given me lots of good advice over the years, and I thank him for that. I congratulate Mike for his admirable and distinguished career and wish him the best of luck in future endeavors.

Mr. Peacock came to the United States from Australia in 1958. He has devoted himself to the causes of Australia and the United States. Re- serve the outstanding relationship between the United States and our loyal ally, Australia. President Bush has made Andrew Peacock a distinguished representative of Australia to the United States.

In just a few short years, his incredible leadership skills and great wit carried him to the position of Prime Minister of the Liberal Party. Andrew Peacock was a great leader and has done so with a joy of life. His life in public service began at the young age of 17, when he joined the Young Liberals in his native country, Australia. In just a few short years, his incredible leadership skills and great wit carried him to the position of Prime Minister of the Liberal Party.

Mr. Peacock made a great endeavor and entered Federal Parliament in 1966. As a parliamentarian, Mr. Peacock has done so with a joy of life. His life in public service began at the young age of 17, when he joined the Young Liberals in his native country, Australia. In just a few short years, his incredible leadership skills and great wit carried him to the position of Prime Minister of the Liberal Party. Andrew Peacock was a great leader and has done so with a joy of life.

Ambassador Peacock has served two excellent terms, and will remain a testament to his accomplishments. Mr. Peacock's excellence. Ambassador Peacock will retire from his duties as Ambassador to the United States and our loyal ally, Australia. President Bush has made Andrew Peacock a distinguished representative of Australia to the United States.

Mr. Peacock made a great endeavor and entered Federal Parliament in 1966. As a parliamentarian, Mr. Peacock has done so with a joy of life. His life in public service began at the young age of 17, when he joined the Young Liberals in his native country, Australia. In just a few short years, his incredible leadership skills and great wit carried him to the position of Prime Minister of the Liberal Party. Andrew Peacock was a great leader and has done so with a joy of life.
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of human dignity, and to the cause of world peace. Not only has Ambassador Peacock proven to be a true hero in Australia but also a great friend to the American people through his great efforts as Ambassador. On a personal level, I am blessed to consider him a friend of many years, and I will miss his presence in our nation’s capital. His laugh, his charm, and spirit has touched this city in so many ways. He has had a profound effect on Australia, America, and the world. I wish him well on all of his new endeavors.

**IN REMEMBRANCE OF DUB HAYES**

**HON. RALPH M. HALL**  
**OF TEXAS**  
**IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**  
**Wednesday, November 17, 1999**

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding individual and close personal friend, William D. “Dub” Hayes of Whitesboro, Texas, who died suddenly on October 3 of this year. Dub was well-known and well-liked in Whitesboro and Grayson County as a prominent community leader who genuinely cared about people. His influence will be felt for generations to come.

Dub was honored as Outstanding Citizen of Whitesboro three times—1965, 1978, and 1994—a testimony to the contributions he made to the life of his home town. At the time of his death he was serving as a director of the Texas Pharmaceutical Association, president of the Grayson County College Foundation, and treasurer of Whitesboro Citizens for Excellence in Education and a member of the Whitesboro Economic Development Corporation Board of Directors.

He was an ardent proponent of education, having served for 33 years as a Trustee of Grayson County College and as past president of the board. He served on the Board from 1965, the year the school opened until 1997.

Dub also served as a charter member of the Texoma Blood Bank Board of Directors, a member of the Grayson County Airport Board and the Texoma Regional Planning Commission, past president of the Chamber of Commerce, Rotary Club and Quarterback Club in Whitesboro. Dub was active in the First Baptist Church of Whitesboro, where he served for many years as deacon, treasurer and Sunday School teacher.

Dub and his brother, Ed, owned and operated a retail pharmacy business in Whitesboro for 28 years. Dub also worked as a pharmacist for 15 years at Wilson N. Jones Hospital—and in the 1970s working until his death as a retail pharmacist and consultant. Dub will be lovingly remembered as one of those pharmacists who was willing to get up in the middle of the night to fill prescriptions for those who were sick.

He was a member of several professional organizations, including the Grayson, Collin, Cook Pharmaceutical Association, the Texas Pharmaceutical Association, the Texas Society of Hospital Pharmacists and the American Society of Hospital Pharmacists.

Born in 1925 in Whitesboro, the son of the late James Albert Hayes and Ruth Cherry Hayes, Dub graduated from Whitesboro High School, attended North Texas Agricultural College in Arlington and received his Pharmacy degree from the University of Texas. He served his county during World War II in both the Pacific and European theaters. In 1949 he married his wife of 50 years, Ruth Helen Acker.

Dub is survived by his wife, Helen; three children, Helen Hayebus and husband Mark; Dr. Jim Hayes of Dallas; and Bill Hayes and his wife, Kelly; four grandchildren, Laura and Robert Gibson and Sarah and Charlie Hayes; brother, Ed Hayes, and his wife, Pat; sister-in-law Marjorie Acker Laney and her husband, Bobby; three nieces and two nephews.

Mr. Speaker, Dub Hayes was a truly great man who lived a life of devotion to his family, his community, his church, and his profession. He was a community leader who led an exemplary life—and he was loved by all who knew him. We will miss him—but his memory will be kept alive in our hearts and in our thoughts—and his legacy will continue to be felt in Whitesboro and Grayson County. Mr. Speaker, as we adjourn today for the last time during this century, I ask my colleagues to join me in paying our last respects to this outstanding man and great American—James W. “Dub” Hayes.

**INTRODUCTION OF THE TELE-HEALTH IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1999**

**HON. BRIAN P. BILBRAY**  
**OF CALIFORNIA**  
**IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**  
**Wednesday, November 17, 1999**

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to announce the introduction of H.R. 3420, the Telehealth Improvement Act of 1999. As we know, telemedicine services can dramatically improve upon the range of health care services available in medically underserved areas through the use of telecommunications technologies and services. Telemedicine can improve the delivery and access of health care services, and is especially useful when a patient needs a specialist who is unavailable in his or her area.

By relying on technologies ranging from interactive video, e-mail, computers, fax machines, and satellites, patients will be able to communicate with their doctors and receive the health care they need regardless of their physical location. These telemedicine technologies can be used to deliver health care, diagnose patients, read X-rays, provide consultation, and educate health professionals, among other things.

Telemedicine services reduce the cost of health care by increasing the timeliness of care, reducing emergency transportation costs, improving patient administration, and strengthening the expertise available to primary-care providers. Telemedicine services also help to bring services to medically underserved areas in a quick and cost-effective manner, and can enable patients to avoid traveling long distances in order to receive access to health care.

While the Balanced Budget Act of 1997 includes a provision that provides for some Medicare reimbursement of telemedicine services, the Health Care Financing Administration (HCFA) has interpreted it too narrowly and as a result, has severely limited the services which are covered. The Telehealth Improvement Act of 1999 will clarify the intent of Congress regarding Medicare reimbursement for telemedicine services and increases telemedicine access to medically underserved areas. This legislation makes improvements to the way telemedicine services are currently regulated and reimbursed through the Medicare program, and applies to rural, underserved, and frontier areas, including areas designated as health professional shortage areas under the Public Health Service Act.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues in the House to support and cosponsor the Telehealth Improvement Act of 1999. We must continue to provide access to health care to underserved areas and provide adequate reimbursement to the hospitals and providers that are currently providing these services.

**HONORING THE LATE D.R. MILLER, “MR. CIRCUS”**

**HON. WES WATKINS**  
**OF OKLAHOMA**  
**IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**  
**Wednesday, November 17, 1999**

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, today I pay tribute to the late D.R. Miller, known as “Mr. Circus” to those who know him best, for his decades of service to his fellow citizens, and for his lifetime of providing laughter and fun to children of all ages.

D.R. Miller was born on July 27, 1916, in Smith Center, Kansas. But it was Hugo, the town in Oklahoma’s Third Congressional District that serves as the winter headquarters for his Carson & Barnes Circus, that D.R. called home.

D.R. Miller passed away on September 8, 1999, in McCook, Nebraska—the very town where D.R.’s father and mother took D.R. and his brother to see their first circus, on August 24, 1924.

In 1937, after numerous business ventures, D.R., his father and brother, founded the famed Al G. Kelly Miller Bros. Circus, advertised as the 2nd Largest Circus in America, and toured the U.S. for years. When Ringling Bros. abandoned big top tents for buildings in 1956, the Al G. Kelly Miller Bros. Circus became the World’s Largest Clown Circus.

After several business and personal setbacks in the 1960s and 1970s, D.R. roared back with the Carson & Barnes Circus, which grew and evolved into the 5 Ring Extravaganza that continues to entertain and amaze children of all ages.

In addition to his founding of two circuses, D.R. gave of himself to make this world a better place. D.R. served his country as a proud member of the Army's 273rd Artillery Division during World War II. He founded the Endangered Ark Foundation, a non-profit association dedicated to the preservation and procreation of endangered animals. He established the D.R. and Isla Miller Scholarship Fund to provide scholarships to deserving Hugo High School graduates. The D.R. and Isla Miller Scholarship Fund supported the non-profit Showman’s Rest Trust Fund to provide plots, burials and proper markers for indigent show people.

D.R. provided countless opportunities to circus artists and fellow dreamers. He was a friend to all. In January 1999, D.R. was inducted into the Circus Ring of Fame in Sarasota, Florida, with his wife and partner Isla Marie Miller, who preceded D.R. in passing.
D.R. Miller was an entertainer, a showman, a family man, a veteran, and a model citizen whose example of success and hard work shine like a beacon for all Americans who aspire to improve their own lives and the lives of others. D.R. Miller was believed by all who knew him.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that today the House pay tribute to Mr. D.R. Miller.

Wednesday, November 17, 1999

Mr. VISCOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my thanks to Israel Policy Forum.

Since its founding in 1993, IPF has been a vigorous and effective advocate for Middle East peace and Israeli security. Few organizations have done so much to shape public attitude's about the peace process or to educate decision-makers about the significance of American international leadership.

On November 20th, the directors, members, and friends of Israel Policy Forum will hold their second Tribute Dinner. In addition to celebrating recent progress in the Middle East peace negotiations and welcoming Prime Minister Ehud Barak, this event will also be an occasion to recognize the outstanding contributions of several remarkable individuals.

