United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 146 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2000 No. 14

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Tuesday, February 22, 2000, at 11 a.m.

House of Representatives

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2000

The House met at 9:30 a.m.

□

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 19, 1999, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member except the majority leader, the minority leader or the minority whip limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

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

□

LIVABLE COMMUNITIES

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, for people who care about livable communities, the D.C. metropolitan area is either a test case or a basket case; sometimes it is both.

In terms of quality of life for the commuter, the experience in recent decades commands a horrid fascination. Between 1982 and 1994, there was a 69 percent increase in the time D.C. area commuters spent stuck in traffic. The average speed on the Beltway has decreased from 47 miles an hour to 23 miles per hour.

In D.C., we are told that the average commuter spends 76 hours a year stuck in traffic; that is almost 10 working days sitting in the car absolutely immobile. In Northern Virginia this summer, nearly 1 out of every 3 days was in violation of ozone clean air standards.

Mr. Speaker, of course, it is no secret that in this metropolitan area we are sprawling far more rapidly than we increase in population. From 1970 to 1990, Metropolitan Washington population grew 25 percent, yet the area that we consume increased over 60 percent.

The suburbs here grew by a population of 18.3 percent while the District itself lost 17 percent of its residents. In the first 7 years of the 1990s, the District was hemorrhaging one person every hour.

There are solutions which we know will not work; one is trying to simply pave our way out of congestion. The congestion in the United States will triple over the next 15 years, even if we increase capacity 20 percent.

The same people who tell us that we have the second worst congestion in the country found that, despite roughly $30.8 billion spent by urban areas to add more vehicle lanes, congestion levels remained almost identical to urban areas that did not.

Mr. Speaker, of course, here we do not have any thoughtful regional land use. But at an era of smart growth, we seem to be continuing to engage in dumb growth, like putting a massive stadium with huge public subsidy out in the middle of nowhere where it is virtually inaccessible any way other than by car and then being surprised when on opening day it is jammed and some people actually are abandoning their cars to get to the game.

We continue to scatter development throughout the region away from Metro stations and designated growth sites. There are things that can, in fact, work and make a difference.

Last week in Atlanta, Transportation Secretary Rodney Slater launched the Commuter Choice Initiative, a program that was created in TEA–21 to provide $65 a month in tax-free transit or vanpool benefits for employees in both the private and the public sector.

While this effort is a step in the right direction, we in Congress need to make sure that the Federal Government leads by example. Unfortunately, here in our congested metropolitan area, there is no uniform program or policy for our Federal employees, yet 350,000 Federal employees make up the majority of people who work here in and near transit.

There is no uniform parking or commuter policy across the Federal Government. The costs and subsidy for parking varies, different levels of transit subsidy.

Mr. Speaker, the administration is looking at an Executive order for Federal transportation in the National Capital region. This Executive order that they are looking at would require each Federal agency in the region to support transit and commercial vanpool benefits, to increase carpool and vanpool benefits, encourage bicycle and walking and provide shuttle service between transits points and agency workplaces where appropriate.

Last week, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) introduced legislation that would make this happen much faster via the legislative route. His bill

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.
Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

would expand Federal employee commuter options and accept the Federal Government's responsibility as the single largest employer in the Capital region to reduce traffic congestion and air pollution.

Mr. Speaker, I am excited about the gentleman from Virginia's leadership and the way that the administration is moving. I hope, however it is done, that we do not let an extra minute go by. People who are caught in traffic as we speak this moment deserve the best from the Federal Government to make our communities more livable, to make our families safe, healthy, and economically secure.

Having a uniform comprehensive approach to the Federal Government's transportation issues in the metropolitan region is an important step in that direction.

□

THE CBO REPORTS ON MEDICARE HMOs

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

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, remember when we debated the Bipartisan Consensus Managed Care Reform Act here on the floor about 3 months ago, and the HMO industry said the sky will fall, the sky will fall; premiums will go out of site.

We get the accurate answer, the accurate answer from the Congressional Budget Office, which has analyzed the bill which passed this floor by a vote of 275 to 151.

What did the CBO say would be the cost? The CBO said that over 5 years, the cost of premiums would go up 4.1 percent total. Now, this is important to understand.

All my colleagues should listen. The HMO industry will say 4.1 percent each year. Wrong. That is not what the CBO report says. In fact, I talked to a CBO staffer, Tom Bradley, last night and he said that in the first year there would be almost no effect. In the second, third, fourth and fifth years, premiums would go up about 1 percent over what they normally would be because of this legislation.

To my friends who debated this liability issue so vigorously, who said liability will cost so much, well look at what the CBO said. The CBO said when it looked at the bipartisan consensus bill that the largest single coster was not liability. The largest single coster in our bill is the internal and external appeals process, at 1.3 percent. Why is that? Well, because they recognize that HMOs are inappropriately denying care and that if a patient has an opportunity to take that denial of care to an independent peer panel, that about 50 percent of the time they are going to overrule the denial of care by the HMO and provide one with the care that they deserve and is justified and is medically necessary.

There is another reason why this report is so interesting, and that is that the CBO estimate for the Senate bill shows an increase of about 1.3 percent over 4 years.

Now some would say that is great. I would point out that that is a recognition that the Senate bill does almost nothing. It only covers about 43 million people. It does not cover the 160 million people that our bill covers, and it does not have an effective internal and external appeals process, because if one looks at the fine language in the Senate bill, it still says at the end of the day that an HMO can say whatever they want is medically necessary or is not. Whereas our bill, the bill that passed this House, addresses that issue.

Mr. Speaker, I would advise Members to look at this; but to remember this, that when they look at that 4.1 percent, it is cumulative over 5 years. That, in effect, is about the cost to the average consumer of one Big Mac per month. That is what we are talking about in terms of the cost, not an excessive amount for people to know that all that money they are currently spending on their health care premiums will actually mean something if they get sick.

Mr. Speaker, I just briefly wanted to mention a report by the Inspector General for Medicare. She looked at Medicare HMOs. We are all concerned about fraud and abuse. This is what the Inspector General found that Medicare HMOs are charging the Federal Government for: $250,000 in meetings for gifts, food, alcoholic beverages, at only one HMO; $190,000 for a sales award meeting in Puerto Rico for one Medicare HMO; $160,000 for a party celebrating a Medicare HMO's parent company's 150th anniversary; $25,000 for leasing a luxury box suite at a professional sports arena by a Medicare HMO; $106,000 for sporting events and theater tickets at four Medicare HMOs; $70,000 for holiday parties at three Medicare HMOs; $37,000 for wine, gifts, flowers, gift certificates, insurance brokers and employees at one Medicare HMO; $3,000 for a massage therapist for an employee at one Medicare HMO.

When the HMOs say that they are really hurting and that we need to increase their Federal dollars, maybe we ought to ask them, gee, maybe the tension is so much that they will need that massage therapist.

□

THE PEOPLE OF NAGORNO KARABAGH MUST HAVE A SEAT AT THAT TABLE WITH AZERBAIJAN AND ARMENIA

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, this week the president of the Republican of Azerbaijan, Heydar Aliyev, is visiting our Nation's Capital. President Aliyev is scheduled to meet with President Clinton this morning at the White House. He will also be holding meetings with Secretary of State Albright and Energy Secretary Richardson.

I would like to take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to express my hope that President Clinton and the other officials in his administration will use these meetings to urge President Aliyev to work in good faith for Azerbaijan for an Azerbaijan-negotiated settlement to the Nagorno Karabagh conflict.

In particular, it is imperative that Mr. Aliyev be urged to accept the direct participation of representatives from Nagorno Karabagh in the negotiations. In the minds of many, the Nagorno Karabagh conflict is viewed as a bilateral dispute between Armenia and Azerbaijan. While these two countries must obviously be part of the negotiations in the final settlement, the people of Karabagh who have their own democratically elected government must have a seat at that table. After all, it is their homeland and their lives that are at stake in this peace process. No one else should be allowed to make these life and death decisions for them.

Mr. Speaker, the United States is one of the cochairs of the Minsk Group, the body under the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, the OSCE, charged with facilitating a negotiated settlement to this dispute.

More than a year ago, the U.S. and our Minsk Group partners put forth a plan for resolving this conflict known as the common state approach. Despite their serious reservations, both Armenia and Nagorno Karabagh previously accepted this framework as the basis for negotiations while Azerbaijan rejected it. We do not necessarily need to be wedded to this one approach for jump starting the negotiations, but we should use occasions like this week's visit by President Aliyev to call for all sides to get back to the negotiating table with no preconditions.

I expect that President Aliyev will use this occasion, this meeting with the President, to call for the lifting of section 907 of the Freedom Support Act, a provision of U.S. law that prohibits direct American government aid to Azerbaijan until that country lifts its blockades of Armenia and Nagorno Karabagh. President Aliyev, backed up by the support of major oil companies, has been lobbying American officials to repeal section 907.

In 1998, this Congress rejected an amendment to the foreign operations bill that would have repealed section 907 and we must hold the line. Azerbaijan has failed to meet the basic condition for lifting section 907, namely, that it take demonstrable steps to lift the blockades it has imposed on its neighbors, and such intransigence should not be rewarded. I call on our administration to use this occasion to stress to the Azerbaijani president that the ball is in his court and that the only way to lift the ban on U.S. aid is for Azerbaijan to lift the blockade.

Mr. Speaker, Presidents Aliyev and Kocharian, President Kocharian of Armenia, have been meeting on a number of occasions at multilateral meetings where both countries are represented, and I welcome these direct talks and hope that they will continue.

Azerbaijan and Armenia must normalize their relations with one another. They have to work for greater economic integration, development of infrastructure, and cooperation in other areas. This is the path that President Aliyev must be encouraged to follow. Indeed, the benefits to his country would be significant by opening up trade investment and assistance, that these benefits cannot begin to flow to Azerbaijan until Azerbaijan lifts its blockades against Armenia and Karabagh. I truly hope Mr. Aliyev will hear this message and not continue to believe he can play the oil card, trying to use Azerbaijan's presumed oil reserves as a way of getting the U.S. to sell out the principle behind section 907.

Mr. Speaker, last week at a White House ceremony to accept the credentials of Armenia's new ambassador to the United States, President Clinton pledged to aid Armenia to achieve a durable and mutually acceptable resolution to the conflict over Nagorno Karabagh. President Clinton also praised President Kocharian and President Aliyev for their willingness to act boldly for peace. He stressed America's commitment to helping Armenia-established democratic institutions and a market economy, and noted that the progress made by the Armenian people means that the U.S. can shift our assistance from humanitarian aid to development projects.

Unfortunately, the President's fiscal year 2001 budget proposal actually calls for a 27 percent reduction in assistance to Armenia. Congress will have an opportunity to reverse this, and I intend to work hard to make sure that the assistance is actually increased.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to renew my call for Armenia's President Robert Kocharian to be extended an invitation for a state visit to Washington. Last November 25, my colleagues in the House joined me in a bipartisan call on President Clinton to extend the invitation to President Kocharian.

I see one of my colleagues on the Republican side, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA), is here and she was one of those.

□ 0945

While President Aliyev's current visit is not an official State visit, President Aliyev has been here on a State visit. President Kocharian, who was elected nearly 2 years ago, has yet to be accorded this honor. To solidify the growing bonds between the U.S. and Armenia, I believe it is time for a State visit for President Kocharian.

PRIVATE BILL FOR VIRGINIA ANIKWATA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a private bill on behalf of two of my constituents, Virginia Anikwata and her 11-year-old daughter, Sharon. Virginia is a resident alien from Nigeria who faces imminent deportation back to her home country. Her daughter Sharon, who was born here in the United States and is a United States citizen, unfortunately faces constructive deportation with her mother since she has no other family or close friends here in the United States to care for her. Virginia's husband, and Sharon's father, died unexpectedly of cancer during the time that he was a student in this country 11 years ago when Sharon was a newborn baby.

What makes this case so compelling is that Sharon would surely be subjected to the horrendous practice of female genital mutilation if she and her mother were forced to return to Nigeria, since that is a universal practice in the community and clan where Virginia's family and her in-law family live. Her in-law family, who are entitled to make these decisions for a widow and a child in Nigeria, have made it clear that FGM, female genital mutilation, would be imposed upon Sharon.

We in Congress have found this practice so abhorrent that we have made FGM subject to criminal sanctions under Federal law. It would seem contrary to the intent of this law for our own government to place itself in the position of aiding and abetting the commission of FGM on Sharon by constructively deporting her to Nigeria when this conduct is subject to criminal prosecution here in the United States.

It also is important to note that Virginia and her daughter are model members of their community. Since her husband's untimely death, Virginia has been a law-abiding resident, supporting herself and her daughter by working as a practical nurse, paying taxes regularly, never seeking or expecting any form of government assistance and contributing to her community in significant ways through her work and religious observation. As a matter of fact, the daughter has been a model student. She is an honor student, very much involved in student activities.

Virginia and Sharon's case present a unique set of circumstances that deserve special recognition and treatment by the Immigration and Naturalization Service and by the U.S. Congress. There has been an overwhelming outpouring of interest and support for this case from members of the public, who have been horrified at the prospect of an American citizen child being placed in the position of being constructively deported or permanently separated from her only surviving parent and family member here in the United States and subjected as well to the horrific practice of female genital mutilation.

I do not introduce private bills usually, but this is an exceptional case. By passing this private bill to provide permanent resident status to Virginia Anikwata, we can prevent a miscarriage of justice and save an American citizen from unimaginable cruelty.

□

NATIONAL ORGAN DONOR MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, what if just one of us could dramatically benefit 80 people at one time? What if through just one event any one of us could literally save the life of a peer? Every single one of us has within ourselves the ability to effect positive changes by giving the gift of life.

Yesterday, this House passed a resolution recognizing the value and the need for organ donations. As we celebrate National Organ Donor Month, we need to remember the thousands of innocent families who will lose a loved one because no viable organ was available; and we must consider our options to help these families.

It has often been said that life is short and the nearly 60,000 patients who are currently waiting on this waiting list to receive these organs know just how precious time is. The waiting time for patients hanging on to life continues to expand. Unfortunately, the number of organs and the number of organ donors does not expand. Every 16 minutes, a name is added to the ever-growing waiting list of those who will wait transplantation. These facts translate into 13 people who die each and every day just because there are not enough organs available for them.

As I said, there are over 60,000 people awaiting organ transplants today; and, sadly, most of them will continue to wait for a tissue or an organ that may never come. Transplantation saves lives and it is important that we, as Members of Congress, do everything we can to raise awareness on the importance of organ and tissue donations and to increase the amount of donors throughout our land and especially in our districts.

Organ donation is as simple as filling out a donor card and indicating one's intent with their driver's license bureau. There are no limitations on who can donate. In fact, organ donors have included newborn babies all the way to senior citizens. However, the most important step that one can take is to discuss this important decision with their family members. It is essential

that family members know our wishes, as relatives will be contacted and asked to sign a consent form upon our death.

Most Americans support organ donations. Nonetheless, only about 50 percent of the families asked to donate a loved one's organs have agreed to do so. Americans traditionally have strong values and share the spirit of giving within ourselves, within our communities, and in our Nation. Yet most Americans do not realize that the loss of one's life can result in the gift of life for many others.