Nathan Gantcher has devoted his considerable intellect and energy to the challenges of business, education, and community service. A towering figure in the world of finance, he is widely respected for his exceptional professional skills and deep devotion to principle.

Robert Lifton has contributed to remarkable range of fields, including law, real estate, entertainment, finance, and health care. His personal commitment to American-Israeli relations is evidenced by his leadership of groups as the American Jewish Congress, AIPAC, the Council on Foreign Relations, and many others.

Norman Pattiz is the founder and Chairman of Westworld One, the undisputed leader in the radio industry, with some 7,000 affiliated stations worldwide. His business acumen is matched by a powerful commitment to quality programming, and a creative understanding of the media’s role in shaping a stronger society. His devotion to promoting Middle East Peace is prodigious, and he has pursued this goal both through personal involvement with Middle Eastern leaders and through tireless activism in the American Jewish community.

Peggy Tishman is a nationally-recognized philanthropic leader, whose devotion to the Jewish community has been particularly inspiring. She was the first President of the merged UJA-Federation, where she helped lay a strong foundation for the future success of the organization, and where she demonstrated the character and charisma that would make her such an invaluable resource to a range of civic endeavors.

I am honored to join in this special tribute, to express my enormous pride in IPF’s fine work, and to salute the examples of dynamic public advocacy IPF’s honorees and leaders set every day.

Wednesday, November 17, 1999

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the members of the congregation of South Post Oak Baptist Church in my home district of Houston, Texas for celebrating their church’s 40th anniversary. The South Post Oak Baptist Church family has been a pillar of the community, effectively ministering to its members for four decades.

South Post Oak Baptist Church was organized October 4, 1959 as a separate entity of Almeda Baptist Church and was incorporated in 1961. From its humble beginnings, the church has been a vibrant voice for the congregation, serving a family man, a veteran, and a model citizen of the community.

Over the past decades, Rev. Wright and his wife Mia have worked to make South Post Oak Baptist Church, “A Positive Place in a Negative World.” Their endurance and tremendous energy in addressing the needs of South Post Oak Baptist Church’s congregation have served their community well.

The youngest of nine children born to Remus and Elizabeth Wright in Indianapolis, Indiana, Rev. Wright answered the call to the ministry during his mid-twenties, becoming an Associate Minister at Grace Apostolic church. He joined the Pentecostal Ambassadors and recorded two gospel albums on which he sang, wrote and produced most of the songs. Upon relocating to Houston, Pastor Wright found his home at South Post Oak Baptist Church, guiding the church into its largest ever period of growth. The Church’s focus has been on the family; the responsibilities of men; special needs of our senior citizens; and “real life” programs for youth. Rev. Wright’s focus on families is a major reason why he now devotes his energy to ministering to more than 2,500 families at South Post Oak Baptist Church.

While Rev. Wright’s religious and spiritual obligations have always been paramount, as a community leader, he has undertaken his civic duties with the utmost seriousness and passion, serving on several boards and organizations. He serves on two local high school boards, the YMCA board, and is a volunteer with LifeGift Organ Donation Program. He was selected to serve as a Foreign Missionary and Church Planter for the Southern Baptist Association in Zimbabwe, Africa. Most recently, he became part of an on-going Summer Leadership Institute Program at Harvard University designed to strengthen faith-based programs throughout urban communities in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, South Post Oak Baptist Church has much to celebrate on its 40th anniversary. The church has been a haven for its community. Since its beginnings four decades ago through the last eight years of unprecedented growth, South Post Oak Baptist Church should be commended for its dedication to God and commitment to the needs of its congregation and surrounding community.
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HON. TAMMY BALDWIN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
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Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the University of Wisconsin’s football team. This has been an exceptional season for the Badgers in many respects. For the second straight year, the Badgers are off to play in a major NCAA Bowl Game. The Badgers could go to the Rose Bowl, just as they did last year, or to another major bowl, depending on how other college teams fare in the closing weeks of the season. On Saturday, a beautiful and unusually balmy day at Camp Randall, the Badgers sealed their ticket to a bowl game by defeating the Iowa Hawkeyes, 41 to 3, and winning the Big Ten championship.

But securing the championship was not all that was celebrated on Saturday. Before nearly 80,000 screaming Badger fans, tailback Ron Dayne made history as he became the all-time rushing leader in NCAA Division I football. Ron Dayne has finished his collegiate career with 6,397 yards—and is the favorite for winning this year’s Heisman Trophy.

Ron Dayne’s historic record and going to a major bowl game for the second straight year are only part of the triumphant season. The whole team created this championship. It was particularly heartening to see the team come together when Coach Barry Alvarez was either coaching from his hospital bed or the coach’s box while waiting for knee replacement surgery.

The Badgers end the regular season with a 9–2 record. Congratulations to all the players, students and fans at the University of Wisconsin! I look forward to enjoying the Fifth Day of the Bowl Team.
Mr. Speaker, please join with me today to honor William Shively for all he has done to help others. We wish him and his family all the best in his retirement and in all his future endeavors.

RESIGNATION OF NATIONAL FOREST SUPERVISOR GLORIA FLORA

HON. GEORGE MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
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Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, Gloria Flora, forest Supervisor of the Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest in Nevada resigned last week, citing relentless "fed-bashing." Since becoming Supervisor of the largest national forest in the lower 48 just over a year ago, Ms. Flora has become embroiled in disputes over grazing, endangered species protection, and road closures. One of these disputes resulted in Elko County residents, including public officials, illegally rebuilding a forest road without federal permits, an act which in turn triggered a U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service emergency listing of the bull trout. At the forefront of these disputes are extremists whose radical anti-government stance has translated into several instances of intimidation and harassment of federal land managers and acts of violence against public servants and property.

It is deeply distressing that public servants who are administering and enforcing the law are subjected to such hostile circumstances that they are forced to leave their jobs and homes. We should keep in mind that federal land managers like Ms. Flora are charged with enforcing laws passed by the Congress and entrusted with public lands and natural resources that belong to all the people of this country.

For twenty years, the wise use movement in its various forms—the Sagebrush rebellion, states' rights, county supremacy—has fostered hostility and hatred toward officials enforcing the laws of Congress. Rather than perpetuating the dishonest and disservice for the government and its laws, I urge my colleagues to use their good offices to create a climate of decency and cooperation.

Mr. Speaker, while I deeply regret that Ms. Flora has chosen to resign, I sincerely hope that we take this opportunity to express our support for her and for the many Forest Service employees who share her concerns. I submit Ms. Flora's letter to her fellow employees.

OPEN LETTER TO EMPLOYEES OF THE HUMBOLDT-TOIYABE NATIONAL FOREST

NOVEMBER 8, 1999

There is no easy way to say goodbye to a group of hard-working, dedicated employees and friends. But the time has come when I must do just that. The best part of working on this Forest is watching each of you perform your day-to-day work. The highest praise comes from yourselves in the outstanding land stewardship and exemplary business practices found on this Forest.

However, I am increasingly troubled by the difficult conditions that so many of us face in the state of Nevada. We now accept as commonplace unwarranted criticisms of our policies and actions by a vocal group of individuals. Officials at all levels of government in Nevada participate in this irresponsible fed-bashing.

The public is largely silent, watching as if this were a spectator sport. This level of anti-federal fervor is simply not acceptable. It is not like this in other places! As you know, I represent the Intermountain West: Montana, Idaho, Utah and Wyoming. Yes, there are arguments and people who have very strong opinions about public policy, but they usually stay within the bounds of reason. As tensions escalate, others weigh in with their opinions and the media does in-depth investigative reporting. These are the methods to resolve complex natural resource issues. Yes, things may get heated but all people have a voice.

The attitude towards federal employees and federal laws in Nevada is pitiful. People in rural communities who respect the law and accept responsibility for complying with it are often rebuked or ridiculed. They are compared to collaborators with the Vichy government in Nazi-controlled France! People who support the federal government or conservation are asked if they are "loyal" and they not be identified for fear of retaliation.

When I speak against the diatribes and half-truths of the Sagebrush Rebellion, I am labeled a liar and identified in an all-out attempt to silence me. When I express concerns for Forest Service employees' safety, I am accused of inciting violence.

This is the heritage of America. All people have a right to speak and all people have a right to protection from discrimination. However, I learned that in Nevada, as a federal employee, there is no right to speak, no right to do your job and certainly no right to be treated with respect. I could go on and on with examples of those of you who have been castigated in public, shunned in your communities, refused service in restaurants, kicked out of motels... just because of who you work for. And we cannot forget those who have been harassed, called before kangaroo courts, or had their very lives threatened.

It disturbs me to think that two million people in this state watch silently, or worse, in amusement, as a small percent of their number break laws and trounce the rights of others with impunity. Rather than recognizing the legitimate role of elected officials who actively support these offenders, those whose responsibility it is to help us enforce the laws passed by Congress and do our communities seem to have a reason why action must be postponed.

The ostracism is simply another example of how certain elements would rather foment conflict; I'm simply advocating that we work towards a solution. These people have a reason why action must be postponed.

Shorefront community.

Brian Lance Gotlieb has earned a well-deserved reputation as a tireless fighter on behalf of the youth in our community, and is rightfully honored for his achievements by B'nai Brith on this special occasion.

Gotlieb, who serves as the liaison to Intermediate School 303 and Public Schools 90, 100, 209 and 253, is currently working on different ways to protect our community's children.

As a member of the District 21 School Board, he has initiated the process of identifying unsafe streets throughout District 21 to ensure the safety and welfare of our children. And, throughout this school year, Gotlieb will be hosting a series of Child Safety Programs that will provide parents with free copies of their children's fingerprints along with Polaroid pictures to present to law enforcement personnel in the event of an emergency.

Further, as my Deputy Chief of Staff, Brian Lance Gotlieb has served as my liaison to the Board of Education and School Construction Authority for the last three years. In addition, he is primarily responsible for the intake and resolution of constituent concerns in my Community Office located in the Sheepshead Bay section of Brooklyn.

Gotlieb, who credits his late mother, Myrna, with teaching him the importance of helping others and being active in the community, created the highly successful organization Shorefront Toys for Tots in 1995. Founded in his mother's memory, Shorefront Toys for Tots has helped bring Chanukah cheer to more than 7,500 underprivileged children in the Shorefront community.