Our corneas could give sight to two people, our kidneys could free up two people from dialysis, our heart, lungs, and liver can literally save the lives of patients who are in desperate need of a transplantation.

There is no greater gift than the gift of life. We must encourage this giving and work to leave a lasting legacy to prevent the needless and tragic deaths of thousands of Americans.

□

MARRIAGE TAX PENALTY

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

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of representing the south side of Chicago and the south suburbs in Illinois; and I am often asked about a fundamental issue of fairness, whether I am at the steelworkers' hall in Hegwish in the City of Chicago, or a legion or VFW post in Joliet, the Chamber of Commerce functions, a coffee shop in my hometown of Morris, or at a grain elevator, and that is the fundamental issue of whether or not it is right or it is fair that under our Tax Code 25 million married working couples on average pay $1,400 more in higher taxes just because they are married.

My colleagues, the folks back home, whether they live in the city, the suburbs, or the country, have all told me that they think it is just wrong that under our Tax Code 25 million married working couples pay on average $1,400 more just because they are married. They think it is wrong, and they want Congress and the President to do something about it.

Let me introduce Shad and Michelle Hallihan, two public school teachers from Joliet, Illinois. Shad and Michelle chose to get married a couple of years ago. They just had a little baby, just a couple of months ago. But Shad and Michelle are a typical example of the 1.1 million Illinois married couples who suffer the marriage tax penalty. Now, if Shad and Michelle stayed single and decided just to live together, they would avoid the marriage tax penalty because the marriage tax penalty results when two people get married and they file jointly.

So, for example, Shad and Michelle have identical incomes of $31,000. Michelle is making $31,000 a year. Under our Tax Code, if she is single, she pays at a 15 percent tax bracket. But when she and Shad chose to get married, and suppose that Shad has an identical income of $31,000, remember he is in the 15 percent tax bracket as well, but when they get married they file jointly and their combined income pushes them into the 28 percent tax bracket. So they are now paying a 28 percent tax rate on that same income. Is that right? Of course not. It is time that we do something about the marriage tax penalty.

I am proud that this House this past week, last Thursday, voted to wipe out the marriage tax penalty with the passage of H.R. 6, legislation that wipes out essentially the marriage tax penalty suffered by Shad and Michelle Hallihan as well as 25 million other married working couples who are punished just for getting married under our Tax Code.

H.R. 6 passed this House with an overwhelming bipartisan vote. Every House Republican and 48 Democrats bucked their leadership and voted to wipe out the marriage tax penalty for 25 million married working couples. That is a big momentum. Of course, our hope is the Senate will follow our lead.

One thing that I am so proud of our leader, the leader of this House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), the House Speaker, I thought made a very smart decision. He made a decision to allow H.R. 6 to come to the floor as a stand-alone bill, a bill that only deals with one subject. A clean bill that wipes out the marriage tax penalty and that is all it does. No extraneous issues.

Remember when the President and AL GORE vetoed our effort to wipe out the marriage tax penalty last year? It was part of a package, tax-related legislation. And, unfortunately, they used the other provisions as an excuse to wipe out our efforts to eliminate the marriage tax penalty.

My colleagues, we have a great opportunity. And my hope is the Senate will follow our lead and move quickly to move H.R. 6, the Marriage Tax Elimination Act, through the Senate as a stand-alone bill. No extraneous provisions, no riders, no poison pills. We need to keep it bipartisan. Let us keep partisan politics out of our efforts to wipe out the marriage tax penalty.

Over the next few weeks, 25 million married working couples like Shad and Michelle Hallihan are going to be back home watching to see if Congress and the President do something about the most unfair aspect of our complicated Tax Code, and that is the marriage tax penalty. We have a great opportunity, and it is all about fairness. Is it right, is it fair that under our Tax Code 25 million married working couples pay on average $1,400 more just because they are married? Twenty-five million couples just like Shad and Michelle Hallihan.

Let us wipe out the marriage tax penalty. The House has done its job. My hope is the Senate will do its job, and my hope is the President will keep his word. Because, remember, in his State of the Union address, he mentioned the marriage tax penalty and the need to do something about it. We have an opportunity. Let us keep it bipartisan, let us get the job done, let us bring fairness to the Tax Code and wipe out the marriage tax penalty once and for all.

□

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 11 a.m.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 57 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess until 11 a.m.

□

□ 1100

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HANSEN) at 11 a.m.

□

PRAYER

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

O gracious God, whose mercies are without number and whose spiritual nourishment is available without limit, we place before You our petitions and prayers. May our hearts be more sensitive to the needs of the poorest among us, the hungry and the homeless, those abandoned and those alone. May we do what we can to share the wonderful blessings of liberty with those who have no freedom or who suffer from the ravages of conflict.

May Your good spirit, O God, that spirit that brought the world into being and gives light and hope to the world, be and abide with us and all people, now and evermore. Amen.

□

THE JOURNAL

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

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

□

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida 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.

□

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is the day for the call of the Private Calendar.

The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

□

DISPENSING WITH CALL OF PRIVATE CALENDAR ON TODAY

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the Private Calendar be dispensed with today.

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

There was no objection.

□

ENDING UNFAIR TAXES ON AMERICANS

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I bring this House and the American people good news this morning, because I have just come from a hearing conducted by our Committee on Ways and Means, on which I am honored to serve.

The good news, Mr. Speaker, for all Americans, but especially for senior Americans, is that this House is preparing to get rid of the unfair penalty on earnings for senior citizens. It is unfair; it is work that is long overdue, and by listening not only to the people of Arizona, but to the people of America, this House stands ready to end the unfair earnings limit on seniors who are Social Security recipients.

We are also pleased, Mr. Speaker, that the President yesterday in an interview joins with us on this. I only hope that the President will also join and work, as this House has done, to sign legislation that ends the unfair marriage penalty on so many Americans.

So, Mr. Speaker, the record is clear: this Congress is working to end tax unfairness and restore tax fairness and equity for the American people.

□

EVERGLADES RESTORATION PLAN

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

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am from Florida, and I rise in support of the Everglades Restoration Plan and funding to make it a reality.

The State of Florida has lost 46 percent of its wetlands and 50 percent of its historic Everglades ecosystem. Fifty years ago, the Federal Government established the Everglades National Park, but simultaneously a series of canals, levees and other flood-control structures constructed by the Southern and Central Florida Project disrupted the life blood flow of water to the Everglades. Clean fresh water was cut off from the Everglades. In addition, 68 plant and animal species have become threatened or endangered with extinction.

The Everglades Restudy we are looking at now, Mr. Speaker, presents us with a very bold road map to undo the damage that has occurred during the last 50 years. It sets forth an extremely challenging agenda to restore the hydrology of the Everglades. It is a beautiful river of grass, and I am sure everyone in this country wants to see it restored.

We want to meet the needs of both urban and the farming industry, as well as the needs of the natural ecosystem. Restoration of the Everglades ecosystem will yield long-lasting human and environmental benefits to us all. By funding this plan, Mr. Speaker, we can restore this Everglades ecosystem.

□

SUSAN B. ANTHONY—A GREAT AMERICAN CHAMPION

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

Mrs. CUBIN. Mr. Speaker, Susan B. Anthony is well remembered as one of our Nation's greatest champions, not just of the rights of women, but the rights of all Americans. In addition to her work for women's rights, she was also a leading voice speaking out against the evils of slavery.

She considered her work in turning women away from abortion as some of the most important in her life. She declared that amongst her greatest joys was to have helped ''bring about a better state of things for mothers generally, so that their unborn little ones could not be willed away from them.''

Today, on the 180th birthday of her death, I rise in honor of this great human rights crusader and to bring her wisdom to bear on one of the great human rights issues of our day, the right of preborn children to live.

Susan B. Anthony was clear: abortion for her was nothing less than, quote-unquote, ''child murder,'' and she devoted much of her energies toward making women independent of what she termed the ''burden'' of abortion.

As we celebrate this day, let us also recommit ourselves to her goal of relieving women of the burden of abortion.

□

SENIORS DESERVE RELIEF FROM SOCIAL SECURITY EARNINGS LIMIT

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

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, it has been said that all work is noble. As much as I believe that, it is a shame that our government does not, because even though we might think all work is noble, our government, unfortunately, views work performed by senior citizens as apparently something less than noble. How else can one explain the Social Security earning limit, which actually penalizes senior citizens who have jobs?

Our seniors have worked hard their whole lives and have paid a lot of money into the Social Security system. They do so with the expectation that they will receive Social Security benefits when they turn 65. But the truth of the matter is that millions of seniors who choose to work after the age of 65 are stripped of their Social Security benefits. This is wrong.

The time has come to stand up for working seniors, just as we stood up for married couples last week. Because just as it is wrong for the government to penalize people for getting married, it is wrong for the government to penalize senior citizens for working. Let us give seniors relief from the Social Security earnings limit.

□

COLOMBIAN DRUG POLICY TOWARDS AMERICA

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, while American politicians just say no, reports say that the Colombian drug cartel has placed a $200,000 bounty on our border patrol. No limits. Kill five agents, you get $1 million.

Now, if that is not enough to tarnish our slogan, Colombia also plans to increase production of cocaine by 20 percent; and Colombia will expand their coca bush planting to 465 square miles, 465 square miles, and most of it targeted for the United States of America.

Beam me up, Mr. Speaker. While American troops are guarding borders overseas, vaccinating dogs in Haiti, the drug lords of Colombia are shooting our border patrol.

A Nation without secure borders is a Nation without security.

I yield back the crime, death, addiction, and stupidity in America.

□

THE KEEP OUR PROMISES ACT

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, in my heart few things are more sacred than the solemn promises that we have made to our veterans, because all of us today would not be able to enjoy the peace and prosperity we have without the sacrifices of our veterans.

Unfortunately, the President's budget proposal completely fails our veterans yet again by breaking the health care promises made to them years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that legislation has been introduced which corrects the administration's appalling oversight and restores adequate health care benefits that were promised to and earned by our veterans.

The Keep Our Promises Act is a bipartisan bill which will finally fulfill the commitment we made to our military retirees. We need to protect the future of veterans' health care. We need to protect those who have paid the ultimate sacrifices for this country.

I encourage our colleagues to support our Nation's veterans by supporting the Keep Our Promises Act. It is the least we can do, for all that they have done for us.

□

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Any recorded votes on H.R. 3557 and H.R. 3642 will be taken after debate has concluded on these motions.

Record votes on remaining motions to suspend the rules will be taken at a later time.

□

PRESENTING CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO JOHN CARDINAL O'CONNOR

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3557) to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to John Cardinal O'Connor, Archbishop of New York, in recognition of his accomplishments as a priest, a chaplain, and a humanitarian.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3557

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

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) His Eminence John Cardinal O'Connor is a man of deep compassion, great intellect, and tireless devotion to both spiritual guidance and humanitarianism.

(2) John Joseph O'Connor was born on January 15, 1920, in southwest Philadelphia, the son of Thomas J. O'Connor and Mary Gomple O'Connor.

(3) John Cardinal O'Connor joined the Navy Chaplains Corps in June 1952 during the Korean Conflict, served with elements of both the Navy and the Marine Corps, and saw combat action in Vietnam. He later served as chaplain of the United States Naval Academy and was appointed as Chief of Chaplains of the Navy with the grade of rear admiral, from which position he retired four years later, in May 1979. He was ordained a Bishop by Pope John Paul II on May 27, 1979. He then served as Vicar General of the Military Ordinariate (now the Archdiocese for the Military Services) until 1984.

(4) John Cardinal O'Connor became Bishop of Scranton, Pennsylvania, on May 10, 1983, was named Archbishop of the Catholic Archdiocese of New York on January 31, 1984, and was elevated to the rank of Cardinal by Pope John Paul II on May 25, 1985.

(5) John Cardinal O'Connor has demonstrated an unwavering commitment to public and parochial school education. He has supported and strengthened Catholic schools in their mission to provide a quality education to students of all races, ethnic backgrounds, and religions in the Archdiocese of New York and throughout the Nation.

(6) John Cardinal O'Connor has provided comfort and care to the sick, the elderly, and the disabled and provided millions of people with spiritual and emotional support. He lead the effort to open New York State's first AIDS-only unit at St. Claire's Hospital, remaining a frequent visitor and volunteer at the hospital.

(7) Throughout his life, John Cardinal O'Connor has also served on behalf of the poor and the oppressed, as exemplified by his assistance on behalf of famine victims in Ethiopia and victims in war-torn Bosnia-Herzegovina.

(8) Throughout his career, John Cardinal O'Connor has been a strong advocate of interfaith healing and understanding, particularly among individuals of the Catholic and Jewish faiths, and has played a significant role in helping to establish diplomatic ties between the Vatican and Israel.

(9) John Cardinal O'Connor took the inspiring words of the Declaration of Independence—''Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness''—and transformed them into a statement of purpose. He has dedicated his life's work to protecting and defending these inalienable rights of all people.

(10) John Cardinal O'Connor celebrated his 80th birthday on January 15, 2000, and has displayed remarkable courage and the true power of his faith in carrying on his life's work in the face of life-threatening illness.

SEC. 2. CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL.

(a) PRESENTATION AUTHORIZED.—The President is authorized to present, on behalf of the Congress, a gold medal of appropriate design to John Cardinal O'Connor, Archbishop of New York, in recognition of his accomplishments as a priest, a soldier, and a humanitarian.

(b) DESIGN AND STRIKING.—For the purpose of the presentation referred to in subsection (a), the Secretary of the Treasury (hereafter in this Act referred to as the ''Secretary'') shall strike a gold medal with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions, to be determined by the Secretary.

SEC. 3. DUPLICATE MEDALS.

Under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, the Secretary may strike and sell duplicates in bronze of the gold medal struck under section 2 at a price sufficient to cover the costs of the medals, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, overhead expenses, and the cost of the gold medal.

SEC. 4. NATIONAL MEDALS.

The medals struck under this Act are national medals for purposes of chapter 51 of title 31, United States Code.

SEC. 5. FUNDING AND PROCEEDS OF SALE.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—There is hereby authorized to be charged against the United States Mint Public Enterprise Fund an amount not to exceed $30,000 to pay for the cost of the medals authorized by this Act.

(b) PROCEEDS OF SALE.—Amounts received from the sale of duplicate bronze medals under section 3 shall be deposited in the United States Mint Public Enterprise Fund.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS).

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

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

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, today we honor a great American, the Cardinal of New York, John O'Connor, a spiritual leader who has been guiding the 2.3 million Catholics in the Archdiocese of New York for 16 years, and millions more in the Navy and Marines as a chaplain for 27 years.

The Cardinal endured military combat when he was called to minister to those entrusted to his care on the battlefields and in the jungles of Vietnam. A general from the Third Marine Division in Vietnam said of him, ''No one was more effective in sustaining for all Marines of any religion a particular morale.''

Cardinal O'Connor has been more than a spiritual guide for Catholics. He has served as a witness of Christ in his love for others and his heroic stance against moral decay and in his personal relationship with Christ. Above all else, his love for God has been the motivation for his love for all other persons.

His love for others has led him to reach out to those with physical disabilities. He has stood with disabled persons and their caregivers and supported them as cherished members of the church. In doing so, he has made them more visible, and the result often is greater acceptance and inclusion on the local level.

He has reached out to those suffering from alcoholism and emotional illness.

□ 1115

In the early 1980s, he opened the first treatment center exclusively for AIDS patients in a New York City hospital.

His love for the truth has led him to preach lively and clearly against offenses to human dignity. A reoccurring theme of the Cardinal's preaching is that each person has immense value and dignity. That dignity is rooted in our relationship to God being made in his own image.

The Cardinal has preached against hatred based on race or religion, against the abuse of women, against the destruction of the unborn, and against injustice in the political and judicial system. His stands against racism are as strong as his outspokenness

against abortion. Indeed, for the Cardinal, both racism and abortion are rejections of God and both demand the response of love. He has said, ''It is God who gave life and God who made life in its diversity. The defilement of the human person is a defilement of God,'' the Cardinal has said. In a mass in Harlem, he said that people cannot achieve community merely on the basis of respect for each other or honoring authority; it must be on the basis of love.

On Pentecost 1990 following a gang slaying of a black teenager, the Cardinal declared racism a sin and an outrage and led a cathedral mass congregation in a pledge to, and I quote, ''treat all men and women of every race and culture with the respect and dignity that is their right as persons made in the image and likeness of God.''

The Cardinal said, and again I quote, ''The church has always taught that the only answer to hate is love. There are no blacks, no whites, no Asians, no Hispanics, only children of God. This city; tragically, this country, has been filled far too long with the hatred we call racism. It is a sin, it is an outrage,'' said the Cardinal.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the House today honors John Cardinal O'Connor, a man whom Pope John Paul II once praised as a ''strong shepherd of men.'' On January 15 of this year, Cardinal O'Connor turned 80; and in the twilight of his great career he is courageously waging a battle against cancer. With his strong character and religious devotion, his spirit is thriving, as his comments on his recent visit to the Vatican witness. I am honored to rise before this House in support of this very timely bill that awards a gold medal on behalf of Congress through the President to this man who so deservedly carries the title, ''His Eminence.''

In 1984, Cardinal O'Connor made his first visit to Rome in his new capacity as archbishop of New York. Pope John Paul II welcomed him as the ''archbishop of the capital of the world.'' Catholic parishioners in America know well Cardinal O'Connor's contributions to the betterment of our society, most especially his many humanitarian endeavors such as his work on behalf of disabled persons and the people who care for them. His efforts to end racism in America command our respect; and in our diverse multicultural, multilingual, and multireligious country, the Cardinal's calls for ecumenical understanding have helped immensely in fostering peaceful fellowship between Catholics and their Jewish and Protestant Christian brethren.

In his devotion to many causes, Cardinal O'Connor has not only served his church with distinction, but also his country. He made the Navy his home for 27 years and through two wars. He retired as a rear admiral in 1979 with a Meritorious Service Medal, a Distinguished Service Medal and a Legion of Merit award, amongst others. He carries the distinction of being the first Roman Catholic priest to become senior chaplain at the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis.

Upon retirement from the Navy, Pope John Paul II installed him in Rome as a bishop for our Armed Forces, and in 1983, after assuming the bishopric of Scranton, Pennsylvania, he garnered national attention as one of the influential drafters of the America Bishops' pastoral letter on nuclear weapons, ''The Challenge of Peace: God's Promise and Our Response.''

In 1984, he assumed stewardship of the Archdiocese of New York. In academia, he holds an M.A. in clinical psychology and a Ph.D. in political theory. Finally, the Cardinal has published several thoughtful books on ecumenical and social issues.

Mr. Speaker, while today we honor a great man, one who has made America a better place, the House should go a step further to learn from Cardinal O'Connor's example and recognize that his spirit and commitment to social justice represent universal human values. For the coat of arms to which his clerical position entitles him, Cardinal O'Connor adopted the motto: ''There can be no love without justice.'' By that he meant, from the beginning of life to the cessation of life, a continuum of justice, a continuum of love. He lived his motto and he preached his motto. No person could do better, no person could do more. We all could emulate the example.

So I know my colleagues will join me and the many cosponsors of this legislation in paying high tribute to a man who has given such outstanding service to his country, his faith, and his pastoral flocks.

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

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman New York (Mr. FOSSELLA), who is the original sponsor of the resolution.

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

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Speaker, first I would like to thank the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) and the House who have understood the importance of this matter and who have helped me move this legislation forward so quickly. For that they should be commended. I would also like to thank a fellow New Yorker and former member of this chamber, CHARLES SCHUMER, who has introduced identical legislation in the other body.

As we have briefly heard, Cardinal O'Connor has spent a lifetime using one simple tool: love. Love for his country, his church, and his fellow human beings. Therefore, I consider it a great privilege to be able to introduce this legislation, an honor to associate with a man who has done so much for our Nation and for New York City.

Many people know that Cardinal O'Connor is the leader of New York's Catholic archdiocese. What many people do not know is that before his tenure in New York, the Cardinal spent 27 years in the Navy, ministering on behalf of our soldiers at home and abroad. Cardinal O'Connor joined the Navy during the war in Korea and saw combat action with the Navy and the Marines during the Vietnam War. He went on to serve as chaplain at the United States Naval Academy in Annapolis, instilling our future admirals with a sense of justice. Eventually, Cardinal O'Connor would rise to the rank of Rear Admiral. Upon leaving the military, he was ordained the bishop of the Armed Forces of the United States, but I believe in his heart, he always remained the chaplain.

Cardinal O'Connor is the spiritual leader of 2.3 million Catholics. Despite this challenge he has not limited his advocacy to strictly Catholic matters. Rather, he speaks out on a variety of issues. For example, Cardinal O'Connor has condemned racism in any and all forms. Cardinal O'Connor has also reached out to New York's Jewish community. He has issued unequivocal condemnations of anti-semitism and spearheaded the effort to establish diplomatic ties between the Vatican and Israel. An endowed chair of Jewish Studies is named in his honor at a Catholic Seminary in Dunwoodie, New York.

But more importantly, the Cardinal is not only a man of words, but of action. During the early and most frightening stages of the AIDS epidemic in the 1980s, he opened New York State's first AIDS-only unit at St. Clare's Hospital. He remained a frequent visitor and volunteer at this unit, spending untold hours with those in pain and suffering, and counseling those in their last moments on this earth. He has also fiercely defended inner-city Catholic schools from the budget axe, keeping schools open in the face of severe fiscal restraints, giving an opportunity to so many children who would have no alternative. Today, not only are those schools open, they are thriving. The Archdiocese's Catholic high school's graduation rate is 99 percent. Students from racial and ethnic minority groups make up 52 percent of the enrollment, and 21 percent of those students are non-Catholic.

There is so much good and noteworthy about this man that it is difficult to encapsulate it all in one thought or one speech, but I know that in a body that sometimes thrives on disagreement, there is one thing we can all agree upon: Cardinal John O'Connor is a great man. Yet, despite his high-ranking office, soldiers, priests, and parishioners know in their hearts that the Cardinal has always been a man of the people. As such, Cardinal O'Connor, through his beliefs, words, and actions, epitomized the true meaning of life, liberty and the pursuit

of happiness, and that is why he deserves the Congressional Gold Medal, and that is why I am honored to have introduced this resolution. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS).

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York has mentioned the Cardinal's important work with the inner-city Catholic schools, and I think that that bears repeating again. The gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA) said that students from racial and ethnic minority groups make up 52 percent of that enrollment. Twenty-one percent of them are not Catholic. Amazingly, the New York Catholic high school graduation rate is 99 percent, which is a testimony to the Cardinal.

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE) for yielding me this time. At the very outset I want to commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA) for the truly outstanding job he has done and the leadership he has shown in bringing this resolution before the House today.

I am proud to join with my colleagues in supporting the awarding of the Congressional Gold Medal to John Cardinal O'Connor. I have had the privilege of knowing Cardinal O'Connor since he first became the Archbishop of New York. I am proud to call him a friend. During that time, like so many other New Yorkers, Catholic and un-Catholic alike, I have witnessed the tremendous leadership he has shown, the willingness he has shown to stand up for what is right, the willingness he has shown to speak out on behalf of truths, the willingness he has shown to defy contemporary thinking, the willingness he has shown to make the tough decisions, to speak out on behalf of life, to speak out on behalf of justice, the support he has shown for the inner-city schools where there are many non-Catholic, nonwhite children being educated in the inner cities and Catholic schools by Cardinal O'Connor. And the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) has pointed out, the tremendous results that have been brought about from that education.

In addition to that, we have seen, as the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA) pointed out, we have seen the Cardinal literally working with AIDS patients at the hospital, giving of his time and effort. We have seen him reach out to other religions and to forge close relationships with non-Catholics, such as former New York City mayor Ed Koch. In fact, the two of them even coauthored a book several years ago. It was that type of ecumenism where he was able to reach across the religious divide and show how all religions should stand together as one, and that friendship and relationship with Mayor Koch personifies that.

□ 1130

In addition, he has reached out to those in need. He has stood behind those police officers that were wounded in the line of duty, such as the hero police officer Steven McDonald who also has told me the tremendous assistance that Cardinal O'Connor has given to him and his family in their time of need.

I have seen Cardinal O'Connor firsthand work on the Irish peace process dealing with many of the players involved, not just in this country, but in Ireland, in Britain, on both sides, Catholic and Protestant alike.

Mr. Speaker, he also has a tremendous sense of humor, a self-deprecating humor, a sense of irony. He has never shown that more during this time of his recent illness, where he is undergoing surgery and treatment for a brain tumor; yet he has courageously come forward and gone before his flock, gone before his congregation and his parishioners, and showed the type of courage in time of adversity that he showed during the good times.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join with my colleagues in voting for this gold medal for Cardinal O'Connor. No one deserves it more than John Cardinal O'Connor; no one personifies more what true religion should be. Whether you are Catholic, Protestant, Jew, Muslim, whatever your religion happens to be, you can identify with Cardinal O'Connor, because he represents eternal truths. He also represents a commitment to peace and justice.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY).

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to rise today in support of H.R. 3357, legislation awarding the Congressional Gold Medal to John Cardinal O'Connor.

I want to thank my good friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA) for introducing this legislation and for the great work that he has done in this body in bringing forward this legislation so that Congress may bestow its highest honor upon one of the most respected spiritual leaders in my great State of New York and our Nation and in the world.

Cardinal O'Connor celebrated his 80th birthday earlier this year amid standing ovations throughout. And I am pleased that we offer today our own ovation here on the floor in the form of the Congressional Gold Medal.

Mr. Speaker, his 54 years of devoted service as an ordained priest in the Catholic Church has shown him to be a cardinal of the people. He is a tireless advocate of charitable giving; reaching out to the homeless, the elderly, the sick and anyone needing a helping hand. His teaching and deeds on behalf of those less fortunate are truly an inspiration.

We owe our thanks to John Cardinal O'Connor for over 3 decades of service to the men and women of our military, as chaplain of the United States Navy and Marine Corps, and then as bishop for the Armed Services of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, we owe John Cardinal O'Connor our deepest gratitude for a lifetime of devoted service to the Catholic Church, to our Nation and its people.

Although illness has presented new challenges to Cardinal O'Connor's strength and his retirement is near, I am certain we have not seen the end of his service.

The Congressional Gold Medal is the greatest honor that this House can extend to an individual, and there is none more deserving than John Cardinal O'Connor.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANSEN). The gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE) has 11½ minutes. The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 of my minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) for him to yield as he might deem wise.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) controls 8 additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) for yielding the time and the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE) as well.

Mr. Speaker, words are inadequate to express my deep respect, affection, admiration and gratitude to John Cardinal O'Connor, one of the greatest and most consistent moral and spiritual leaders of the 21st century.

Conferring the Congressional Gold Medal on this extraordinarily brave man of conscience is a small but important token of our appreciation of a life so selflessly and wonderfully lived.

Mr. Speaker, I want to especially thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA) for sponsoring this legislation today and for the Republican leadership for bringing it up on the floor as well.

Mr. Speaker, I have known Cardinal O'Connor for almost 20 years. Although he would be embarrassed to hear it said, he is a living saint. Cardinal O'Connor is a man after God's own heart. He loves unconditionally and gives generously, expecting nothing in return.

He faithfully proclaims and demonstrates by his words, works, and actions the indescribable blessings of the

Gospel. He is a good and holy priest who radiates Christ and the healing power of God to both believers and nonbelievers alike.

Over the years, however, there are some, who have belittled, mocked, and rejected Cardinal O'Connor's clear Christian teaching on the sanctity of human life and the duty of all men and women of good will, especially politicians, to protect the vulnerable from violence. Yet, he always treated the enemies of his message with respect and good humor. Amazing!

Thank God, Mr. Speaker, that Cardinal O'Connor has been—and continues to be—a lightning rod for truth and inclusion and protection in law of all persons, regardless of race, color, creed, or condition of dependency. Cardinal O'Connor has worked tirelessly and effectively to bring an end to the culture of death and to usher in a culture of life so that God's will be done on earth, as it is in Heaven.

Notwithstanding the enormous responsibility of being the leader of the New York Archdiocese, which includes 413 churches, 293 schools, and 35 full and affiliate hospitals, he has repeatedly called on all Americans to face up to the cruelty and the inherent violence and injustice of abortion.

Under his leadership, the Archdiocese of New York has reached out to many mothers in need of help, shelter, medicine, or spiritual guidance. His new order of nuns, known as the Sisters of Life, are but one manifestation of his tangible love in action.

Mr. Speaker, in the 25th chapter of Matthew's gospel, Jesus spoke of the last judgment and those who would be blessed in eternity. Jesus said, and I quote, '''. . . For I was hungry and you gave Me food; I was thirsty and you gave Me drink; I was a stranger and you took Me in; I was naked and you clothed Me; I was in prison and you came to me.' Then the righteous will answer Him, saying, ''Lord, when did we see You hungry and feed You, or thirsty and give You drink? When did we see You a stranger and take You in, or naked and clothe You? Or when did we see you sick or in prison and come to You?' and the King will answer and say to them, ''Assuredly, I say to you, inasmuch as You did it to the least of these My Brethren, you did it to Me.'''

Mr. Speaker, Cardinal O'Connor has devoted his life and inspired countless others to do the same to help the least of our brethren, to help the disenfranchised and the unwanted, seeing Christ himself in the lives that nobody else wants and nobody else cares about. And he has done it without any fanfare whatsoever, never seeking applause, never seeking an accolade or pat on the back. He is truly a great man.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA).

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

Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of first meeting Cardinal O'Connor in New York in 1996. I was drawn to meet with Cardinal O'Connor because of an outstanding offer that he had made. He had made an offer to the city of New York and to the New York public schools that the Catholic schools of New York would take the 5 percent lowest performing students in all of New York's public schools, and that he would embrace those students and take them into the Catholic school system, and that the Catholic school system and he would take responsibility for educating those children.

We had an awesome meeting in 1996, a group of four or five of us meeting with Cardinal O'Connor and sharing his view on education. In 1997, we went back to New York, and Cardinal O'Connor testified in front of our Committee on Education and the Workforce about his view and his vision for educating all of the young people in New York City and all of the young people in America.