A student at the Rabbi Harry Halpern Day School and its Talmud Torah High School division, Gotlieb packed and delivered Passover packages to aid needy senior citizens.
Gottlieb strengthened his bond with the Jewish community as an undergraduate and graduate student through his involvement with the Jewish Culture Foundation at New York University and B'nai B'rith Hillel at the University of Florida, where he served as a Reporter for the Jewish Student News.

Gottlieb is a member of Community Board 13 and serves on its Education and Library and Youth Services committees. He also serves as a member of the Board of Directors in Section 4 of Trump Village and as an Executive Board member of the New York City Federation of Labor and B’nai B’rith at the University of Florida.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud the members of Brighton-Atlantic Unit #1671 of B’nai B’rith for recognizing the achievements of Brian Lance Gottlieb, a tireless worker for the people of Brooklyn and Queens.

CONGRATULATING THE PASCACK HISTORICAL SOCIETY

HON. MARGARET ROUKEMA
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 17, 1999

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the Pascack Historical Society on the recent restoration of its museum, and for all the work the Society has done to preserve the heritage of the Pascack Valley.

The Pascack Historical Society Museum, located in Park Ridge, New Jersey, is a wonderful collection depicting life in the region from the 18th Century through the early 20th Century. It is a popular destination for tourists and natives alike, and is a treasure-trove of archival information for scholars of local history.

Special recognition must go to a number of key individuals involved in the project. The work was ably guided by Historical Society President Katharine P. Randall, Vice President Francesca Moskwitz, Secretary Ellen Kramer and Treasure Richard Ross.

The renovation would not have been possible without the generosity of the late Ellen Berdais, a long-time member of the Historical Society who died of cancer in 1995, just after the project began. In her honor, the annex will be named the Ellen Berdais Hall. In addition, the main museum building will be named in memory of its longtime curator, Wilma Uder.

The museum is housed in the 19th century former First Congregational Church of Park Ridge. During the three-year, $275,000 renovation, the church building was substantially restored and a dilapidated barn was replaced with an 18,000-square-foot addition. Its exhibits include the facade of a country store, a turn-of-the-century parlor, and a recreation of rooms from a small, Colonial-era home. Artifacts include items of the Leni-Lenape Indian tribe and early settlers used for trading, farming and manufacturing. A machine in making the “wampum” ornaments Native Americans once used as currency is part of the collection, along with a printing press from a local newspaper and a wooden horse used by a saddle maker.

The Historical Society was founded in the 1930s by John C. Storms, publisher of the Park Ridge Local, and was formally incorporated in 1942. A small group of area residents dedicated themselves to collecting and preserving artifacts and written accounts of Pascack Valley history, and sharing the collection through exhibits, lectures and a quarterly newsletter. The society’s collection was housed in various locations until it found a permanent home in 1952 with the purchase of the church, which had been a Park Ridge landmark since 1875.

During its nearly half-century of operation, thousands of school classes, civic organizations, researchers and individuals have visited the museum and attended the Historical Society’s lectures. Staffed entirely by volunteers, the museum has depended on the generosity of its members and friends for financial support.

It became obvious in 1994 that the adjacent bar—used as a meeting room, research center, storage area and workroom—was in such a dangerous state of disrepair that its demolition was ordered by the borough. With the loss of this facility, it was necessary to temporarily close the museum and begin a major fundraising campaign to rebuild. Supports worked for five years to make the dream a reality.

I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in commending the Pascack Historical Society and all its members on the hard work and dedication that have preserved this American historic treasure for the benefit of all.

THE BICENTENNIAL OF MONROE, NEW YORK

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 17, 1999

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note to our colleagues that the Town of Monroe, New York, in my congressional district is currently celebrating its 200th anniversary.

With its population estimated in 1996 to be nearly 26,000, the Town of Monroe has long been considered one of the major hubs of our Hudson River valley. Within the boundaries of the Town are three incorporated villages: the Village of Monroe, incorporated in 1814, the Village of Harriman (incorporated in 1914), and the Village of Kiryas Joel (incorporated in 1977). The Village of Monroe sprang up along a mill pond created by the construction of a dam and grist mill constructed prior to the Revolutionary War. Soon, stagecoach routes, inns, and taverns grew along Monroe’s Mill Pond, and soon the community became the economic and social focal point of the area.

The Village of Harriman was the sight of a creamery and grist mill which early in this century became the site of the estate of the railroad magnate Edward H. Harriman. The Village was named in his honor, and became the home of his son, Avellin, who served as a cabinet member, diplomat, and Governor of New York.

The Village of Kiryas Joel is the second largest legally incorporated community of Hasidic Jews in the world. The community is a unique village where traditional values and the centrality of family are the guiding principles of community life. To preserve these values, Kiryas Joel remains without television or radio.

The entire Town of Monroe has enjoyed a varied history over the past 200 years. In the earliest days, it was known for its iron mines and smelting furnaces. The famous giant chain which was stretched across the Hudson River to prevent invasion by the British army was forged in Monroe. The Monroe iron mines thrived as late as the 1880’s.

For many years, Monroe was the center of a thriving dairy and cheese industry. We forget today that the concept of shipping fresh milk from the farm to the city is a relatively new concept which did not come about until the advent of the railroads. The Town of Monroe was host to a variety of dairy farms, and beginning in 1841 what are now the Villages of Monroe and Harriman were the railroad terminals from which dairy products were shipped.

But it is for cheese that Monroe is most famous. Two types of cheese beloved throughout the world—velveeta and liederkranz—were invented in Monroe and originally manufactured at the factory operated by Emil Frey.

Today, the Monroe Cheese Festival is the biggest and most successful event held annually in Monroe. Conceived by Village Mayor Robert Bonney—who tragically passed away soon after he “sold” the festival idea to the community—the cheese festival annually attracts thousands of visitors of all ages to the community from far and wide.

In 1997, a local newspaper reporter wrote that: “There are few places where a kid can wear a giant foam cheese wedge on his head and still look pretty cool. A Green Bay Packer game may be one. Another, most definitely, is the Monroe Cheese Festival.”

Other long time traditions which permeate Monroe are the Mombasha Fire Department, over 100 years old, and the Museum Village, which preserves for tourists and scholars a typical colonial community. The legendary showman, George M. Cohan, was a resident of Monroe. When in his declining years the classic motion picture biography of his life, “Yankee Doodle Dandy” was released, he was too ill to travel to New York City for the grand premiere. So a special screening for Cohan and his family was arranged to take place at the Mombasha Fire House. Mr. Cohan applauded the portrayal of his life story by the legendary Jimmy Cagney.

Today, as we stand on the threshold of a new millennium, the Town of Monroe and the three Villages within its boundaries all look forward to the third century years with a sense of confidence that the challenges of tomorrow will be met.

Mr. Speaker, I invite all of our colleagues to join with me in saluting the town of Monroe, New York, on this milestone occasion.

TRIBUTE TO STEPHEN M. MELTZ
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 17, 1999

Mr. PHELPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Stephen M. Meltz on his sixieth birthday. Stephen will gather with his friends and family to celebrate this momentous occasion just after Thanksgiving. Stephen was born in Chicago, Illinois, on December 15, 1939. Jacob and Carol married in 1961 and Stephen was raised in Chicago his entire life. He attended college at
the University of Chicago, receiving both his undergraduate degree in political science and his M.B.A. at the prestigious university. He also served his country proudly in the United States Army Reserve.

Stephen M. Meltz is currently the President of Stephen Meltz Associates, a technology and consulting firm located in Lincolnwood, Illinois. It is a successful business, where his clients know that the work done by Stephen’s firm is both professional and honest. For the last year his son David Meltz has joined him at the firm, which now makes it truly a family business. But for all that he has accomplished in his professional life, I know that his family is his greatest sense of pride and accomplishment.

Stephen has always made the best interests of his family his primary concern. He has taken care of his wife, his children, his parents, his wife’s parents and many members of his extended family with loving care. He saw to it that his children received the best educations available. He made sure that the final years of his and his wife’s parents were lived with dignity and comfort. Like many fathers, his devotion to his family has sometimes gone unnoticed, but he does not care for his loved ones for accolades, but because he loves his family. For all these reasons, Stephen is a patriarch in the truest sense of the term. A pillar of integrity that all his family can lean on in their hour of need and celebrate with during times of joy.

Mr. Speaker, it is often said, that the road to the Underworld is paved with good intentions. Contrary to this premise, Stephen M. Meltz has always had honor and a strong core of moral beliefs and intentions, and his actions have always had those values. Aristotle said, “In the arena of human life the honors and rewards fall to those who show their good qualities in action.” Stephen’s rewards are both a devout family and loyal friends who have witnessed his lifelong “good qualities in action” and will honor him over dinner on his sixtieth birthday.

Mr. Speaker, last year, I am particularly pleased to have this opportunity to congratulate Stephen M. Meltz, on his sixtieth birthday, because his son Gary C. Meltz is a member of my staff here in Washington, D.C. Gary asked me to put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech to commemorate his father’s birthday. I am honored to do this for Gary and his father. I urge all my colleagues to join me now in wishing Stephen M. Meltz a happy sixtieth birthday and Godspeed.

M.D. ANDERSON CANCER CENTER

HON. GENE GREEN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 17, 1999

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives a recent article about the wonderful medical advances at the M.D. Anderson Cancer Center in Houston, Texas. The article tells the stories of two people, a young college student and the former Speaker of the House Jim Wright, dealing with cancer and their experiences with this once debilitating disease. Their respective stories highlight the need to support our Nation’s cancer centers and highlight how medical advances can truly give Americans hope where none previously existed.

Reconstructing Lives by Mary Jane Schier—For 19-year old James Smith, the quality of survival from cancer of the jaw is paramount in order to pursue his dream of playing professional football.

Smith is a junior majoring in health and human performance at McNeese State University in Lake Charles, LA, where he was an outstanding defensive tackle until diagnosed with a disease uncommon among teenagers. He and his family were stunned to learn in November 1998 that he had a tumor in his right mandible, the horseshoe-shaped bone that forms the lower jaw. The mandible, he knows, is the largest and strongest bone in the face.

Smith was forced to take an extended timeout from the football team to begin the biggest challenge of his young life. Upon coming to M.D. Anderson, he joined a new team whose members are nationally ranked for treating head and neck cancers.

The head coaches in the multidisciplinary treatment network Smith received are Dr. Helmhut Goepfert and Dr. Geoffrey L. Robb, who chair the Department of Head and Neck Surgery and the Department of Plastic Surgery, respectively. For the coaches and their specialty colleagues, the common goal centers on removing head and neck cancers and restoring optimal form and function.

Smith’s surgery 3 days before last Christmas involved cutting out his diseased jaw and reconstructing the mandible with bone and tissue taken from his left leg. Although he couldn’t talk or eat his favorite pizza for a while, Smith says now, “I’m getting stronger every day . . . and I’m eager to play again.”

At the other end of the age spectrum is 19-year old Alabama native James Smith, the quality of survival for whom has “greatly improved our ability to use our remaining years more constructively in the arena of human life the honors and rewards fall to those who show their good qualities in action.” Stephen’s rewards are both a devout family and loyal friends who have witnessed his lifelong “good qualities in action” and will honor him over dinner on his sixtieth birthday.

Mr. Speaker, last year, I am particularly pleased to have this opportunity to congratulate Stephen M. Meltz, on his sixtieth birthday, because his son Gary C. Meltz is a member of my staff here in Washington, D.C. Gary asked me to put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech to commemorate his father’s birthday. I am honored to do this for Gary and his father. I urge all my colleagues to join me now in wishing Stephen M. Meltz a happy sixtieth birthday and Godspeed.
of Justice to acquire 49% of COMSAT. Neither federal agency felt that competition or anti-trust laws were threatened by Lockheed Martin's purchase.

Now it is Congress' turn to weigh on this issue and I believe that this bill goes to great lengths to achieve honest and fair competition in the telecommunications market. I also believe that we can complete legislative action on this bill before Congress leaves this year, which I understand the Chairman has said he intends to do. But as we move toward that legislative objective, it is important that we realize that certain issues must be addressed before we can declare a victory for the private competitive marketplace.

First of all, there is the issue known as “Level IV direct access”. In effect, it would result in the forced divestiture of billions of dollars of Comsat shareholder investment in Intelsat infrastructure—investment undertaken often at the behest of the U.S. Government. Level 4 direct access simply guts the economic rationale for a private company to invest in Comsat. Indeed, that may be the rationale behind this provision: to dissuade Lockheed from acquiring Comsat. If that is the case, it would be a cynical attempt to manipulate the free market in the name of “competition.” This provision must be changed in conference. Similarly, Congress should simply repeal the ownership cap on Comsat upon enactment of final consent legislation, rather than making it contingent upon occurrence of unrelated events as it does now.

Other outstanding differences between the House and Senate have been raised by both Members and must similarly be resolved in conference. I urge Chairman Dingell to work with Mr. DINGELL toward a consensus, notably on the privatization criteria, which serve as FCC licensing criteria, and must be made more flexible.

Again, I consider myself as a supporter of this bill. The Congress has been very shrewd in letting the telecommunications marketplace work its will towards fair competition. We should use this opportunity to continue that successful record. I urge the conferees to consider the work each has crafted into a final package to present to the Congress and ultimately the President.

A TRIBUTE TO FREDERICK C. MALKUS, J.R.

HON. STENY H. HOYER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 17, 1999
Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a great statesman and leader in the State of Maryland. With the death of former state Senator Frederick C. Malkus, Jr., on November 4, 1999, as well as the entire State of Maryland, lost a great patriot and a dutiful public servant.

Frederick C. Malkus, Jr. died at the age of 86, having spent all of his adult life in the service of his fellow citizens. Senator Malkus, a conservative Democrat, served in the legislature for 12 years in the House of Delegates and 34 in the Senate—before retiring in 1994. Upon his retirement, he was the longest serving State Legislator in the United States.

Born July 1, 1913, in Baltimore, Senator Malkus moved to the 380 acre Egypt Road farm, nine miles outside of Cambridge, on Maryland's Eastern Shore where he was raised there by his aunt and uncle. He spent the past 83 years on the working farm that produced hay, corn, and soybeans. He graduated for Western Maryland College in 1934 and received his law degree four years later from the University of Maryland Law School. During World War II, Senator Malkus served in the U.S. Army and rose to the rank of major. He resigned from the Maryland and in 1947 won a seat in the House of Delegates.

He was, Mr. Speaker, an unforgettable individual who was a wonderful servant to Maryland and America. To know Fred Malkus was to know how deeply he cared for rural America and more specifically for the Chesapeake Bay region. Senator Malkus was at the forefront of the fight to save the Bay. Even though he was pro-business in his views, he was a great environmentalist. His legacy will no doubt live on and serve as a model for future leaders of our State and our Country.

Senator Malkus is survived by his wife of 41 years, the former Margaret “Maggie” Moorer, his son, Frederick C. Malkus III, two daughters, Margaret Elizabeth “Fay” Larken and Susan Moorer Malkus, and three grandsons.

HONORING JACK A. BROWN III

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 17, 1999
Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize the achievements of Jack A. Brown III.

Jack is a native New Yorker who was born and raised on the lower east side of Manhattan. He currently resides, in my district, in the Clinton Hill section of Brooklyn. Jack has had a distinguished seven-year career with the Correctional Services Corporation (CSC). The Corporation is a private company contracted by local, State, and Federal Corrections Departments to provide concrete services to the inmate population. As the Vice President of Correctional Services Corporation Community Services Division, Mr. Brown maintains overall responsibility for the day to day operations of the five New York programs. These programs, three for the Federal Bureau of Prisons and two for the New York State Department of Corrections, are designed to provide inmates with the tools necessary to successfully reintegrate back into their respective communities as self-sufficient, responsible, law abiding citizens.

Prior to his employment with CSC, Jack served as an officer in the United States Air Defense Artillery Division for four years. He is a graduate of the State University of New York at Buffalo with a Bachelor's degree in Human Services, with a concentration in mental health, and Biology. During his academic years, he gained invaluable experience in the field of social services holding positions as Physiatrics Counselor, Chemical Dependency Counselor and Youth Counselor. In December, Jack expects to earn a double Masters degree, an MBA and a Master of Science and Economic Development, from the University of New Hampshire. I wish Jack Brown success in his future endeavors and I commend his achievements to my colleagues' attention.

TRIBUTE TO NATIONAL WOMAN'S CHRISTIAN TEMPERANCE UNION

HON. DAN BURTON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 17, 1999
Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on November 18, 1999, the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union (WCTU) will celebrate 125 years in existence, making it the oldest, continuing, nonsectarian Christian woman's organization in the United States. Their motto is "For God and Home and Every Land."

Directed entirely by women from its beginning, the WCTU has united women from various backgrounds and geographical regions in their determination to educate the world about the dangers associated with the use of alcohol, tobacco, and other drugs. Throughout the years, the WCTU has advocated for universal voting rights for women and minorities, the eight-hour work day, equal pay for equal work, opposition to child labor, shelters for abused women and children, and world peace. In 1945, the WCTU became a charter member of the United Nations Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO).

Their first National president, Annie Wittenmyer, was thanked by Presidents Abraham Lincoln and Ulysses S. Grant for her work during the Civil War in organizing diet kitchens in military hospitals. Their second National president, Frances E. Willard, was honored in 1905 by having her statue placed in the Statahuy Hall of the U.S. Capitol—the first woman and the only woman to be honored for more than 50 years. The current National president of the WCTU is Sarah Ward, a resident of the great State of Indiana, and I wish her all the best in her endeavors with the WCTU as they continue their good work for the protection of the home.

A TRIBUTE TO JENNIFER MUMMERT

HON. JERRY LEWIS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 17, 1999
Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like today to pay tribute to Jenny Mummert, a hardworking, highly valued staff member of the Defense Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, who is leaving November 19th after eight years to pursue her career in the private sector.

Whether she was putting in long days and endless hours working on behalf of our national defense—or struggling to look serious at the Paris Air Show—Jenny Mummert couldn't help being her ever-positive self. She has always been a vital member of the team, doing all she can to make the defense appropriations subcommittee the best committee in the House of Representatives.

Now she has decided to leave us to seek new challenges and opportunities. But she will always be a part of our family. We know that her husband, Joe, and their four children, Joey, Kandyce, Kevin and Karley, are excited about her new career. But they are very likely just as excited about the prospect of mom having a more normal work schedule.
SENSE OF HOUSE REGARDING DIABETES

SPEECH OF
HON. GERALD D. KLECZKA
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 16, 1999

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a cosponsor of this important resolution expressing our continued commitment to the fight against diabetes.

Diabetes remains the most costly health problems in America. More than 1 out of every 10 health care dollars in the United States, and about 1 out of every 4 Medicare dollars is spent on care for people with diabetes.

The devastation caused by diabetes, however, goes far beyond the financial costs. Over 16 million Americans suffer from this chronic disease for which there is no cure. Diabetes is the seventh leading cause of death in the United States.

While over 10 million Americans know that they are living with diabetes, another 5.4 million people are not even aware that they have the disease. Many people only realize that they have diabetes when they develop a life-threatening complication like blindness, kidney disease, nerve damage, heart disease or stroke.

Early diagnosis and treatment can help reduce the risk of these terrible complications. I am pleased to note that constituents in my district have access to a number of outstanding diabetes education programs, including those at the Children's Hospital of Wisconsin, Clement J. Zablocki VA Medical Center, Columbus Hospital, Froedtert Memorial Lutheran Hospital, St. Francis Hospital, St. Luke's Medical Center, Waukesha Memorial Hospital, and West Allis Memorial Hospital.

The resolution before us today recognizes the important role that these dedicated health professionals and volunteers play in the fight against diabetes.

Mr. Speaker, these health providers and their patients need our help. Improvements in technology and the general growth in scientific knowledge have created unprecedented opportunities for advances that might lead to better treatments, prevention, and ultimately a cure.

Congress has a responsibility to support this critical, life-saving research. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution and affirm their commitment to find a cure for diabetes.