But perhaps what had the biggest impact on me was actually going to the Catholic schools in New York City. Having listened to what Cardinal O'Connor had to say, and then having the opportunity to take a look at what he was actually doing was awesome, educating kids in some of the most difficult areas of New York City and providing them with hope and opportunity, and providing them with a foundation to move forward.

In a diverse neighborhood, the Catholic schools were not talking about diversity, but they were talking about what brings us together, the saving grace of Jesus Christ. In an area of high poverty, high unemployment, high crime, they do not teach self-esteem, they talk about that every individual is created in the image of God.

I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this legislation to honor Cardinal O'Connor. I only saw a small part of what he did, but was impressed with his commitment and the results that he made to all Americans, and the impact that he has had in the lives of many people in this country and probably around the world.

I wish him the best as he enters his retirement, and thank him for his years of dedication and service.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS).

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Alabama for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA) for introducing this legislation. It is an honor for me to be a cosponsor.

Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Gold Medal is our highest expression of national appreciation for distinguished achievements and contributions to the American society. Over the past 224 years, this honor has been reserved for those of uncommon patriotism, leadership, and compassion, whose contributions to our history and culture have been both significant and enduring.

Cardinal John O'Connor, spiritual leader of the archdiocese of New York, is the type of person for whom the Congressional Gold Medal was created. Cardinal O'Connor is widely known for his strength of character, courage of conviction, and humility, and humor. His contributions to our society and culture stretch far beyond the community of the Catholic Church. Whether strengthening the ties among those of all faiths, or personally providing comfort to those afflicted with AIDS or attending to the poor, Cardinal O'Connor has spent a lifetime leading by example, an example that we would all do well to follow.

While perhaps best known as New York's Cardinal, his contributions and achievements can be felt all across America. He signed up for military chaplaincy during the Korean War, served in the Navy and Marine Corps, was Chaplain of the United States Naval Academy, and rose to the rank of Navy Chief of Chaplains.

Cardinal O'Connor's lifetime of leading and inspiring us to be better people and to serve our fellow man with devotion and compassion has earned him this unique distinction. I am proud and honored to join in nominating Cardinal John O'Connor for the Congressional Gold Medal.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD).

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

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to rise today as an original cosponsor of H.R. 3557 and in support of awarding the Congressional Gold Medal to John Cardinal O'Connor, Archbishop of New York. I hope that all my colleagues will join with us in recognizing Cardinal O'Connor's devotion to faith, service, and country.

The Diocese of Scranton, which I am proud to represent, was once home to Cardinal O'Connor. I remember how thrilled I was when in 1983 he became the Bishop of Scranton, and what mixed emotions the people of the diocese had when he was selected to become the Archbishop of New York. We hated to lose a leader that was doing so much for our area. He had the great respect and genuine affection of everyone of all faiths in northeastern and north central Pennsylvania.

Cardinal O'Connor is quoted as saying that he has no intention of fading into the woodwork. We are all very glad to hear that. I am confident that he will continue his ministry of personal compassion to those whose quiet cries are often lost in the din: the unborn, the handicapped, the sick, and the working poor.

One month ago today Cardinal O'Connor turned 80. I say to His Eminence, I wish him belated happy birthday, and I thank him for his many years of selfless service to his Nation and his faith.

I would like to thank my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA), for his leadership in bringing this bill before the House today to honor this great leader, this great American, John Cardinal O'Connor.

□ 1145

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

Mr. Speaker, Cardinal O'Connor's prayers, his sacrifices, and his personal chastity are a model of how to achieve personal fulfillment and happiness for all of us. As the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE) has said, the Pope has praised Cardinal O'Connor as a strong shepherd of men. In fact, Cardinal O'Connor has been called a spokesman for the Pope in the United States.

Cardinal O'Connor led the negotiations to restore relations between the Vatican and Israel, and he has proclaimed the Pope's message against a culture of death. But more than a spokesman, he has been a living witness to the civilization of love, which is at the heart of the Pope's message for the new millennium.

Among those that he has shown particular love and sacrifice for are the disabled and their caregivers; for victims of racism, whether from race or religion; the elderly; innercity youth; AIDS victims; the unborn; military personnel; and those with mental illness and alcoholism.

To close, Mr. Speaker, I will simply say this, today, by honoring Cardinal O'Connor we honor all those who put their faith into action each and every day to build a new civilization of love, to treat all men and women of each race and culture with the respect and dignity that is their right as persons made in the image and likeness of God.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. FOSSELLA), the sponsor of this bill, and I commend him and the New York delegation.

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) for yielding me this time. I want to thank him again for his leadership and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) and especially Speaker HASTERT, Majority Leader ARMEY, and all of my colleagues, and the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE), the ranking member, for their support of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard it all. Cardinal O'Connor is a tremendous man, and if we could all be like him, what a wonderful world this could be.

In just a few weeks, Mr. Speaker, there is a spectacle that takes place in New York City called the Saint Patrick's Day Parade, which people come from all over the world to witness. One of the highlights of that parade is just passing by Saint Patrick's Cathedral and the Cardinal will be there with his smile and greeting the parade goers and wishing us all well. I look forward to that day.

I look forward to the House passing this, as well as the other body, in honoring a true great American.

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

Mr. Speaker, in closing, one might think that Cardinal O'Connor had no critics in life. He had many critics, but underlying all of that criticism, in my judgment, was his innate belief in what he and others have called a consistent life ethic.

Senator Hubert Humphrey, a great liberal, a great Democrat, once said that the moral test of government and the moral test of individuals is how they treat those in the dawn of life, our children; how they treat those in the shadows of life, the disadvantaged, our handicapped; and how they treat those in the twilight of life, our seniors, especially those dying.

From the very beginning of life to the very cessation of life, Cardinal O'Connor was consistent in his belief that all deserved justice under the law and as much human love as mankind was capable of. For that, we honor him today.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 3557. At the same time, I rise in total support of, and with complete respect for, the work of Cardinal O'Connor. Cardinal O'Connor is a true hero as he labors tirelessly on behalf of the most needy and vulnerable in our society; promotes racial and religious harmony; advocates the best education for all children regardless of race, religion, or financial status; ministers to the poor, sick, and disabled; all the while standing up for that which he believes even in the face of hostility.

I must, however, oppose the Gold Medal for Cardinal O'Connor because appropriating $30,000 of taxpayer money is neither constitutional nor, in the spirit of Cardinal O'Connor who dedicates his life to voluntary and charitable work, particularly humanitarian.

Because of my continuing and uncompromising opposition to appropriations not authorized within the enumerated powers of the Constitution, several of my colleagues felt compelled to personally challenge me as to whether, on this issue, I would maintain my resolve and commitment to the Constitution—a Constitution, which only last year, each Member of Congress, swore to uphold. In each of these instances, I offered to do a little more than uphold my constitutional oath.

In fact, as a means of demonstrating my personal regard and enthusiasm for the work of Cardinal O'Connor, I invited each of these colleagues to match my private, personal contribution of $100 which, if accepted by the 435 Members of the House of Representatives, would more than satisfy the $30,000 cost necessary to mint and award a gold medal to the well-deserving Cardinal O'Connor. To me, it seemed a particularly good opportunity to demonstrate one's genuine convictions by spending one's own money rather than that of the taxpayers who remain free to contribute, at their own discretion, to the work of Cardinal O'Connor as they have consistently done in the past. For the record, not a single Representative who solicited my support for spending taxpayer's money, was willing to contribute their own money to demonstrate the courage of their so-called convictions and generosity.

It is, of course, very easy to be generous with other people's money.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join in supporting this legislation which will grant long overdue recognition to an outstanding American, one who I am especially honored to call a friend.

This legislation authorizes the President to present, on behalf of the Congress, to His Eminence, Cardinal John O'Connor of New York a gold medal in recognition of his accomplishments as one of our outstanding religious leaders. The medal pays tribute to Cardinal O'Connor for his roles as a priest, as a chaplain, and as a humanitarian.

For most of our colleagues in this chamber, John Cardinal O'Connor is a living legend. His dedication to God and his religion is well known throughout our nation.

However, for those of us who have the honor of representing Districts within the New York Archdiocese, Cardinal O'Connor is more than a legend. He is a living personification of love for one another, for peace, and for living up to the ideals of our Judeo-Christian heritage.

In my Congressional District, Cardinal O'Connor is ubiquitous. He is always on hand for school graduations, for cornerstone layings, and for religious services. Cardinal O'Connor personifies the trait of looking to the future, rather than the past, and his message is consistently a message of hope.

Cardinal O'Connor is a native of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. It is there that he entered the priesthood in 1945. The Cardinal studied at a number of institutions of higher education, and holds advanced degrees in Ethics, Clinical Psychology, and Political Theory.

Cardinal O'Connor served as a chaplain with both the Navy and the Marine Corps for a total of 27 years. After leaving military service, His Holiness Pope John Paul II ordained him a Bishop for the Military in 1979. After serving as Bishop of Scranton, PA, he was promoted Archbishop of New York in 1984. He was raised to the position of Cardinal a year later.

The motto on Cardinal O'Connor's personal coat of arms summarizes the philosophy of this outstanding leader: ''There can be no love without justice.''

Mr. Speaker, His Eminence, Cardinal O'Connor is known for promoting racial and religious harmony, and for advocating the best education possible for all children regardless of race, religion, or financial status. No one in America should forget that Cardinal O'Connor welcomed AIDS patients into the Catholic hospitals of New York back at a time when other institutions of medicine were turning them away. In New York, His Eminence is well known for ministering to the sick and disabled, and for being a friend to the poor.

It is regrettable that in this day and age Cardinal O'Connor has been harassed by elements of our society who feel comfortable attacking those institutions which continue to uphold our

ancient moral standards. The reaction of His Eminence to this misplaced hostility has earned him the respect and awe of all of us.

Mr. Speaker, this medal will be funded by the sale of authentic bronze duplicates of the medal which will be placed on sale by the U.S. Mint. I am honored to associate myself with this legislation initiative, and to congratulate Cardinal O'Connor and to wish him good health and happiness upon his anticipated retirement.

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of a bill to award a Congressional gold medal to Cardinal John O'Connor. We are gathering here today to honor a man who has been described as being the spine of the Catholic community throughout the United States. Cardinal John O'Connor has held the most influential post in the U.S. Catholic Church and has led the congregation of St. Patrick's Cathedral since 1984 with unwavering faith and a sense of leading a good Catholic life devoted to service.

His life of service formally began when he was ordained as a Roman Catholic priest in 1945. His service continued to not only include the Church and to God but also to his country as he served in the Chaplain Corps of the U.S. Navy, including assignments in Okinawa and Vietnam.

Cardinal O'Connor was able to revitalize the bishops' sense of urgency about the premier civil right issues of our time. He has indeed left an imprint on New York City and Catholics nationwide as a ''prophetic voice'' which has constantly challenged people's views—regardless of how upsetting they might be, even to politicians.

The Cardinal has been an icon for and has diligently served the American Catholic community particularly due to his strong bond with Pope John Paul II. He consistently served to participate in and better the Catholic school system and gave children the opportunity to be taught in the traditional Catholic system.

The Cardinal also sought to strengthen the ties between Catholics and Jews. Once, in Jerusalem he went so far as to apologize for the Church's history of anti-Semitism and was a chief advocate in persuading the Vatican to recognize Israel.

Today, we as a nation gather to celebrate the work Cardinal O'Connor has devoted his life to: charity, service to our community, acceptance of others and living a good life in the eyes of God. We would be lucky to be able to follow his example as selflessly as he has led his life. Cardinal O'Connor has left a deep impression on America and he will continue to inspire to follow in his footsteps.

Mr. LAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to help celebrate His Eminence John Cardinal O'Connor. For all of his accomplishments as a priest, a chaplain, and a humanitarian, there can be no way to fully honor him. The Congressional Medal of Honor—the highest honor Congress can bestow—is simply a beginning. While we will do our best in Congress to honor him, it is clear that the true honor is ours for having the privilege of learning from him.

As New York's archbishop since 1984, Cardinal O'Connor has seen the Catholic population of the archdiocese rise from 1.8 million when he arrived to the 2.3 million it is today. In a time where many sense a loss of spirituality across America, this is a testament to the wonder and grace of Cardinal O'Connor. That he was able to reach out and touch the souls of so many people, help them, guide them—it is inspiring.

We would all do well to follow the examples of what he has done for the people of New York and the American people. Cardinal O'Connor is an outspoken critic of racism. In the face of severe budget challenges, Cardinal O'Connor has protected and preserved inner-city Catholic schools. The Catholic High School's graduation rate is 99 percent. And his commitment to helping the sick and people with disabilities has been unwavering.

It is our responsibility to honor him outside of this House, and beyond just today. We can do that by learning from his grace and practicing what he has taught us.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANSEN). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3557.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 3557, the bill just considered.

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

There was no objection.

□

PRESENTING CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO CHARLES M. SCHULZ

Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3642) to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to Charles M. Schulz in recognition of his lasting artistic contributions to the Nation and the world.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3642

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

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) Charles M. Schulz was born on November 26, 1922, in St. Paul, Minnesota, the son of Carl and Dena Schulz.

(2) Charles M. Schulz served his country in World War II, working his way up from infantryman to staff sergeant and eventually leading a machine gun squad. He kept morale high by decorating fellow soldiers' letters home with cartoons of barracks life.

(3) After returning from the war, Charles M. Schulz returned to his love for illustration and took a job with ''Timeless Topix''. He also took a second job as an art instructor. Eventually his hard work paid off and when the *Saturday Evening Post* began purchasing a number of his single comic panels.

(4) It was in his first weekly comic strip, ''L'il Folks'', that Charlie Brown was born. That comic strip, which was eventually renamed ''Peanuts'', became the sole focus of Charles M. Schulz's career.

(5) Charles M. Schulz has drawn every frame of his strip, which runs seven days a week, since it was created in October 1950. This is rare dedication in the field of comic illustration.

(6) The ''Peanuts'' comic strip appears in 2,600 newspapers around the world and reaches approximately 335 million readers every day in 20 different languages. Because of this, Charles M. Schulz is the most successful comic illustrator in the world.

(7) Charles M. Schulz's television special, ''A Charlie Brown Christmas'', has run for 34 consecutive years. In all, more than 60 animated specials have been created based on ''Peanuts'' characters. Four feature films, 1,400 books, and a hit Broadway musical about the ''Peanuts'' characters have also been produced.

(8) Charles M. Schulz is a leader in the field of comic illustration and in his community. He has paved the way for other artists in this field over the last 50 years and continues to be praised for his outstanding achievements.

(9) Charles M. Schulz has given back to his community in many ways, including owning and operating Redwood Empire Ice Arena in Santa Rosa, California. The arena has become a favorite gathering spot for people of all ages. Charles M. Schulz finances a yearly ice show that draws crowds from all over the San Francisco Bay Area.

(10) Charles M. Schulz has given the Nation a unique sense of optimism, purpose, and pride. Whether through the Great Pumpkin Patch, the Kite Eating Tree, Lucy's Psychiatric Help Stand, or Snoopy's adventures with the Red Baron, ''Peanuts'' has embodied human vulnerabilities, emotions, and potential.