IN RECOGNITION OF JOHN P. POWELL

HON. BOB RILEY
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 17, 1999

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize John P. Powell, who was honored on November 14, 1999, at the official dedication of the newly named J.P. Powell Middle School in Chambers County, Alabama.

John P. Powell was born in Chambers County, Alabama, on September 13, 1912. After graduating from Florida A&M University, he began his teaching career at Langdale School in 1949. On September 24, 1954, he became the principal of the Chambers County Training School (renamed Southside Elementary School during the 1970–71 school year) and remained its principal for 27 years until his retirement on May 28, 1976. The Chambers County Board of Education by official action renamed the school, now a middle school for grades 6–8, in Professor Powell's honor on May 19, 1999.

During his career and after his retirement, Mr. Powell was active in the Lafayette, Alabama, community. He served on the Chambers County Industrial Board and was active in the Chambers County Extension Service. His community involvement included the Red Cross, United Methodists, the Chambers County Retired Teachers organization, and senior citizens' groups. Even now, at the age of 87, Professor Powell is president of the Birmining Rehabilitation Center where he resides.

In 1991, the Lafayette City Council proclaimed John Powell Day in Lafayette. In the resolution issued, Mr. Powell was commended for his community involvement and his leadership, particularly in the area of education, industry, and race relations. Now, once again, he is being recognized for what he has done to promote respect between races and the value of education for his students. Most important, however, he is recognized for his life-long commitment to public service.

I join the residents of Chambers County in thanking John P. Powell and saluting him on this special day of recognition.

CONDEMNING ARMENIAN ASSASSINATIONS

SPEECH OF
HON. PETER T. KING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 16, 1999

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my concern about the violence that recently took place in Armenia. The Prime Minister and the Speaker of the Parliament, as well as other prominent Armenian politicians, were killed in a hail of gunfire on the floor of the Armenian Parliament.

Besides my deep concern and sympathy for the individuals who were brutally murdered and their families and friends, I fear that this event could cause a delay or postponement of the peace talks currently underway between Armenia and Azerbaijan. Thankfully, both governments have stated that the peace process will not be interrupted by this tragic event.

Armenia should step up its efforts to push the peace process along. The conflict between Armenia and Azerbaijan has been going on for 11 years now, and more than 30,000 people have been killed and over a million refugees created on both sides, including over 800,000 in Azerbaijan. It is time to reach a peace agreement, and Presidents Heydar Aliyev of Azerbaijan and Robert Kocharian of Armenia have met four times in recent months to discuss such a settlement.

As original sponsor of legislation designed to repeal Section 907 of the Freedom Support Act, I would like to draw your attention to a statement in the New York Times, that appeared on November 3, urging to lift “the ban

THE BOOKER T. WASHINGTON LEADERSHIP INSTITUTE AT HAMPTON UNIVERSITY

HON. ROBERT C. SCOTT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 17, 1999

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to introduce "The Booker T. Washington Leadership Act of 1999". This legislation will establish the Booker T. Washington Leadership Institute at Hampton University in Hampton, Virginia.

Booker T. Washington is perhaps the most renowned alumnus of Hampton University. His vision championed the idea that black colleges and universities should embrace the responsibility not only to train men and women in their disciplines and trades, but to create and sustain new institutions and communities driven by the principle of service—service to God, country, and humankind.

The mission of this Institute reflects this vision. It is based on Hampton University’s fundamental premise that leadership development is best understood and achieved in the moral context of social responsibility and service to society. The Institute will be committed to the development of ethical values, interpersonal skills and the competencies that are required for effective leadership in a broad range of business, civic and political environments.

Hampton University is uniquely prepared to launch this Institute. For the past 130 years, Hampton University has promoted higher education and positive character development as the cornerstones of effective leadership and responsible citizenship. Initially founded in 1868 to train promising young men and women to teach and lead their recently emancipated people, it has grown into a comprehensive university, offering a broad range of business, civic and political environments.

Hampton University has a unique prepared to launch this Institute. For the past 130 years, Hampton University has promoted higher education and positive character development as the cornerstones of effective leadership and responsible citizenship. Initially founded in 1868 to train promising young men and women to teach and lead their recently emancipated people, it has grown into a comprehensive university, offering a broad range of business, civic and political environments.

Hampton University has a unique prepared to launch this Institute. For the past 130 years, Hampton University has promoted higher education and positive character development as the cornerstones of effective leadership and responsible citizenship. Initially founded in 1868 to train promising young men and women to teach and lead their recently emancipated people, it has grown into a comprehensive university, offering a broad range of business, civic and political environments.
on giving Azerbaijan the same kind of eco-

nomic assistance that it provides to all other
former Soviet republics. This would serve both
to recognize the risks that Heydar Aliyev,
Azerbaijan’s President, has taken for peace
and begin to bring about more realistic atti-
uides in Armenia. If we are to be an effective
broker, we must adopt a balanced approach.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SOLOMON P. ORTIZ
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 17, 1999

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, during the fol-

lowing rolcall votes, I was unavoidably de-
tained. Had I been present, I would have
voted as indicated below.

Rolcall No. 587, “yes”; rolcall No. 588,
“yes”; rolcall No. 589, “yes”; rolcall No. 590,
“no”; rolcall No. 591, “yes”; rolcall No. 592,
“yes”; rolcall No. 593, “yes”; rolcall No. 594,
“yes”; rolcall No. 595, “no”.

A PROPOSAL TO GUARANTEE
HEALTH INSURANCE TO EVERY
AMERICAN CHILD BORN IN THE
NEXT CENTURY: SEEKING IDEAS
AND COMMENTS ON THE PRO-
POSAL

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 17, 1999

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, it is a national
disgrace that 11.1 million children in the
United States still do not have health insur-
ance as we enter a new millennium.

What we have done so far has not worked.
Since 1996, the numbers and percentages of
children without insurance have actually crept
upward. They have not yet reached a statisti-
cally significant decrease of increase, but we are
moving in the wrong direction.

The web of programs we pieced together in
1997, CHIP/Medicaid/transitional Medicaid, are
failing to get health insurance coverage to
more children.

We need to come back to this question, and
find something that will work. America’s chil-
dren deserve health insurance.

I have begun to develop a bill to address
this problem, currently in a rough draft form,
and we need to come back to this question, and
find something that will work. America’s chil-
dren deserve health insurance.

I have begun to develop a bill to address
this problem, currently in a rough draft form,
which is based on the idea that we need a
simple and comprehensive solution: We want
every child in America to have health insurance.

Every child in America is issued a birth cer-
tificate and social security number at birth.
Let’s automatically enroll every child at birth
into a Medicare-type program; call it “MediKids.”

MediKids will be both an umbrella and a
safety net for all of the other programs insur-
ing our children, so that no child will ever fall
through the enrollment cracks again, much less
11.1 million children.

Our current approach places the burden on
already disadvantaged parents. State and local
enrollment and welfare workers are unable
to determine which families match vari-
ous programs—much less process pages of
forms and documentation in order to enroll
children in health insurance.

Instead, I propose we do what’s right, sen-
sible, and directly accomplishes the goal of
health insurance for all of our children: (1) En-
roll every child in MediKids automatically at
birth; and (2) allow parents who do have other
choices to go down to the clinic and show us
evidence of coverage to their tax forms, thus
 exempting themselves from the premiums
used to finance MediKids.

Children are relatively inexpensive to insure,
but this program will have a budget impact. I
am developing a plan for covering the costs of
this program. Ultimately, however we pay for
it, we must make the stand that some things
are worth spending money on, particularly in
this time of unprecedented, record-breaking
economic growth.

My staff and I will be refining this bill over
the holiday recess. For example, we will want
to adjust the MediKids program to cover the
specific services which children need. As our
work progresses, we will be posting our drafts
on our website, http://www.house.gov/stark
and we invite everyone to visit the site and
offer their input.

We plan to introduce this bill at the start of
the next Congressional session—the first of
the new millennium. I invited all of my col-
leagues, and everyone in America who cares
about the health of our children, to join us in
developing this idea, and to co-sponsor this
important effort to get every millennium baby
off to a good start.

IN HONOR OF THE PANPAPHIAN
ASSOCIATION AND SAVAS C.
TSIVICOS

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 17, 1999

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker,
I rise today to pay special tribute to the
honoree, Savas Tsivicos, this year, Savas
Tsivicos.

The Panpaphian Association was founded in
1987, by a group of Cypriot-Americans of
Paphian ancestry in order to encourage and
promote their cultural heritage. The Associa-
tion’s mission is to maintain and promote the
cultural traditions of the region of Paphos and
Cyprus.

This year’s honoree, Savas Tsivicos, exem-
plifies the honorable characteristics of the peo-
ple from Paphos. He came to the United
States in 1982 from a farming community in
the village of Inia to live the “American Life.”
His life embodies the dreams, hopes and aspi-
rations of thousands of immigrants who arrive
in the United States to construct a decent life.
Mr. Tsivicos holds a Bachelor’s Degree and
MBA from Fairleigh Dickinson University and a
Masters Certificate from George Washington
University, where he received numerous scho-
lastic awards and honors.

Mr. Tsivicos has also become an outspoken
community leader. He serves on the Ethnic
Advisory Council of New Jersey and has been
elected President of the Cyprus Federa-
tion of America. He is a member of the Arch-
dioecesan Council of the Greek Orthodox
Church of America and is an Archon of the
Ecumenical Patriarchate. Mr. Tsivicos is on
the Advisory Board of the Center for Byzantine
and Modern Greek Studies of Queens Col-
lege, and on the Board of Directors for the
Foundation of Hellenic Studies, the Greek
American Chamber of Commerce, and the
Congress of Overseas Cypriots.

Savas Tsivicos is a proud American who
does not forget his roots. He is imbued with
the determination to bring justice and freedom
to Cyprus and has served as Vice President of
the International Coordinating Committee
Justice for Cyprus. A very successful busi-
nessman, Mr. Tsivicos is president and owner of
Paphian Enterprises, Inc. He is married to
Maria Tsiptsov and they have three children,
Haralambos, Elpetha and Evangelos ages 11, 9
and 6.

The Panpaphian Association is now led by
Florentia Christodoulou, and supported by:
George Sophocleous, Debbie Riga
Evangelides, Stygos Stylianou, Michael
Hadjioulous, Kyriaki Christodoulou, Irene
Theodorou, Andreas Pericleides and George
Theodorou, plus the Advisory Board, Stavros
Charalambous, Annoula Constantides,
Andreas Chrysostomou, Anna Chrysostomou,
Savvas Konnaris, George Kouninas, Chrus
Kleopas Notskas, Ismini Michaelides, and
Evan Tziaras.

Mr. Speaker, I salute Mr. Savvas Tsivicos
and the work of the officers and friends of the
Panpaphian Association of America.

1999 INTERNATIONAL PRESS
FREEDOM AWARDS

HON. CONSTANCE A. MORELLA
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 17, 1999

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I want to con-
gratulate this year’s recipients of the 1999
International Press Freedom Awards, pre-
presented by the Committee to Protect Journal-
ists (CPJ).

CPJ was founded by American journalists in
1981 to defend the “human and professional
rights of journalists around the world.” CPJ
works to protect reporters who are threatened
by authoritarian regimes and other foes of ac-
curate, independent journalism. Its annual
awards honor those journalists working under
the most onerous of conditions.

This year’s honorees, who have been beat-
en, jailed, or had their lives threatened be-
dause of their work, will receive their awards
at a ceremony in New York next week. I join
CPJ in congratulating: Jesus Joel Diaz Her-
andez, who is serving a four-year prison sen-
tence in Cuba for starting an independent
news agency; Batan Haxhiu, editor of
Kosovo’s leading independent newspaper,
“Koho Ditore,” which he continued to publish
from exile after eluding Serbian police; Jignu
Mohsin and Najam Sethi, publisher and editor
of “The Friday Times” of Lahore, Pakistan—
last spring, Sethi was beaten, abducted, and
jailed after the paper published charges of
government corruption; and Maria Cristina
Cavallero, a reporter for Colombia’s “Semana,”
who received frequent death threats as a result of her work covering the
country’s civil war.
Mr. Speaker, too often we take a free press for granted. CPJ and this year’s honoree’s remind us that press freedoms are vital to the functioning of democratic government and that journalists often risk their lives to assure that the rest of us know the truth.

EXPRESSING SUPPORT OF CONGRESS FOR RECENT ELECTIONS IN REPUBLIC OF INDIA

SPEECH OF
HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 16, 1999

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 211. First let me thank Mr. GEJJDENSON, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. HASTINGS for co-sponsoring this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the contrasting events in India and Pakistan over a single 24 hour period speak eloquently about the new challenges and opportunities that we face in South Asia. In India, we have seen hundreds of millions of voters enthusiastically exercise their votes in a free and fair election. In Pakistan, we witnessed a military coup.

This resolution, Mr. Speaker, recognizes that the people of India have a deep and abiding commitment to democracy and it salutes them for the passion with which they choose their own destiny. No country reflects our own values more in that part of the world than does India.

It is high time we seriously begin to recognize this fact and graduate from mere platitudes to some tangible policy changes toward India.

I believe that it is time to re-examine our basic premise regarding U.S. policy in South Asia. We should abandon old paradigms and Cold War hangups and see that India, a democracy, is our natural ally in the region.

The best way to demonstrate our commitment to the people of India is by ensuring that the President travels to India as soon as possible, as the resolution urges him to do.

I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2116, VETERANS MILLENNIUM HEALTH CARE AND BENEFITS ACT

SPEECH OF
HON. MICHAEL F. DOYLE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, November 16, 1999

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the final version of legislation that deals with a comprehensive and complex set of veterans’ healthcare and benefits issues. Without question, this conference report on H.R. 2116, the Veterans Millennium Health Care and Benefits Act, deals constructively with a significant portion of the substantive matters considered at length by the Veterans Affairs Committees in both the House and the Senate.

I want to recognize the efforts of Senator SPECTER, Senator ROCKEFELLER, Senator STUMP, and Ranking Member EVANS for their demonstrated leadership in crafting collaborative compromises in the most productive manner as the conference allowed.

This agreement makes significant steps forward in defining the VA’s mission in a number of critical health care areas: Extended care, emergency services, mental health services, and chiropractic care. The agreement also moves in the right direction in terms of addressing the lingering need for additional national veterans cemeteries and long-term care facilities, as well as needed renovations at various VA medical centers. This agreement also acknowledges and benefits a few. This agreement also provides constructive direction in the areas of veterans’ education and housing, in meeting the needs of homeless veterans, and improving the administrative structure of the court of appeals for veterans claims.

I am disappointed, however, that many of the provisions that were originally included in the House version of the bill pertaining to employee and veterans organizations participation in various VA decision-making and planning practices were not made part of this final package. I also think that the conference could have produced a better work product in terms of providing strong language that speaks to the need for cost-benefit analysis, employee protections, stringent hospital closure guidelines, and heightened oversight measures throughout the entire VA network. Inclusion of such provisions would have greatly improved the agreement’s overall intentions and would have made them less susceptible to inconsistent treatment system wide.

So in summary, while the conference agreement is not a perfect piece of legislation, it is nonetheless worthy of members support. And as Representative EVANS pointed out earlier, the conference agreement in many ways represents the need to demonstrate our concerted interest in reaffirming our commitment to our nation’s veterans. But as I have repeatedly stated, the most well intentioned efforts in terms of authorizing language are only as good as the amount of adequate funding that is appropriated. I have very serious concerns that next year we will find ourselves in the same vicious circle of logical debate. And the circle begins and ends with the need to have adequate resources to sufficiently support our responsibilities in meeting the needs of our veterans.

It is my hope that all members who cast their vote in support of the conference agreement will maintain their focus on veterans issues so that in the next fiscal year we can reverse the course we have been on for far too long and begin our work on matters concerning veterans with enhanced resources, not severe budgetary cuts.

TRIBUTE TO COLONEL HARRY SUMMERS

HON. IKE SKELTON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 17, 1999

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, Colonel Harry G. Summers, Jr., United States Army, died this week. In his long service to the Nation and the Army he lost a soldier and scholar, who ranks among the preeminent military strategists and analysts of this century.

As an Army officer, who began his professional life as an enlisted soldier, and later as a military analyst, author and commentator, Colonel Summers knew personally the bayonet-point reality of war and thought and wrote widely about strategic issues. He was a decorated veteran of combat in Korea and Vietnam, awarded the Silver Star for valor, and the Legion of Merit; twice awarded the combat infantry badge; and twice awarded the Purple Heart for wounds received in combat.

An infanty squad leader in the Korean conflict, he served as a battalion and corps operation officer during the Vietnam war, and later as a negotiator with the North Vietnamese in Saigon and in Hanoi. Instructor of strategy at the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College, he was a political-military action officer on the Army General Staff, a member of the then Army chief of staff Creighton Abrams’ strategic assessment group, and served in the Office of the Army Chief of Staff from 1975 to 1980, before joining the faculty of the U.S. Army War College.

At the war college, Colonel Summers was at the heart of the rebirth of strategic studies in the professional military education of our Armed Forces in the early 1980’s. His book On Strategy: The Vietnam War in Context provided a critical strategic appraisal of American military thinking in that war and a seminal American work in the relationship of military strategy to national policy. On Strategy has been characterized as being “about” the Vietnam war in much the same way that Clausewitz is “about” the Napoleonic wars or that Mahan is “about” 19th century naval strategy between France and England. That is, Harry Summers used the Vietnam war as a vehicle for analysis and illustration of principles of war that apply universally.

After his retirement from active service, Harry Summers continued to contribute to the professional development of the officer corps and to the development of strategic thought and military strategy as a lecturer, visiting professor, columnist, editor, and commentator.

When Harry Summers testified before the House Armed Services Committee in December 1990 before Operation Desert Storm, he reemphasized the need for clarity of purpose and the relation of means to objective as this House wrestled with the decision to go to war against Iraq and commit U.S. military forces to protect the vital interests of the United States. He appeared before the committee again as we reviewed what happened to U.S. forces in Somalia in 1994 and provided valuable insights on the relation of military force and commitment to our national objectives and commitment in that country.

Harry Summers was obviously proud of his sons and their service as Army officers and of his daughter-in-law who served as a warrant officer in the Persian Gulf War. In all this, he was supported by his wife, Eloise. My good friend, Floyd Spence, the chairman of the House Armed Services, will review this in sending our sympathies to them at this time.

Colonel Harry Summers made a tremendous contribution to the rebirth of the study of military strategy and to the professional military education of our armed forces, and I urge all of us to reflect on his commitment to the Nation and the Army that he loved was unstinting. The Nation and the Army are poorer for his passing.
IN HONOR OF MS. JAMILA DEMBY,
NCAA WOMAN OF THE YEAR

HON. DOUG OSE
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 17, 1999

Mr. OSE. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise to acknowledge University of California, Davis, Olympic gold medalist, Jamila Demby, who was recently named NCAA Woman of the Year.

Ms. Demby, the first UC Davis athlete to earn this NCAA honor, was selected as a national finalist from among 50 state winners. Representing California, she was one of two Division II finalists.

It was a perfect ending to a perfect career at UC Davis. A seven-time All-American, Ms. Demby won eight conference championships in four years. During last year’s California Collegiate Athletic Association championships, Ms. Demby established a new UC Davis 800-meter record of 2 minutes, 10.8 seconds. In addition, she ran the final leg of the 4x400 relay team, which set a UC Davis record of 3:45.33.

In addition to her athletic achievements, Ms. Demby has been active in student and community activities. In addition to serving as a UC Davis Aggie team captain and sitting on the student-athlete advisory committee, Ms. Demby finds time to regularly visit children at the Shriners Hospital and tutor at local schools. In fact, her work with children has become such an influential experience that she changed her career path from advertising to serving underprivileged and underrepresented youth.

As NCAA Woman of the Year, Ms. Demby was chosen from a group of highly accomplished women. Ms. Demby will graduate from UC Davis this December with a degree in rhetoric and communications and will continue to give back to her community.