(11) Charles M. Schulz's lifetime of work has linked generations of Americans and has become a part of the fabric of our national culture.

SEC. 2. CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL.

(a) PRESENTATION AUTHORIZED.—The President is authorized to present, on behalf of the Congress, a gold medal of appropriate design to Charles M. Schulz in recognition of his lasting artistic contributions to the Nation and the world.

(b) DESIGN AND STRIKING.—For the purpose of the presentation referred to in subsection (a), the Secretary of the Treasury (hereafter in this Act referred to as the ''Secretary'') shall strike a gold medal with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions, to be determined by the Secretary.

SEC. 3. DUPLICATE MEDALS.

Under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, the Secretary may strike and sell duplicates in bronze of the gold medal struck under section 2 at a price sufficient to cover the costs of the medals, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, overhead expenses, and the cost of the gold medal.

SEC. 4. NATIONAL MEDALS.

The medals struck under this Act are national medals for purposes of chapter 51 of title 31, United States Code.

SEC. 5. FUNDING AND PROCEEDS OF SALE.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—There is hereby authorized to be charged against the United States Mint Public Enterprise Fund an amount not to exceed $30,000 to pay for the cost of the medals authorized by this Act.

(b) PROCEEDS OF SALE.—Amounts received from the sale of duplicate bronze medals under section 3 shall be deposited in the United States Mint Public Enterprise Fund.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS).

Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with mixed emotions. It is with great pride and honor that I support awarding Charles M. Schulz the Congressional Gold Medal. However, as we all know, Mr. Schulz, the creator of the beloved comic strip Peanuts, died last Saturday, February 12, at his home in Santa Rosa, California, at the age of 77. Therefore, I stand before my colleagues with great sadness.

I would like to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) for introducing this most appropriate piece of legislation. Congress has commissioned gold medals as its highest expression of national appreciation for distinguished achievements and contributions. Without a doubt, Mr. Schulz has earned this great honor.

Mr. Schulz first introduced his legendary Peanuts cartoon to us in October of 1950. It was then that the world became acquainted with such characters as Snoopy, Charlie Brown, Lucy, Linus and others.

Like millions of other Americans, I often felt as though I knew the man personally, having read and watched his cartoons for as long as I can remember. I believe that I knew the man as only a life-long fan could know him, through his work. I am extremely appreciative of Mr. Schulz and his creation of the Peanut gang.

For almost 50 years, he provided us with endless hours of humor, entertainment. His cartoons and characters will live with us forever.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3642, introduced by the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON), a bill to award a gold medal to a man who was a friend to the entire Nation, Charles M. Schulz. Peanuts was both a national treasure and a national delight. Every morning for almost half a century, America awoke to read the newspapers and millions of eyes turned to the pages where Charlie Brown, Lucy, Snoopy, and Linus lived.

Yet, it was not only Americans who took in the bounty of the strip's tender humor and sage advice. Worldwide, the best estimate is a global audience of 355 million fans. They were in 75 countries, read in 2,600 newspapers, and spoke 21 languages.

Then there were the spin-offs. Beginning in the 1960s, a Charlie Brown Christmas; It's the Great Pumpkin, Charlie Brown, were among the television specials. In an era where relentless violence is the main fare of television programming, how welcome to find true amusement in good taste, where the most dangerous party is either a girl who pulls away the football just before the kick or a fantasy Red Baron.

There were songs and even a musical, You Are a Good Man, Charlie Brown.

Peanuts was not easy, slapstick humor. Long-time readers know there was real substance about the disappointments in life. However, it was also about the great line, Happiness Is a Warm Puppy, which for millions of children and their parents had that ring about what truly makes life worthwhile.

Most in this chamber will be surprised that the spell of Peanuts so bedeviled theologians, philosophers, and psychiatrists that weighty books and articles were written probing the true meanings of the comic strip. They all found something of great worth, sometimes a brooding worth, all of which is fine. But for most of the adults we simply reveled in how four or five small cartoon frames Schulz could pack so much humor, joy, sadness and irony, all of the elements of great expression.

However, the whole production of Peanuts cartoons, films, musicals, books and even the dolls had special allure for children. Schulz had no problem communicating across many generations from when the first Peanut strip appeared half a century ago. I suspect one of his attractions to the young was that he was so easy to read and so direct. There was also Linus' security blanket. It gave the young the idea that through it all there are things, lasting things, to hold on to.

The books were just great reading instructors for millions of children that were nonviolent, but not just a bowl of cheer.

Mr. Speaker, for years now I have worn about three different Peanuts ties. I wear one today. I do not think I have ever worn a Peanuts tie when it has not been commented upon and it has not lit up someone's day. It is almost impossible to see a Peanuts tie and not smile, not feel some warmth, some empathy. That was the effect of Charlie Schulz.

We are all familiar with his fame, but I would like also to remind all that Schulz had served his country on the battlefields of World War II. He never forgot he was a veteran, and served as head of the fund-raising campaign for the National D-Day Memorial. He had the grit to be a good hockey player; the mathematical skill to be a fine bridge enthusiast; and the devotion it takes to teach Sunday school and deliver sermons.

Rarely can a man be called a global social institution; but in Charles M. Schulz' case, that is surely just what he was when he died after 77 years of phenomenal productivity and contribution. How it all came about will remain a mystery. A personality that large is never a simple book, but this much we know: in his life he did get to kick that football over the goal post. His work, with all its substance and wit, has become part of the national and global fabric and will be with us for a long time.

At last, one can say, ''Thank goodness, Charlie Brown.''

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON), the author of the resolution.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH), the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS), and the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE), along with the 308 cosponsors who supported this legislation, and for their assistance in bringing this bill to the floor today. It means a great deal to Mr. Schulz's family. It means a great deal to me, and it means a great deal to the community that I have the honor to represent that has had the honor to share that community with Sparky Schulz.

□ 1200

I would also like to thank my California colleague, Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN, who has introduced the identical bill in the Senate to make sure that this gold medal does come to fruition.

Mr. Speaker, this bill before us today is not about honoring a cartoonist who made us laugh and think but, rather, about honoring a lifetime of work that has transcended generations of Americans and has become the fabric of our national culture. We have adopted his characters as our own, and sometimes even as ourselves. Through them he provided us a uniquely American sense of optimism, purpose, and pride.

While many other pop figures reflect our fantasies, Sparky Schulz's characters, like Charlie Brown, reflected who we really are. Charles Schulz created the Peanuts comic strip in October of 1950, and he personally drew every single daily and Sunday strip. Peanuts appeared in 2,600 newspapers around the world and reached approximately 355 million readers every day, and they came in some 20 different languages.

Sparky Schulz gave us more than just Peanuts. Most notable was his work with the Regional Organization Canine Companion. This wonderful organization breeds, raises, trains, and places dogs with individuals who are limited by disabilities. Along with his wife Jeanne, Sparky led and, in large part, personally financed the construction and the operation of the Canine Companion's facility in Sonoma County, California. Here dogs are introduced

to individuals with disabilities and together they are trained to work with each other, forming a lifetime partnership and friendship.

He also built a great ice rink in Santa Rosa, California, an ice rink that loses almost $1 million a year. But he did it to give something to the community. And just a side note. In that ice rink he stored many hundreds of folding beds. Just in case there was ever a disaster in his community, people would have a place to come, a place to stay, and a place to receive shelter.

Sparky Schulz' public service and service to our Nation did not begin with Peanuts or with the Canine Companion. It started when he served as a staff sergeant in the United States Army during World War II fighting on the front lines in France immediately after the D-Day invasion. To help keep morale high, Sparky Schulz would often decorate the letters of fellow soldiers, letters that they were sending back home to their families, with cartoon characters depicting barracks life or battlefield life.

Scott Adams, the creator of the Dilbert cartoon, remarked yesterday about our great loss, the loss of Sparky Schulz. He said, ''It's the end of an era, and it is hard to imagine that cartooning will ever be the same. In basketball, you can say that Michael Jordan was the greatest ever. In cartooning, Charles Schulz was the greatest ever, and probably the greatest there will ever be.''

We will never forget Snoopy's imagination, Lucy's cynicism, Linus' gentle innocence, Woodstock's loyalty, or Charlie Brown's vulnerabilities, hopes, and dreams. Sparky's gift to our Nation were characters who spoke with clarity about those simple fleeting moments that bind us together, bind together our adulthood and our childhood, those simple and honest sparks about what it means to be a human being.

I thank everyone who is going to take part in making this gold medal a reality, and I urge all my colleagues to vote in favor of this gold medal resolution; and I say, ''Farewell and thank you,'' to Charles Schulz.

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, how much time do we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANSEN). The gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE) has 10 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) has 18½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO).

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and it is with great sadness that I learned of the recent death of Charles Schulz. During his lifetime this native Minnesotan touched countless lives through his wonderful creation, the Peanuts comic strip.

Since 1950, when Peanuts was first published, until this past Sunday, when the last Peanuts comic strip appeared, Americans young and old have been entertained by the aventures and foibles of Charlie Brown, Linus, Lucy, and Snoopy. Through each of these lovable human characters Charles Schulz reached out to all of us, teaching us important life lessons.

Through Charlie Brown's failed efforts to lead his team to victory in the neighborhood baseball game, we learned that winning is not everything. At the same time, his repeated attempts to kick the football out of Lucy's hands, while never succeeding, helped teach us the importance of never giving up hope.

Mr. Speaker, I support the efforts of my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON), to recognize Charles Schulz with a Congressional Gold Medal. I am so proud that this gifted artist hails from the Twin Cities. For the many values Charles Schulz taught us, for the enjoyment he brought to our homes, and for the way he touches so many of our hearts, it is only fitting that we offer our thanks.

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Sonoma County, California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. On Saturday night, millions of Americans lost their security blanket. Life will not be the same without Charles Schulz. The touching human stories he told every day through the Peanuts characters in his cartoons gave us such warmth that old and young understood how Linus felt holding his trusty blanket.

Now our friend is gone, and we will have to rely on memoirs. Fortunately, Charles Schulz left us plenty of these. I knew Sparky as a silver-haired man who spent time every week at Redwood Empire Ice Arena in Santa Rosa, California, located in my district. I also knew him as a hard-working artist who traveled from his home in the district of my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON), to his studio in Santa Rosa.

But my colleague from California and I are not the only people who shared Charles Schulz; neither is our colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO), who represents the district that Charles Schulz was born and raised in. Charles Schulz left a piece of himself with every single person whose day was brightened by one of his cartoons. We let Peanuts into our lives on a daily basis, and the cartoon characters came to feel like a part of our families.

Like so many Americans and people around the world, I delighted in following the ups and downs of Snoopy, Charlie Brown, Lucy, and the rest of the gang. My kids grew up on Peanuts. In fact, my daughter's first Christmas, her very favorite, favorite gift that she has probably ever had, was ''Noopy.'' She carried ''Noopy'' around on her shoulder for about a week, and ''Noopy'' is still in a trunk, cherished, in our garage.

In a way, we all grew up with Peanuts; learning a little something about ourselves and about life from those lovingly drawn cartoons: Learning humility, learning to win, learning to lose, learning to care, learning to express ourselves through the eyes of these children in his cartoons. It was through Charles Schulz's characters that we felt his spirit, and it is through those characters that his spirit will live on.

Beyond the pages of America's newspapers, Charles Schulz also touched the lives of his friends and neighbors in Santa Rosa. Our children are better off for the smiles they shared at his ice rink. Our community is stronger for the friendliness he added to it. It is only fitting that a man who has touched so many lives be awarded the Congressional Gold Medal.

It is with great pride that I have worked with the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) to secure the high honor for Charles Schulz. I only wish that he had lived long enough to receive this award himself. But I know that wherever he is today, Sparky is smiling just to know that his dream of drawing cartoons has given so many people the pleasure of laughter. I look forward to a unanimous vote for this Congressional Gold Medal for Charles Schulz today.

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

Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Peanuts gang, created by Mr. Schulz, has and will continue to honor and entertain millions of children and adults throughout the world. The Peanuts gang was a fabulous bunch to observe. We all hoped that one day Snoopy would finally catch the dreaded Red Baron. Millions of Americans would turn to the comics every morning to see if it was the day that Pig Pen would finally find the washroom. We all wished we could receive the advice that Lucy often provided for only a nickel. And, of course, everyone knew that someday, someday, Charlie Brown would kick the football straight through the uprights.

However, these things never did, and now will never, happen. That was the beauty of Charles Schulz and the cartoon he created. This group of children captivated our imagination for 50 years. They provided heart warming tales of everyday life along with humorous adventures. Mr. Schulz was the genius behind this American icon that allowed us to take a step back and enjoy the world around us.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH), the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I rise simply to thank my distinguished colleague from Oklahoma and my distinguished friend from New York for this very thoughtful presentation.

Charles Schulz had a greater impact on the life of America than perhaps all but a very few in literature and the arts. He brought to America something that is unique. He conveyed to the average American real human life and theology of a very deep human nature.

We at one time almost had the ''Gospel According to Peanuts.'' But the one aspect of the ''Gospel According to Peanuts'' that always struck me was that life was happy; that the traumas that we all face were traumas that could be resolved in an uplifting way in which the American circumstance was reflected to ourselves and to the world.

Charles Schulz, in many ways, when it comes to the creative arts, was the quintessential American artist, operating in a fashion of bringing art to the public and literature and theology and philosophy to America. And for this he is a treasure of this last century, and we all are deeply saddened at his passing.

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, it was with great sadness that I learned of the recent death of Charles Schulz.

During his lifetime, this native Minnesotan touched countless lives through his wonderful creation, the ''Peanuts'' comic strip.

Since 1950—when ''Peanuts'' was first published—until this past Sunday—when the last ''Peanuts'' comic strip appeared—Americans young and old have been entertained by the adventures and foibles of Charlie Brown, Linus, Lucy, and Snoopy.

Through each of these lovably human characters, Charles Schulz reached out to all of us, teaching us important life lessons.

Through Charlie Brown's failed efforts to lead his team to victory in the neighborhood baseball game, we learn that winning isn't everything. At the same time, his repeated attempts to kick the football out of Lucy's hands—while never succeeding—help teach us the importance of never giving up hope.

Mr. Speaker, I support my colleague Mike Thompson's efforts to recognize Charles Schulz with the Congressional Gold Medal.

I am so proud that this gifted artist hails from the Twin Cities. For the many values Charles Schulz taught us, for the enjoyment he brought to our homes, and for the way he touched so many of our hearts, it is only fitting that we offer our thanks.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANSEN). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3642.

The question was taken.

Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 3642, the bill just considered.

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

There was no objection.

□

□ 1215

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANSEN). Debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules.

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

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 3557, by the yeas and nays; and

H.R. 3642, by the yeas and nays.

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

□

PRESENTING CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO JOHN CARDINAL O'CONNOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 3557.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3557, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 413, nays 1, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 18]

YEAS—413

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastert
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner

Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—1

Paul

NOT VOTING—21

Baird
Bonior
Brown (OH)
Callahan
Campbell
Capps
Clay
Cummings
DeFazio
Graham
Hinojosa
Kasich
LaTourette
Lowey
Martinez
McCollum
Moakley
Mollohan
Pelosi
Vento
Waters

□ 1240

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANSEN). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on the additional motion to suspend the rules on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

□

PRESENTING CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO CHARLES M. SCHULZ

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 3642.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3642, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 410, nays 1, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 19]

YEAS—410

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

NAYS—1

Paul

NOT VOTING—24

Archer
Baird
Bonior
Brown (OH)
Callahan
Campbell
Capps
Clay
Cummings
DeFazio
Graham
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Kasich
Lowey
Martinez
McCollum
Metcalf
Moakley
Mollohan
Ney
Pelosi
Taylor (MS)
Vento

□ 1250

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□

NETWORKING AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 422 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 422

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2086) to authorize funding for networking and information technology research and development for fiscal years 2000 through 2004, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Science now printed in the bill, modified by striking section 8 (and redesignating succeeding sections accordingly). Each section of that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be

printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HANSEN). The gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. 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, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

(Mr. HASTINGS of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 422 would grant H.R. 2086, the Network and Information Technology Research and Development Act, an open rule. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate, equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science.

The rule provides that it shall be in order to consider as an original bill, for the purpose of amendment, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Science now printed in the bill, modified by striking Section 8. The amendment in the nature of a substitute as modified shall be open for amendment by section.

The rule allows the chairman of the Committee of the Whole to accord priority in recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and provides that those amendments shall be considered as read.

The rule also allows the chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone votes during consideration of the bill and to reduce voting time to 5 minutes on a postponed question if the vote follows a 15-minute vote. Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, the Networking and Information Research and Development Act, H.R. 2086, amends the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991 to authorize funding for networking and information technology research and development programs of the National Science Foundation, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Department of Energy, the National Institute of Standards and Technology, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and the Environmental Protection Agency for fiscal years 2000 through 2004. The bill was reported favorably by the Committee on Science by unanimous vote of 41 to 0.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government has an enormous task in maintaining its position as the global leader in the information-technology field. This bill serves to reiterate our commitment to this agenda by emphasizing basic research and information-technology funding levels. This research has played an essential role in fueling the Information Revolution, advancing national security, and bolstering the U.S. economy by creating new industries and millions of new jobs. Information-technology now represents one of the fastest growing sectors of our economy, growing at an annual rate of 12 percent between 1993 and 1997 and generating over $300 billion of U.S. revenue in 1998.

In order to maintain the economic growth the U.S. is currently experiencing, we must maintain our role as a technological leader. Although the private sector provides the bulk of information-technology research funding, the Federal Government has a responsibility to support long-term basic research to the private sector, but that is ill-suited to pursue. H.R. 2086 recognizes this by providing adequate funds for such activities.

Specifically, over the next 5 years the bill would authorize $2.2 billion for the National Science Foundation, $602 million for the Department of Energy, $1.4 billion for NASA, $73 million for the National Institutes of Standards and Technology, $71 million for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and $22.3 million for EPA.

Finally, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that appropriating the amounts authorized in H.R. 2086 would result in discretionary spending totaling $3.7 billion over the 5-year period.

The Committee on Rules was pleased to grant the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Chairman SENSENBRENNER) for an open rule on H.R. 2086, and accordingly I encourage my colleagues to support H. Res. 422 and the underlying bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, today the United States leads the world in information-technology, and, because of our global dominance in this field, we continue to lead in the fields of science and engineering, our economy is stronger and growing faster than any other, working Americans are more productive than ever, and our future is bright with promise.

But if we are to maintain this dominance, we cannot sit back and rest on our laurels. For, just as the Federal Government has been responsible for much of the basic and follow-on research that has made this technology revolution possible, it is necessary that the Federal Government now refocus its efforts on long-term fundamental research, while continuing its spectacularly successful partnership with private industry and academia.

It is also critically important that we find ways to continue to encourage students to enter the fields of science and information-technology in order that we can be assured in the future we will have the highly skilled workers we need to continue our dominance in these fields.

H.R. 2086, Mr. Speaker, seeks to address those questions in a comprehensive manner by authorizing nearly $4.8 billion available over 4 years for a variety of research and development projects, as well as for grants to colleges and universities for the creation of for-credit internship programs at IT companies and grants to 2-year colleges to improve programs in education related to IT. This Networking and Information Technology Research and Development Act is an important legislative proposal for what surely is a national, not a partisan, priority.

Mr. Speaker, the fact that this bill was reported from the Committee on Science on a vote of 41 to 0 certainly demonstrates that the promotion of research and information-technology is not a partisan issue. The rule providing for the consideration of the Networking and Information Technology Research and Development Act is an open rule which will allow any Member to offer germane amendments to this important bill.

I urge my colleagues to support both the rule and the bill so that the House may act quickly on this proposal that will reap benefits for every American for years to come.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), for introducing this visionary piece of legislation. It was passed out of the Committee on Science with unanimous bipartisan support.

I would also like to honor our former colleague, the Honorable George Brown, who put a lot of work into this bill, and the continuation of George's work by the gentleman from the great State of Texas (Mr. HALL), our ranking member.

The Networking and Information Technology Research and Development Act, H.R. 2086, is truly a visionary

piece of legislation. I am proud to stand here today with my colleagues as an original cosponsor.

H.R. 2086 is about one simple thing, access to information. A major component of access to information is the continued development and expansion of information-technology.

□ 1300

I find it distressing today that we are forced to bring people in from outside of the United States to fill the employment needs of our IT companies. The average annual wage of technology workers in the Silicon Valley is $72,000 a year.

Quite simply, our work force pool lacks the experience and knowledge to fill a lot of these high-paying jobs. We must begin to focus on this problem, and this IT bill does just that.

The businesses in my home State of California exported $105 billion in products in 1998. Twenty-eight percent of those exports were in the electrical and electronics realm alone.

Mr. Speaker, in 1999 California had the largest State economy with an estimated gross State product of over $1 trillion.

The importance of H.R. 2086 to California alone is enormous. This bill ensures the United States and California continue to lead the way in information technology way into the 21st century.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the rule and strongly encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support our future in the global economy, support the generation's participation and the information technology community.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Chairman SENSENBRENNER), first of all, and congratulate him. I appreciate the exceptional work that he and the committee has done on H.R. 2086, the Networking and Information Technology Research and Development Act.

I also want to commend my colleagues, including the gentleman from Michigan (Chairman SMITH), who heads the Subcommittee on Basic Research and the rest of the Committee on Science, Democrats and Republicans, for unanimous support of this important piece of legislation.

No single field of study or research is so vitally important to our future from academia to industry, from the CEO, to the high school student. Information technology is the cutting edge of American and global economies in the next century.

Mr. Speaker, this bill represents over $5 billion of investment that will be made over the next 5-year period. Congress often talks about raising the standard of living for Americans. H.R. 2086 will bring about positive change and new high-tech jobs which now pay 50 percent more than the average wage.

This bill would create jobs not just through the funding of research but also by creating whole new industries. Recently there has been concern about the demand and subsequent shortage of information technology workers in the United States.

This bill provides funding for both improved education in the information technology fields and grants to partner colleges with companies to train today's students to be tomorrow's leaders.

Most importantly, H.R. 2086 provides long-term basic information technology research that has largely been neglected by the private sector and other Federal programs and uses a peer review system to make sure that the money is spent where it will produce the best results.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will create information technology research centers where multi-discipline research can be combined for the greatest results.

It will allow the National Science Foundation to produce new state-of-the-art computer systems through a competitive bidding process that will help fight disease, track and predict weather and allow grant recipients access to the computer hardware they need to carry out their research at a new level of excellence.

In the 20th century, Federal research money brought us the Internet, which has revolutionized computing and information technology for all of us. H.R. 2086 will help make the United States the leader for the next generation and the next century in the information revolution and will continue to lead the world in information technology far into the next century.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that my colleagues will join me in supporting the rule and the bill.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), a leader in the technology age in this Congress.

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

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in favor of the rule and of the bill. I also wish to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), the chairman of the Committee on Science, for taking what was submitted to the Science Committee last year as a very flawed piece of work and which he developed into an excellent bill which will serve this Nation well.

As was mentioned I have been in the technical field of computers and the Internet, but I am also of an age that allows me to recognize the importance of what went on many, many years ago. Too often our citizens do not appreciate the value of basic research, even though it takes a very long time to pay off. Let me explain.

During World War II, a group of scientists working together developed the first computers. It is interesting that some very knowledgeable people in the field at that time predicted that the world probably would never need more than 10 of those huge computers. Today, on every desk in every office in this Congress and this country, we have computers that are far more powerful and faster than those huge computers that were developed back then. It is a rapidly growing field and a very important field, with a multi, multibillion dollar industry that has developed out of this.

Similarly, with the Internet, today we have many people who claim to have developed or invented the Internet. That always happens after an invention, but when we look back at history, there is only a small handful of physicists and computer scientists who developed the basic ideas of the Internet. No one at the time really appreciated the future benefits. It was intended simply to allow our national laboratories to communicate information and data very rapidly.

However, once the Interenet was commercialized, it developed into a another multibillion dollar industry. Fundamental research in information technology has contributed to the creation of new industries and high-paying jobs that today pay about 80 percent above the average in the private sector. Today, we have 7.4 million people working in high-tech jobs.

What this bill does is prioritize the basic information technology research of the Nation, and this is extremely important to us. It funds basic IT research that will provide a real payoff in the next generation of innovations and it will set the framework for our economy for 10, 20, even 30 years from today. We cannot rely on industry to do the basic research; they have to deal with the bottom line every quarter. But the government has an appropriate role here and this bill recognizes that.

In addition to that, the bill will help produce the next generation of highly-skilled information technology workers. We need more students in this field. We have a grave shortage, as evidenced by the number of H1B visas that this Nation issues ever year. The internship program in the bill will help meet the need for those new employees.

This bill will also meet the need for state of the art computing systems for the civilian research community, a need that will grow in the future, and it provides for a terascale computing competition at the National Science Foundation. Most people do not realize that the Japanese supercomputers have now surpassed ours and they have a huge market they are developing internationally. We must, as a Nation, catch up to that and develop equally good computers, and preferably better computers.

This is bipartisan legislation. It passed the Committee on Science on a 41 to zero vote, and I congratulate the

chairman on getting that agreement within our committee. It demonstrates a real commitment to upholding our Nation's preeminence in information technology. It has been endorsed by dozens of organizations and clearly is a good piece of work that is going to serve this Nation well.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members of this Congress to support this legislation and to recognize the importance of basic research, not only in this field, but in other fields. I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON).

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, we are in the middle of a revolution right now in America, only the second such revolution in the history of our country. The first was when America transitioned from an agrarian society to an industrial society. Many of our colleagues and citizens did not want to make that change, but we had no choice because the economy of the world was going to be driven by that Nation that could lead the industrial age. We rose to the occasion, and we were successful.

The revolution we are going through today is an information revolution. We are changing from an industrial society to an information society. Therefore, we have to change. If we are going to lead the world's economy, we have to lead the information revolution. Therefore, it presents to us a challenge, a challenge to have the best educated, the best equipped, and the best technology available to make sure that we are leading the information revolution.

As the chairman of the Subcommittee on National Security Research, I am extremely concerned about the security implications of this challenge. In fact, information dominance, the threat of cyber terrorism, and the use of information technology is one of our three greatest threats in the 21st century. We have to be prepared.

The kind of battle that will be fought in the 21st century will probably not be one fought on soil or on the water, but will be fought through computer systems and cyber terrorism acts. We must make sure that we have the tools, the people, the training necessary to meet that challenge. In the military, we are attempting to establish a program to develop young people who go through ROTC programs to gain the skills that are necessary. This legislation does the same thing in the civilian community.

The greatest challenge we have in this century and the greatest factor for improving our quality of life is the use of information technology. I submit to our colleagues it is also the greatest vulnerability we have in this society, because those adversaries of America who wish to take us down, understand that if they can take out our information capabilities, they could disrupt not just our military, but our civilian quality of life. We have to be prepared, and that means we have to put billions of dollars into the R&D investment for the military, for information dominance and for protection against cyber terrorism and in the private sector, to encourage those technologies to allow us to build the systems to use data mining, to do the rapid speed transmission of data that is going to be so necessary in the 21st century economy.

So for all of those reasons, I join with my colleagues in supporting this legislation. I commend the chairman of the Committee on Science. We on the Committee on Armed Services have pledged to work closely with the Committee on Science so that both our military establishment and our civilian establishment are working hand in hand to make sure that America leads the world in the 21st century in this information revolution.

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

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST), the distinguished member of the Committee on Rules, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong support of this legislation and the critical investment that it makes in the future of information technology research. At a time when our Nation is enjoying unlimited economic growth and prosperity, we should use this opportunity to invest in scientific research and development, especially in the area of information technology.

This legislation would authorize $3 billion for the National Science Foundation over the next 5 years, of which nearly two-thirds of this funding would be designated for long-term, basic research grants to support research on a variety of IT projects. The authorization represents a 92 percent increase in information technology funding, which is a badly needed boost in a field that really has been defining our economy.

We can attribute much of our economic prosperity today to the Federal investments we made in the National Science Foundation and the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency in terms of their development of the Internet. That research investment was basic and has given us a multi-fold return, more return than we can calculate or imagine, really, in addition to the other basic research programs that are taken for granted but really fuel the engine of growth for America's economy.

Who would have thought that such an investment in DOD and the National Science Foundation would have permeated every sector of our economy and our way of life, but they have. The National Science Foundation has been performing amazing work toward establishing the next generation Internet, as well as fostering the pursuit of science, math, engineering, and other technical sciences in this country. So by investing in R&D and these programs today, we are investing in our future economic potential as a Nation. Unless we increase the flat budgets which basic research has experienced in the past several years, we cannot expect to continue to yield the kind of scientific advances that will ensure that the United States remains at the forefront of our global economy.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 2086 and to support these critical investments in information technology research. I also urge my colleagues on the Committee on Appropriations to support the necessary funding in the fiscal year 2001 bills to carry out the activities of this legislation.

□ 1315

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 422 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2086.

□ 1315

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2086) to authorize funding for networking and information technology research and development for fiscal years 2000 through 2004, and for other purposes, with Mr. GILLMOR in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) each will control 30 minutes.

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

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

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, the United States stands as the global leader in computing, communication, and information technology. This $500 billion a year industry accounted for one-third of our Nation's economic growth since 1992 and created new industries and millions of new high-paying jobs. This staggering success, however, is predicated on Federal

research conducted over the last 3 decades.

Fundamental IT research played an essential role in the information revolution. However, maintaining the Nation's global leadership in information technology is not a given. The congressionally-chartered President's Information Technology Advisory Committee, called PITAC, stated that the ''current boom in information technology is built on basic research in computer science carried out more than a decade ago. There is an urgent need to replenish the knowledge base.''

Although the private sector conducts most of the IT research, that spending has focused on short-term applied work. As our Nation's economy becomes more dependent upon the Internet and IT in general, current Federal programs and support for fundamental research and IT must be revitalized.

To accomplish this, I, along with George Brown, the late ranking minority member of the Committee on Science, and 24 other Members introduced H.R. 2086, the Networking and Information Technology Research and Development Act, a 5-year authorization bill. The committee subsequently passed this bill by a vote of 41 to nothing, showing rare bipartisan unanimity on an important piece of legislation facing this Congress.