In closing, I would like to congratulate Ms. Demby for a job well done.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT’S OBLIGATION TO THE STATE OF LOUISIANA

HON. CHRISTOPHER JOHN
OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 17, 1999

Mr. JOHN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a bill with Mr. TAUZIN and the entire Louisiana congressional delegation that will bring closure to an issue that has lingered long enough concerning our home State of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the State of Louisiana and the Federal Government have a long history of working together to develop our abundant natural resources in a cooperative manner that protects our unique habitat and spurs economic development. I am pleased that we have been able to rectify our differences when they occur in order to reach sensible and judicious decisions that foster goodwill and the efficient use of our resource base.

Mr. Speaker, there remains before this House an obligation on the part of the Federal Government to satisfy an authorization that was included in the Oil Pollution Act of 1990. This authorization was crafted to resolve a unique dispute between the State of Louisiana and the Federal Government over the development of the oil and gas resources on the Outer Continental Shelf. Unfortunately, this authorization has never been satisfied and my home state has lost literally millions of dollars as a result.

Today, I am joined by members from Louisiana, Texas, New York and Pennsylvania in introducing legislation directing the Minerals Management Service of the Department of the Interior to adjudge the claims of lost revenues that occurred and quantified the resulting loss. At the termination of the fact finder, it is important to note that during the 4-year period of study, the federal government's inappropriate actions have been identified.

In November of 1985, the State of Louisiana began to notify MMS that a federal lessee was draining the West Delta Field at the expense of the State and its lessees. The Governor made this request based on the entire history of cooperative development agreements between the State and Federal government. The State sought to "utilize" the field by allocating the appropriate shares of the field's resources to each lessee. Utilization is standard practice in cases where multiple producers share common reservoirs. Much to the State's amazement, officials at MMS disagreed with the State and the entire Louisiana congressional delegation regarding the need and availability of relief for the State.

In order to bring some unbiased perspective to the debate, the Congress authorized an independent fact finder to review the situation and determine if unauthorized drainage occurred and to what extent, if any, loss had been identified. In 1988, the Congress, in the Interior Appropriations Act for FY89, authorized the Secretary of the Interior to appoint an independent fact-finder to determine if Louisiana had been drained of its gas and oil resources and, if so, the market value of those confiscated reserves.

That independent fact finder reported to Congress in 1989 that drainage had indeed occurred and quantified the resulting loss. At that point, the congressional delegation sought and obtained an authorization of appropriations for compensation that matched the determination of the fact-finder. It is important to note that during the 4-year period of study, the federal lessee continued to drain the sacred reservoir and actually continued to drain the field until the Federal wells ceased producing in 1998.

Why is that important to note? Because the State is seeking compensation only for the drainage that can be empirically determined by the fact finder's report for those initial 4 years. All drainage that occurred for the next decade has basically been written off by my State although they would have every right to seek their share of those revenues shiphoned by the Federal Government. In short, my State is knowingly leaving money on the table in order to make a good faith effort to resolve this issue.

In addition, we believe it is important to point out that satisfying this obligation in no way opens the doors to a myriad of similar demands on the Federal budget. From early on, the uniqueness of this situation was recognized when the Department of Interior wrote to then-Senator Johnston on September 19, 1991, that "To the best of our knowledge, the West Delta dispute is the only (emphasis added) situation in which the Department did not agree to unitization, or a similar joint development agreement on the Outer Continental Shelf when requested to do so by the Governor of a coastal State." To verify that this situation is unique, the State of Louisiana thoroughly reviewed its records and has confirmed that there are no other similar cases anywhere along the OCS boundary. In fact, in that same letter the Department wrote, "The Department agrees with your understanding that Section 6004(c) of the Oil Pollution Act does not create a precedent for the payment of any funds to any parties other than the State of Louisiana and its lessees." As for the environmental concerns raised by the Federal government's inappropriate actions, the record is clear. In OPA 90, the Congress specifically reiterated the harmful effects of "unrestrained competitive production on hydrocarbons from a common hydrocarbon-bearing geological area underlying the Federal and State boundary." The logic behind this language is simple. Why would we encourage the construction and operation of more oil and gas wells in U.S. waters than are necessary? If a field can be produced with one well, having two only doubles that chances of an accident. The concept is common sense and has been at the root of all Federal and State policies for decades. I see no reason to abandon that intelligent precedent now.

Mr. Speaker, after years of wailing, my State is interested in putting this issue behind us and moving on. What makes that statement so intriguing is that is the exact line the MMS stated in a letter to the dean of the Louisiana delegation over 9 years ago when they too wrote, "We are also very interested in putting this matter behind us."

Our legislation is simple. It will allow the State and its lessees to recover a portion of what was lost by the unauthorized development of the West Delta Field and will do so in the most benign of methods. The State and its lessees have proposed an alternative method for providing compensation by foregoing payment of federal royalties due by the lessee on other federal leases and distributing those withholdings to the State and lessee until the federal obligation is satisfied. Upon a restitution, the lessee will resume their payments to the Federal Government. By withholding royalty payments and sharing those revenues proportionately between the State and its lessees we expect the Federal obligation will be satisfied within 2 to 3 years.

After more than a decade, it is time for the federal government to settle this outstanding obligation and, at the same time, protect the rights of my home State. In addition, we must reaffirm that this Congress does not support policies that may well create precedents that would needlessly and recklessly endanger our coastal environments.
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CELEBRATING THE 100TH BIRTHDAY OF MRS. AGNES VENETTA STANDBRIDGE

HON. ANNA G. ESHTO
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 17, 1999

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in honor of Mrs. Agnes Venetta Standbridge, who will celebrate her 100th birthday on December 20, 1999.

As a young adult, Mrs. Standbridge observed first hand the effects that both World War I and World War II had on family and friends. She saw the world turned upside down as many of her friends, neighbors and family went off to the trenches in Europe and never returned or returned scarred by injury and the nightmares of battle. During World War II, Mrs. Standbridge was a young mother raising her four children in Lemington Spa near Coventry, England. There, she and her husband, Albert Standbridge did their best to protect their children from the sights and sounds of German aircraft bombing factories in the area. During these tumultuous times she developed a quiet courage and inner strength. By the early 1950’s she would need that bravery to confront the passing of her beloved husband at a young age. She never remarried and his memory remains with her today.

Mrs. Standbridge began another memorable chapter in her life when she moved to Northern California and ultimately settled in Mountain View where she has lived for 38 years. Living in beautiful Silicon Valley, Mrs. Standbridge witnessed the world change again—in a far more positive way. The technological revolution that has occurred over the last few decades has made her world and ours, a more prosperous place than ever before.

The events of the 20th Century have had a great impact on Mrs. Standbridge’s life and she has been shaped by the relationships of those who hold her dear. Family and friendship flow through her life and have enriched her century of living. She is a great example of resilience and courage. I’m proud to represent Mrs. Standbridge and ask my colleagues to join me in wishing this extraordinary woman a very blessed and a very happy 100th birthday.

TRIBUTE TO PETER McCUEN

HON. DOUG OSE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 17, 1999

Mr. OSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with a humble heart to pay tribute to a distinguished leader, a personal friend, and a true pioneer for the city of Sacramento, Mr. Peter McCuen. The city lost one of its great giants on Monday, when Peter succumbed to his third battle with cancer.

More than any other person in the last 20 years, Peter McCuen transformed the landscape of Sacramento and many of those who live in it. We can see the visual legacy he left when we drive through the Highway 50 corridor. The region’s most graceful skyscraper and its most visible ziggurat building remind us how integral he was in bringing prosperity to the city.

Peter came to Sacramento in 1980 after having successful careers as a professor at Stanford University and a hi-tech entrepreneur in Silicon Valley. He had planned on retiring in the city. But immediately after he arrived, he saw the many opportunities Sacramento had to offer. He was involved in over 100 development projects, including the Library Plaza, the U.S. Bank Plaza, the Teale Data Building, and the redevelopment of Mather Air Field. He also played a vital role in bringing major corporations like Intel and Sprint to this region, which created thousands of jobs for the people of Sacramento. His impact on the economic development of the Sacramento area is unparalleled.

But for many of us, it is not just the suburban business parks he built or the highrises he helped engineer that touched our lives. It is Peter’s unreserved generosity, canny vision, boundless energy and incomparable intellect that make him a truly unique human being.

Peter’s philanthropic efforts benefited a long list of causes and groups in the city. His renowned love of arts, education and civic organizations earned him the Regional Pride Excellence Award in 1991. He served on the advisory boards of the Cancer Center at UC Davis Medical Center and both the engineering school and the graduate school of management at UCD. He also served on the advisory board to the president of the Cal State University, Sacramento and the State’s Clean Air Partnership.

Peter had a bright vision for our city, and he tried everything in his power to fulfill that vision. Sacramento is a better place because of Peter McCuen. My heart goes out to his wife Susan, his two children, Pamela and Patrick, and the entire McCuen family. Sacramento will miss one of its true leaders.
HIGHLIGHTS

Senate and House passed Continuing Appropriations H.J. Res. 82 and H.J. Res. 83
House passed H.J. Res. 82, H.J. Res. 83, and H.J. Res. 84, Making Further Continuing Appropriations
House agreed to the Conference Report on H.R. 3194, District of Columbia Appropriations Act
House agreed to the Conference Report on H.R. 1180, Ticket to Work and Work Incentives Improvement Act
House agreed to H. Con. Res. 235, providing for the adjournment of the House and Senate

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S14751-S14838

Measures Introduced: Sixteen bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1955-1970, S. Res. 233, and S. Con. Res. 76. Pages S14805-06

Measures Reported: Reports were made as follows:
   S. 1561, to amend the Controlled Substances Act to add gamma hydroxybutyric acid and ketamine to the schedules of control substances, to provide for a national awareness campaign, with amendments. Page S14805

Measures Passed:

   Continuing Appropriations: Senate passed H.J. Res. 83, making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2000. Pages S14796-97

   Adjournment Resolution: Senate agreed to H. Con. Res. 235, providing for a conditional sine die adjournment of the first session of the One Hundred Sixth Congress. Page S14799

   Continuing Appropriations: Senate passed H.J. Res. 82, making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2000, after agreeing to the following amendments proposed thereto:
   Pages S14796-97, S14799-S14803
   By 56 yeas to 33 nays (Vote No. 370), Byrd/McConnell Amendment No. 2780, to provide for the disposal of excess spoil and coal mine waste. Pages S14796-97, S14799-S14803