H.R. 2086 provides comprehensive authorization for the Federal government's civilian basic information technology research efforts at the six agencies under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science, the National Science Foundation, NASA, the Department of Energy, the National Institute of Standards and Technology, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and the EPA.

This bill fundamentally will alter and greatly enhance the way information technology research is supported and conducted. Its centerpiece is the Networking and Information Technology Research and Development Program, which will be managed primarily through NSF and which will focus on long-term peer-reviewed basic research of the kind in which the NSF excels.

While funding for individual investigators remains an important aspect of IT research, funding for research teams and centers can also lead to dramatic progress. Therefore, this bill authorizes $130 million for large grants of up to $1 million each for high-end computing, software, and networking research, and $220 million for information technology research centers that are comprised of research teams of six or more members.

To attract more students to science and to careers in IT, the bill also authorizes $95 million for universities to establish for-credit internship programs for IT-related research at private high-tech companies. Both 2-year and 4-year schools will be eligible for these grants, which will operate on a 50–50 cost-sharing basis.

To help meet the need for state-of-the-art computing systems for the civilian research community, H.R. 2086 authorizes $385 million for a terascale computing competition at NSF. The bill requires that the funds be allocated on a competitive, peer-reviewed basis, and that awardees be required to connect to the Partnership for Advanced Computational Infrastructure network.

Finally, the bill authorizes the Next Generation Internet program through completion in fiscal year 2002.

Mr. Chairman, our future global influence lies in the hands of our young people, the education and training they receive, and the new scientific breakthroughs they produce. This bill combines increased authorizations for research funding with important policy changes that will keep the Nation at the cutting edge of information technology and produce the next generation of highly-skilled IT workers. It offers opportunities for all by providing open competition for IT grant funding, as well as benefiting diverse groups ranging from 2-year community colleges through the largest universities.

This bipartisan legislation demonstrates a commitment to upholding our Nation's preeminence in information technology. It has been endorsed by dozens of organizations, including the 1999 co-chairs Bill Joy and Ken Kennedy of PITAC, the Technology Network, the Computing Research Association, the Big Ten universities, and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

I believe that H.R. 2086's widespread support stems from the realization that information technology research assists all fields of science. Indeed, the research funded under this bill will help physicists, mathematicians, engineers, meteorologists, and computer scientists alike.

I ask my colleagues to join me in maintaining our world leadership in information technology by supporting H.R. 2086.

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

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise, of course, in support of H.R. 2086, the Networking and Information Technology Research and Development Act. It is a bill to support a coordinated basic research initiative in information technology. The chairman of the committee covered that very well.

I think it was introduced, of course, by the chairman of the Committee on Science, with bipartisan cosponsorship. I am pleased that the committee acted in a spirit of cooperation to perfect the bill. Some improvements have come from both sides of the aisle and were accepted during the markup of the measure.

H.R. 2086, as reported, enjoys, as the gentleman from Wisconsin (Chairman SENSENBRENNER) reported, broad bipartisan support. I congratulate the gentleman for his leadership in moving the bill forward for consideration of the House. I thank the late George Brown for his input.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to knowledge the efforts of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) and my colleague, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), the chairman and the ranking member, respectively, of the Subcommittee on Basic Research, for their contributions to the development of the bill.

Information technology is transforming the way people live, the way people learn, the way people work, and the way people play. It has been estimated that information technology is responsible for at least one-third of the Nation's economic growth since 1995.

I would also submit that H.R. 2086 will help to ensure that the advances that we have referred to here in information technology continue. This will in turn, I think, create new infrastructure for business, new infrastructure for scientific research and personal communication. This will go hand-in-hand with the next 5 years of what I believe are going to be the greatest years and era of prosperity certainly since I have been in this Congress. It is the first time that we expect, we reasonably expect, that we are going to have a surplus to work with to do the things that we really ought to do to push this country forward.

The bill supports research needed to underpin the technological advances that are going to emerge even 20 years from now. I think it will take up some of the slack that this Congress lost when we killed the super collider. My goodness, how destructive we were of finding our place in the field of technology when we cast that vote.

Put another way, the initiative is focused on the long-term high-risk research that industry itself cannot fund, for a lot of reasons. Due to intense competitive pressures, the computer and communications companies are forced to concentrate their resources on near-term development that is necessary to bring products to market rapidly, so we understand that.

But in addition to generating the new ideas that will form the basis for future products and services, the programs authorized by H.R. 2086 will train the next generation of scientists and engineers who are essential to ensure continued U.S. leadership in information technology. The bill will accomplish this valuable outcome through its focus on university-based research. They are waiting with bated breath for this support, this new support, which combines leading edge research with graduate student education.

I will offer an amendment, Mr. Chairman, at the appropriate time to increase the authorization level for the National Science Foundation program to align the bill with the fiscal year 2001 request.

The bill has received very strong support, not only from the academic and industrial research communities, but from a wide range of computer, software, and communication companies.

It has also been endorsed by broad industry groups such as the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2086 is a bipartisan bill that will lead to many societal benefits. It will help ensure that this Nation continues to maintain economic growth and international competitiveness in the information economy of the 21st century. I ask for the support of my colleagues for the passage of this bill.

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH), who is the Chair of the Committee on Science's Subcommittee on Basic Research, which has jurisdiction over NSF.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, first, I would thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Chairman SENSENBRENNER) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), who have done such great service to further the efforts of science and research in this country. I would also compliment the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Basic Research, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

This legislation I think gives the emphasis needed to move us ahead in information technology, and certainly we should remind ourselves that information technology research has been instrumental in bringing about the information revolution, which some have compared to the industrial revolution in its size and in its scope.

This revolution has spawned new businesses, created millions of good high-paying jobs, advanced the sciences, and certainly improved the health and welfare of the citizens of the country and people all over the world.

However, as the President's Information Technology Advisory Committee recently noted, the current boom in information technology is based on the basic research in computer science carried out more than 15 years ago. There is an urgent need to replenish the knowledge base. The advisory committee advocated a 5-year initiative to boost basic research funding significantly and help maintain the Nation's lead in this critical area. This bill, H.R. 2086, was designed to carry through on PITAC's recommendations.

In testimony before the Subcommittee on Basic Research last year, university researchers and members of the private sector were very supportive. Dr. Lazowska, a professor at the University of Washington and chair of the Computer Research Association, praised this bill, saying that it exemplifies a sound approach to making research policy by responding to clear national needs with recognizable objectives and a well-defined program for meeting those objectives.

□ 1330

In addition, Dr. Roberta Katz, president and CEO of the Technology Network, noted favorably that the 5-year authorizations in the bill demonstrate a commitment to a continued strong Federal investment in basic IT research to move information technology ahead.

In today's fast-paced science and technology environment, resting on our past successes is not enough if we are going to keep ahead in a world where other countries are dedicated to matching our productivity and taking away our customers. H.R. 2086 will help ensure that America stays at the cutting edge of new information technologies that will stimulate economic growth, improve our lives, and push forward the frontiers of science.

I am pleased to have been a cosponsor of this bill, because it is this kind of initiative that is going to help assure a good future for the citizens of the United States.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2086. The bill authorizes a major new research investment in information technology, which is consistent with the President's information technology for the 21st century initiative. This research initiative is very important to the Nation's future and its well-being, and I am pleased that the measure has now come before the House for its consideration; and I give my thanks and respect to the chairman, and the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking member of the committee.

Information technology is a major driver of economic growth. It creates high-wage jobs, provides for rapid communication throughout the world, and provides the tools for acquiring knowledge and insight from information. Advances in computering and communications will make the workplace more productive, improve the quality of health care, and make government more responsive and accessible to the needs of our citizens.

Vigorous long-term research is essential for realizing the potential of information technology. The technical advances that led to today's computers and the Internet evolved from past federally sponsored research, in partnership with industry and universities.

H.R. 2086 will ensure that the store of basic knowledge is replenished and thereby enable the development of future generations of information-technology products and services.

H.R. 2086 has received the bipartisan cosponsorship of many Members, and I would like to acknowledge the collegial manner in which the bill was developed by the Committee on Science.

I want to thank the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), for his efforts in crafting the bill and further thank the chairman, and the ranking Democratic Member, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), for their efforts in moving the bill to the floor.

H.R. 2086 will establish a multi-agency research initiative that responds to the recent findings and recommendations of the President's information-technology advisory committee. This committee, which was established through statute, is composed of distinguished representatives from computer and communication companies and from academia. It reached its conclusions following a comprehensive assessment of current federally funded information-technology research.

The President's advisory committee found that Federal funding for information-technology research has tilted too much toward support for near-term, mission-focused objectives. They discovered a growing gap between the power of high performance computers available to support agency mission requirements versus support for the general academic research community. They identified the need for socio-economic research on the impact on society of the rapid evolution of information technology, and they judged that the annual Federal research investment is inadequate by more than $1 billion.

I believe that H.R. 2086, as reported from the Committee on Science, addresses each of the deficiencies identified by the advisory committee and will effectively implement its recommendations. I am particularly pleased by the inclusion of a provision that I offered in committee to explicitly authorize research to identify, understand, anticipate, and address the potential social and economic cost and benefits from the increasing pace of information technology-based transformations.

In addition to support for research, H.R. 2086 will also contribute to providing the highly trained workers needed by the information industry. My district knows about this all too well. The bill would expand the human resources pool through two principal mechanisms. First, as a part of their training, graduate students will participate in most of the individual research projects supported by the bill; and, secondly, special provision is made for student internships in industry to help recruit individuals for careers and information-based companies.

I sponsored the provision in the bill that opened such internships to students participating in the Louis Stokes Alliances for Minority Participation program administered by the National Science Foundation.

Research discoveries in information technology over the past 30 years have resulted in new commercial enterprises that now constitute a major fraction of the economy. Businesses that produce computers, semiconductors, software and communications equipment have accounted for a third of the total growth in the United States economic production since 1992.

Clearly, there is ample evidence of the value of past Federal investments

in information-technology research. A 1995 study by the National Academy of Sciences documented several billion-dollar-per-year companies that had their genesis from discoveries resulting from government-sponsored research.

H.R. 2086 will provide the basic research needed to underpin the technological advances in the future. Because of the wide recognition of the importance of the research and education components of H.R. 2086, many organizations have expressed their support for the bill's passage. Among the industrial organizations that have endorsed 2086 are the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the Association for Manufacturing Technology, the National Association of Manufacturers, the Business Software Alliance, and the Computing Technology Industry Association.

In addition, many academic institutions and technical societies have expressed support for the bill, including the Association of American Universities, the National Association of State Universities Land Grant Colleges, and the Computer Research Association.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that H.R. 2086 is an important investment in the future prosperity of this Nation and in the well-being of our fellow citizens. I commend the measure to all of my colleagues and ask for their support for its passage.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA), who is the Chair of the Subcommittee on Technology of the Committee on Science.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), for yielding to me this time.

Mr. Chairman, as an original cosponsor, I am very pleased to rise in support of H.R. 2086, the Networking and Information Technology Research and Development Act. I want to commend the chairman of the full Committee on Science, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER); and the ranking member, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL); and all of the cosponsors and those who are involved in the various subcommittees who helped to craft this bipartisan piece of legislation.

As Chair of the Committee on Science's Subcommittee on Technology, I realize that today's rapid advancement in technology development has opened up to all of us a new and exciting world that has forever changed the way that we live, the way that we work, the way that we learn.

If we are to maintain our global preeminence in IT, it is clear that we must prioritize and increase our investment in fundamental information-technology research, and that is why the Committee on Science has introduced this bill.

H.R. 2086 is an innovative 5-year authorization bill aimed at returning this Federal Government's funding emphasis on information technology to basic research.

I am pleased that the legislation authorizes funding for cutting-edge research at the National Institute of Standards and Technology in the critical areas of computer security and wireless technology. Every day, we hear more and more about the need for that.

In addition to increasing IT research funding, H.R. 2086 seeks to improve the information-technology workforce by providing college students the opportunity to get hands-on experience in the information-technology workforce.

Specifically, it authorizes $95 million over 5 years to establish an internship program which will award grants to colleges, including community colleges, for students to intern at IT companies. Throughout my many meetings and hearings involving the information-technology industry, I have heard time and time again there is a shortage of IT workers to meet the needs of both government and industry. Well, this internship program takes important steps to actively train and recruit U.S. workers to fill these high-tech jobs.

I am also concerned that we need to do more to draw women and minorities into the IT workforce. Women represent nearly 50 percent of all U.S. workers, and yet they only comprise about 22 percent of the science and engineering workforce. So I think the internship program that is proposed in this legislation can also go a long way in helping to engage and involve those who are currently underrepresented in the science and engineering fields to explore careers in information technology.

Finally, the bill directs the National Science Foundation to conduct a study on the availability of encryption technologies in foreign countries. While the administration recently approved regulations that helped to ease some of the export restrictions on encryption products for certain sectors, many in the United States high-tech industry argue they did not go far enough. I am hopeful that the study conducted by NSF will allow the administration and Congress to make informed decisions on criteria for exporting U.S. encryption products and will help us to ensure that U.S. companies remain competitive in the international marketplace. This is a win/win piece of legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I applaud the efforts of the chairman of the Committee on Science, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), the ranking member, to advance this important legislation. I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 2086 here today.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY), a senior Member from California.

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 2086. As a Member of the Committee on Science and as a representative from the North Bay of the San Francisco Bay area, I am acutely aware of the enormous contributions information-technology research has made for the economies of my district and its positive impact on our State of California and the national economy in total.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to share with my colleagues an amendment offered to this bill that was accepted by the full Committee on Science that is now part of the bill we are debating right now. As we all know, computer and information-technology know-how will be essential to our children's success in the 21st century.

As I look at the limited use of technology in our classrooms, I wonder and have asked myself over and over, who is taking care of our children? Who is giving today's students the tools they need to be tomorrow's high-tech contributors and tomorrow's high-tech leaders? To help answer these questions, H.R. 2086 now contains an amendment that I wrote and creates a research program at the National Science Foundation to look at exactly how schools can better use available technology.

Through the assistance of NSF, we will now be able to assess and develop ways to increase the use of computer technology in elementary and secondary schools. This provision links academic researchers and teachers who will be developing materials and teaching methods. It requires that demonstrations be conducted in a broad range of educational settings to assess the effectiveness of computer materials and methods, to gain evidence about which methods and programs work and which work better than others.

Lastly, the program includes a provision to establish electronic libraries with access to this information in order to disseminate best practices and materials.

We all know the first step is to wire our schools, Mr. Chairman; but until we develop meaningful ways to incorporate that technology into our children's education, the technical infrastructure will be of little benefit to most of them.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support research and development. Vote for H.R. 2086.

□ 1345

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), a very valued member of the committee.

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I rise in support of H.R. 2086, and applaud our chairman,

the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), as well as the ranking member, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA), and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Mr. Chairman, I also applaud the fact that the Committee on Science was able to capture the moment as we entered the 21st century and focus, now moving from the superhighway to the concept of networking and information technology research and development.