   By 88 yeas to 1 nay (Vote No. 371), Lott (for Helms/Edwards) Amendment No. 2781, to provide for agricultural disaster relief and emergency assistance in North Carolina. Pages S14796-97, S14799-S14803

   District of Columbia Appropriations Conference Report: By 80 yeas to 8 nays (Vote No. 369), Senate agreed to the motion to proceed to the consideration of the conference report to H.R. 3194, making appropriations for the Government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000. Pages S14796-99

   A motion was entered to close further debate on the conference report and, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, a vote on the cloture motion will occur on Saturday, November 20, 1999, at 1:01 a.m. Page S14799

   Loan Guarantee Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that no later than March 30, 2000, if no Senate committee has reported a bill limited to providing loan guarantees to establish local television service to rural areas by satellite and other means, that the leadership or their designees be recognized to introduce a bill limited to sections 2002, 2003, 2004, and 2006 of the conference report accompanying H.R. 1554 providing such loan guarantees, and that the Senate immediately begin consideration of the bill with relevant
first degree amendments in order and second degree amendments that are relevant to the first degree amendment they propose to amend. Further, that if legislation is reported that is limited to such loan guarantees it be considered on, or before March 30, and be open to relevant amendments as provided above, and further that upon the disposition of all amendments, the bill be read a third time and passed, with no intervening action. Pages S14795–96

Messages From the President: Senate received the following message from the President of the United States:
Transmitting the report of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal year 1998; referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation. (PM–77). Page S14803

Messages From the President: Page S14803

Messages From the House: Pages S14803–04

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:
H.R. 1095, to require the United States to take action to provide bilateral debt relief, and improve the provision of multilateral debt relief, in order to give a fresh start to poor countries, amended (H. Rept. 106–483, Pt. 1);
H.R. 728, to amend the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide cost share assistance for the rehabilitation of structural measures constructed as part of water resource projects previously funded by the Senate under such Act or related laws, amended (H. Rept. 106–484, Pt. 1); and

Speaker Pro Tempore: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he designated Representative LaTourette to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. Page H12791

Guest Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the guest Chaplain, Rev. Douglas Tanner of Washington, D.C. Page H12730

Motion to Adjourn: Rejected the Obey motion to adjourn by yea and nay vote of 14 yeas to 375 nays; Roll No. 598. Pages H12730–31

Motion to Adjourn: Rejected the Kind motion to adjourn by a recorded vote of 25 ayes to 395 noes, Roll No. 603. Pages H12737–38

Motion to Adjourn: Rejected the Obey motion to adjourn by yea and nay vote of 24 yeas to 378 nays, Roll No. 604. Pages H12738–39

Motion to Adjourn: Rejected the Obey motion to adjourn by yea and nay vote of 24 yeas to 379 nays, Roll No. 605. Pages H12740–41

Member Sworn: Representative-elect Joe Baca of California presented himself in the well and was administered the oath of office by the Speaker. Pages H12739–40

Further Continuing Appropriations: The House passed H.J. Res. 82, making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2000 by a recorded vote of 403 ayes to 16 noes, Roll No. 607. Pages H12741–46

Rejected the Obey motion to reconsider the joint resolution to the Committee on Appropriations by yea and nay vote of 1 yea to 420 nays, Roll No. 606. Agreed to table the motion to reconsider the vote by voice vote. Pages H12744–45
Agreed to table the motion to reconsider the vote by a recorded vote of 294 ayes to 123 noes, Roll No. 602.

Agreed to order the previous question on the rule by yeas and nay votes of 375 ayes to 45 nays, Roll No. 599, and then agreed to table the motion to reconsider the vote by a yeas and nay vote of 316 yeas to 101 nays, Roll No. 600.

**Consolidated Appropriations Act:** The House agreed to the conference report on H.R. 3194, making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000 by a yeas and nay vote of 212 yeas to 219 nays, Roll No. 610.

**Committee Election:** The House agreed to H. Res. 391, electing Representative Baca to the Committees on Agriculture and Science.

**Work Incentives Improvement Act:** The House agreed to the conference report on H.R. 1180, to amend the Social Security Act to expand the availability of health care coverage for working individuals with disabilities, to establish a Ticket to Work and Self-Sufficiency Program in the Social Security Administration to provide such individuals with meaningful opportunities to work by a yeas and nay vote of 418 yeas to 2 nays, Roll No. 611.

**Further Continuing Appropriations:** The House passed H.J. Res. 84, making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2000.

**Chippewa Cree Tribe Water Rights Settlement:** The House passed S. 438, to provide for the settlement of the water rights claims of the Chippewa Cree Tribe of the Rocky Boy’s Reservation—clearing the measure for the President.

**Establishing National Historical Sites in Ohio:** The House passed S. 548, to establish the Fallen Timbers Battlefield and Fort Miamis National Historical Site in the State of Ohio—clearing the measure for the President.

**Coastal Barrier Resources System Map Corrections:** H.R. 34, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to make technical corrections to a map relating to the Coastal Barrier Resources System.

**Presidential Message—Aeronautics and Science:** Read a message from the President wherein he transmitted his report on aeronautics and science for fiscal year 1998—referred to the Committee on Science.
map relating to the Coastal Barrier Resources System—clearing the measure for the President.  
(See next issue.)

John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System: The House passed S. 1866, to redesignate the Coastal Barrier Resources System as the “John H. Chafee Coastal Barrier Resources System”—clearing the measure for the President.  
(See next issue.)

Foster Care Independence Act: The House passed H.R. 3443, to amend part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to provide States with more funding and greater flexibility in carrying out programs designed to help children make the transition from foster care to self-sufficiency.  
(See next issue.)

Healthcare Research and Quality Act: The House passed S. 580, to amend title IX of the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend the Agency for Healthcare Policy and Research—clearing the measure for the President.  
(See next issue.)

Women’s Business Center Program: The House passed S. 791, to amend the Small Business Act with respect to the women’s business center program—clearing the measure for the President.  
(See next issue.)

Correcting Enrollment: The House agreed to H. Con. Res. 236, providing for the correction of the enrollment of H.R. 1180.  
(See next issue.)

Designating the Sandra Day O’Connor U.S. Courthouse: The House passed S. 1595, to designate the United States courthouse at 401 West Washington Street in Phoenix, Arizona, as the “Sandra Day O’Connor United States Courthouse”—clearing the measure for the President.  
(See next issue.)

Designating the Robert C. Weaver Federal Building: The House passed S. 67, to designate the headquarters building of the Department of Housing and Urban Development in Washington, District of Columbia, as the “Robert C. Weaver Federal Building”—clearing the measure for the President.  
(See next issue.)

(See next issue.)

Continued Reporting of Intercepted Wire, Oral, and Electronic Communications Act: The House passed S. 1769, to continue reporting requirements of section 2519 of title 18, United States Code, beyond December 21, 1999. Agreed to the Coble amendment in the nature of a substitute. Agreed to amend the title.  
(See next issue.)

(See next issue.)

Condemning Hate Crimes in Illinois and Indiana: The House agreed to H. Res. 254, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives condemning recent hate crimes in Illinois and Indiana.  
(See next issue.)

China’s Persecution of Falun Gong: The House agreed to H. Con. Res. 218, expressing the sense of the Congress that the Government of the People’s Republic of China should stop its persecution of Falun Gong practitioners. Agreed to the Gilman en bloc amendments.  
(See next issue.)

Designating the Merlin Malcolm Dymally Post Office: The House passed H.R. 642, to redesignate the Federal building located at 701 South Santa Fe Avenue in Compton, California, and known as the Compton Main Post Office, as the “Mervyn Malcolm Dymally Post Office Building”.  
(See next issue.)

National Children’s Memorial Day: The House passed H. Res. 376, to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to provide that the United States Army Corps of Engineers perform contract oversight of Fund financed remedial actions under that Act. Agreed to the Ose amendment.  
(See next issue.)

Meeting Hour—Friday, November 19: Agreed that when the House adjourn today, it adjourn to meet at 12:00 p.m. on Friday, November 19, 1999.  
(See next issue.)

Late Report: Committee on Government Reform received permission to have until midnight on Dec. 10, 1999 to file an investigative report.  
(See next issue.)

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Read a letter from the Chairman wherein he transmitted copies of resolutions approved on Nov. 10, by the Committee—referred to the Committee on Appropriations.  
(See next issue.)

Sine Die Adjournment: Agreed to H. Con. Res. 235, providing for the sine die adjournment of the first session of the One Hundred Sixth Congress.  
(See next issue.)

Convening Date of the Second Session: The House passed H.J. Res. 85, appointing the day for the convening of the One Hundred Sixth Congress.  
(See next issue.)

Committee to Inform the President: H. Res. 395, appointing Members to join a similar committee appointed by the Senate to inform the President that the two Houses have completed their business of the
session and are ready to adjourn. Subsequently, appointed Representatives Armey and Gephardt to the Committee.

(See next issue.)

Extensions of Remarks: Agreed that members may have until publication of the last edition of the Congressional Record authorized for the First Session by the Joint Committee on Printing to revise and extend their remarks and to include brief, related extraneous material on any matter occurring before the adjournment of the First Session Sine Die.

(See next issue.)

Resignations—Appointments: Agreed that until the day the House convenes for the Second Session of the 106th Congress, and notwithstanding any adjournment of the House, the Speaker, Majority Leader, and Minority Leader be authorized to accept resignations and make appointments.

(See next issue.)

Speaker Pro Tempore: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he designated Representative Morella and in her absence Representative to act as Speaker pro tempore to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions through the end of the First Session of the One Hundred Sixth Congress.

(See next issue.)

Senator Messages: Messages received from the Senate appear on pages (See next issue.)


Adjournment: The House met at 10:00 a.m. and adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

Committee Meetings
No committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY,
NOVEMBER 19, 1999

Senate
No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House
No committee meetings are scheduled.
Congressional Record

Next Meeting of the SENATE
10 a.m., Friday, November 19

Program for Friday: Senate will consider any cleared legislative and executive business, including appropriation measures.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
12 p.m., Friday, November 19

Program for Friday: Pro forma session.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

(House proceedings for today will be continued in the next issue of the Record.)