I was elected in 1994 and had the pleasure of starting to serve on the Committee on Science in 1995. For some reason, I began to coin a phrase in most of my opening statements in the Committee on Science, which was to emphasize that science would be the work of the 21st century. At that time, even in 1995, the 21st century seemed to be enormously distant. It is not that at this point, we are here in the 21st century.

So we must continue to provide substantial resources for the American people in the 21st century, and the support of technological research and development will ensure that the United States continues to be at the forefront of the information age. Moreover, great strides in information technology will allow the economy to sustain its expansion over all of our sectors.

Though we had a guru in Dr. John Koskinen, I believe, who handled our Y2K, and certainly, unless we were all imagining, we seemed to have done very well with getting through the Y2K effort, or the Y2K journey. But I would add in my compliments a sense of caution and reservation. For even as we worked to get through Y2K, there was a noticeable missing element of outreach to all segments of our population. Low income, minorities, and nonprofits all seemed to be at the short end of receiving the kind of information that would help enhance their progress into this next century and this new technological society.

The Networking and Information Technology Research and Development Act, I believe, will take a decisive act in providing grants necessary to adequately fund and equip those agencies and groups that are dedicated to ensuring America's technological hegemony. In particular, this act grants the National Science Foundation with $1.8 billion for long-term research grants.

These grants would support research on high-end computing software, the social and economic consequences of information technology, and I will add to that by focusing on some of our low-income population and women in this, network stability, and security issues involving privacy. Furthermore, $385 million is provided for computing equipment that can process information at a rate of at least 1 trillion operations per second.

I am most gratified, as has already been stated, by the opportunity to provide and ensure monies to colleges and universities, but in particular to create internship programs.

I also raise the issue, although we are not discussing it at this time, and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) joins me as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, that there will be many things happening with this Internet. The world opens to us. We are proud of the technology, but we are also cognizant of many sort of negative influences. Although we do not discuss that today, we will be facing in the years to come the whole issue of Internet gambling. We will be discussing, as many victims groups have come to me and brought to my attention, the idea of utilizing the Internet in a sort of morbid auctioning of the belongings of victims of heinous crimes. So we will, in this research, I hope, be able to expand technology but, at the same time, be cognizant of the need to be cautious about technology.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2086 provides Information Technology Education and Training Grants authorizing $95 million for colleges and universities helping to create internship programs in information technology research along with private sector companies. Additionally, this bill also requires private companies to offer at least half of the funding for internships. H.R. 2086 grants $56 million for the NSF to establish a research program to develop and analyze information technology application to elementary and secondary education. NASA, the Energy Department, NIST, NOAA, and the EPA will also participate and support the NSF.

This Act will improve the Internet by funding the Next Generation Internet (NGI) Program with $111 million in FY 2000 and FY 2001; $30 million to the Energy Department; $50 million to NSF; $20 million for NASA; and $11 million for NIST.

Moreover, $1 million is earmarked for the NSF, to work in concert with the National Research Council, to study Internet privacy issues. These privacy issues touch privacy research and policy, laws and best practices in other countries.

This bill will offer prosperity to all and provide and educational opportunities for all Americans, especially those in the lower economic strata. I urge all my colleagues to support this Act for the good of the country.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very good bill. I hope to speak more about it as I put forth an amendment to ensure that some of those issues that I have discussed have been raised.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL).

(Mr. UDALL of Colorado asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 2086. There is a clear need for this legislation. Last year's report by the President's Information Technology Advisory Committee pointed out that Federal programs in information technology research are insufficient. The committee stressed that if we were to continue to make advances in education, manufacturing, medicine, and communications, this country needs a long-term plan to replenish Federal investment in basic IT research.

While information technology as a sector of the economy has grown at an annual rate of 12 percent between 1993 and 1997, Federal funding for IT research has grown only at the rate of inflation. In fact, appropriation levels for information technology initiatives and for all coordinated IT research programs for this fiscal year were well below the President's request.

H.R. 2086 authorizes dramatically increased government-funded research in long-term basic information technology and networking, an increase mainly directed at the National Science Foundation and NASA, but also benefiting DOE, NIST, NOAA and the EPA.

I wanted to call the attention of the House to the part of our committee's report on H.R. 2086 that stresses the importance of including physics, mathematics, chemistry, engineering, and other fields of science in the IT research efforts. This language is intended to ensure that the NSF and other agencies that participate in the research initiative authorized by the bill tap into the expertise and capabilities of other disciplines.

As author of this part of the report, I appreciate the support of the chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), the ranking member, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), and the committee for this statement. It will send a message that the planning process should reflect an inclusive attitude.

I also want to take a moment to talk about a few of the amendments being offered today. The amendments offered by my colleagues, the ranking member, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU) would make a good bill better by boosting authorization levels for the National Science Foundation, and I urge its support.

Another amendment by my colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON), would require the NSF and other agencies to prepare a report that would address key issues relating to the digital divide. More than half of the U.S. classrooms are connected to the Internet today, compared to less than 3 percent in 1993. But students in schools without Internet access are quickly falling behind the Internet. The amendment of the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) would help meet this challenge.

Finally, I wanted to speak in support of the amendment offered by my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL), who will address the issue of Internet access for seniors. In 1998, the number of people aged 50 to 74 using the Internet doubled from the year before. It is estimated by the end of this year there will be 100 million citizens over the age of 50 on line. I can count my mother as one of those people, and I am soon to be one of those people over 50 as well. The gentleman

from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL) would make sure that the benefits of the Internet are available to senior citizens.

So all in all these amendments are important in their emphasis on making the benefits of these newest technologies available to all Americans. I support these amendments and support H.R. 2086.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in favor of H.R. 2086.

Investment in long-term fundamental information technology research is critical to the continued evolution of the Internet and to the economy of New York City and the country.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this investment in IT research will benefit the country many times over. As the economy becomes increasingly global in nature, the U.S. must continue to invest in developing safer and faster information technology.

While the press has largely concentrated on the incredible wealth that has accumulated in high-tech stocks, the most substantial impact of IT on the economy can be measured in productivity gains and in job growth.

In New York City, the power of IT as a job creator has been stunning. According to a November report in Craine's New York Business, New York's Silicon Alley has created 56,000 jobs since 1994. When peripheral jobs that work with Silicon Alley companies are included, the total is well over 100,000 jobs, twice the number that neighboring Wall Street has added during the unprecedented Bull market.

Research projects funded by the bill include the development of the next generation Internet and ''terascale'' computing equipment. Funding will also go to information technology education and training grants that will be jointly funded with the private sector.

Mr. Chairman, I applaud the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) for their hard work and leadership in this important bill. I would also like to thank President Clinton and Vice President Gore for their 8-year commitment to technology issues.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I too would like to add my voice in appreciation as a member of this chamber for the leadership from the committee in terms of making sure that the United States' leadership in the area of information technology will be assured with the enactment of this legislation. This is an important step in the right direction.

I wanted to reference simply two points that are of special interest to me.

I appreciate the language in this legislation that would require the study of the encryption technologies that are available in foreign countries. I have often been concerned that our encryption policy in the United States in terms of export restrictions verged on the ludicrous.

□ 1400

We were in danger having the potential of some Gameboy platforms running athwart our restrictions until recently by action of the administration. And having a rational study of what is available overseas, compare that to what is available here, trying to make this something that makes sense in the broader world stage is important, I think, for our constituents who are engaged ultimately in ways to make sure that we have maximum benefit of encryption technology in the United States and we do not put American companies at a disadvantage.

Second, I appreciate and applaud the leadership of this committee trying to focus the need on having permanent research and development tax credit. This is something that makes a huge difference to industry in the long term looking over the long haul, something that industry can use to be able to make its research and development decisions.

I hope that the legislative leadership in both Chambers will take seriously the message that has been delivered by the committee to make sure that this is made permanent so that industry can count upon it.

I look forward to having a clean vote on this item before we adjourn. I think it would be overwhelmingly approved, it would be an important signal for our industry, and I think it is something that we no longer need to delay.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, as is usual in the courtroom, we save the best for the last. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this legislation. I want to congratulate the chairman and the ranking member of the committee and the other members of the committee for bringing the bill to the floor today.

It is critical that we continue to invest in basic research and technology and support the Next Generation Internet. The Government can play and has played a critical role in stimulating science and in improving people's lives. Government investment in basic research was essential to the creation and the development of the Internet we know today. We must continue to invest in cutting-edge technology and basic science to develop the Internets of the future. We must do everything we can to support this type of research.

I support this bill specifically because it continues to fund the Next Generation Internet. This initiative focuses on developing revolutionary applications and networking capabilities that will dramatically increase the speed and efficiency of the Internet.

The Next Generation Internet will be capable of operating at what we today would call incredible speeds. Imagine downloading data not at 56k, but at 622 megabits per second or even 2.4 gigabits per second or even 9.9 gigabits per second. That is what the future holds for Internet users if we continue to fund this.

These types of networks will enable bandwidth-intensive applications, such as telemedicine, video-conferencing, advanced engineering, and virtual-learning environments. The Internet of the future ought to be able to transmit voice, date, and video quickly and efficiently. If we invest wisely and support continued funding, then it will do so.

The National Science Foundation has played a central role in steering and providing seed money for this new national network. The bill recognizes the critical importance of strong Federal investment in basic research and science and specifically in the Next Generation Internet.

The research of today will stimulate future economic development as the research of yesterday has stimulated our current economic boom, and the research of today will further benefit our economy and our country in future years.

Again, I congratulate the committee; and I urge all my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2086, the Networking and Information Technology Research and Development Act. This legislation supports the vital funding of basic information technology research in the high-Performance Computing and Communications, Next Generation Internet, and additional NITRD programs.

I am particularly proud to support this legislation because of the instrumental role my own constituents at the University of Illinois have played in information technology research. While many in Washington are talking about making the Internet more accessible, but it has been researchers at the university of Illinois' National Computational Science Alliance (NCSA) that have made it happen. It was these researchers that pioneered the effort to create Mosaic, the browser which has the allowed the public access to the World Wide Web and the Internet. Without the National Science Foundation's support of this research, access to the Internet may still be only reserved for the few.

By devoting $130 million to the NSF for high-end computing, software, and networking research, H.R. 2086 will continue to support such important endeavors as those in my district to ensure that America's technological revolution leaves no one behind. Events of the past 10 years are evidence that any costs we incur today will be far outweighed by the rewards we reap tomorrow.

It is my hope that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join the bipartisan coalition of Science Committee members who passed H.R. 2086 by a unanimous 41–0 vote at Full Committee. Please support H.R. 2086 and support real efforts to make the information super-highway available to all.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 2086, the Networking and Information Technology Research and Development Act, because I believe that this legislation provides funding for internet and computing research that is essential to maintaining our status as a world leader in information technologies. Last week's hacker attacks on some of the foremost e-commerce web sites indicates the degree to which the development of the internet and our understanding of all of its possibilities and pitfalls, is still in its infancy. Just as buying stock in information technology companies has been a successful investment, dedicating funds to basic research into internet privacy, security, and stability, and helping to develop the technologies that will drive the next-generation internet, is as worthwhile an investment as we can make.

The federal government played a founding role in the growth of the internet, helping to develop and build both the infrastructure that carries the internet and the computers that power it. This bill continues that tradition of our role in the growth of this technology, technology that has the power to benefit so many people. H.R. 2086 provides nearly half a billion dollars to the National Science Foundation, hundreds of millions of dollars to NASA and the Department of Energy, and millions more to the National Institute of Standards and Technology, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and Environmental Protection Agency. The money is dedicated to long-term basic research on networking and information technology, and involves universities and the private sector in this collective research effort through grants for development and study.

This bill is truly legislation that everyone, particularly everyone involved in the growth of our new high-tech economy, can support. And most everyone already has. The Science Committee approved this bill unanimously, and a tremendous coalition of business, university, and government groups from across the country have voiced their support for this extremely important legislation. This bill will be a boon to the people of Silicon Valley, the area that I represent, and companies and trade associations that have been at the forefront of the development of the newest generation of information technology. But this is hardly a local phenomenon. The University of Washington, the Big Ten Universities, MIT, the National Association of Manufacturers, and the Co-Chairs of the President's Information Technology Advisory Council all have endorsed this legislation. Little wonder that internet technology, which has connected people from across the country and across the world like nothing before it, could also connect people in support of this legislation assisting in its development.

Mr. Chairman, basic research into new internet technologies drove the development of the world wide web and the incredible system of networks that now traverse the globe. Decades of basic research into computers and information technology were the catalyst for the internet economic boom that is now sweeping the country with a broad swath of prosperity in its wake. This bill provides hundreds of millions of dollars of extremely well-spent investment into further basic research to continue there geometric advances in information technologies, and I hope that the rest of my colleagues will join the 41 Members of the Science Committee in supporting it wholeheartedly.

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the bill, modified by striking section 8 and redesignating succeeding sections accordingly, shall be considered by sections as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, and pursuant to the rule, each section is considered read.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he has printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone a request for a recorded vote on any amendment and may reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for voting on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote, provided that the time for voting on the first question shall be a minimum of 15 minutes.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute be printed in the RECORD and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as modified, is as follows:

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Networking and Information Technology Research and Development Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Information technology will continue to change the way Americans live, learn, and work. The information revolution will improve the workplace and the quality and accessibility of health care and education and make government more responsible and accessible.

(2) Information technology is an imperative enabling technology that contributes to scientific disciplines. Major advances in biomedical research, public safety, engineering, and other critical areas depend on further advances in computing and communications.

(3) The United States is the undisputed global leader in information technology.

(4) Information technology is recognized as a catalyst for economic growth and prosperity.

(5) Information technology represents one of the fastest growing sectors of the United States economy, with electronic commerce alone projected to become a trillion-dollar business by 2005.

(6) Businesses producing computers, semiconductors, software, and communications equipment account for one-third of the total growth in the United States economy since 1992.

(7) According to the United States Census Bureau, between 1993 and 1997, the information technology sector grew an average of 12.3 percent per year.

(8) Fundamental research in information technology has enabled the information revolution.

(9) Fundamental research in information technology has contributed to the creation of new industries and new, high-paying jobs.

(10) Our Nation's well-being will depend on the understanding, arising from fundamental research, of the social and economic benefits and problems arising from the increasing pace of information technology transformations.

(11) Scientific and engineering research and the availability of a skilled workforce are critical to continued economic growth driven by information technology.

(12) In 1997, private industry provided most of the funding for research and development in the information technology sector. The information technology sector now receives, in absolute terms, one-third of all corporate spending on research and development in the United States economy.

(13) The private sector tends to focus its spending on short-term, applied research.

(14) The Federal Government is uniquely positioned to support long-term fundamental research.

(15) Federal applied research in information technology has grown at almost twice the rate of Federal basic research since 1986.

(16) Federal science and engineering programs must increase their emphasis on long-term, high-risk research.

(17) Current Federal programs and support for fundamental research in information technology is inadequate if we are to maintain the Nation's global leadership in information technology.

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION.—Section 201(b) of the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991 (15 U.S.C. 5521(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''From sums otherwise authorized to be appropriated, there'' and inserting ''There'';

(2) by striking ''1995; and'' and inserting ''1995;''; and

(3) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; $439,000,000 for fiscal year 2000; $468,500,000 for fiscal year 2001; $493,200,000 for fiscal year 2002; $544,100,000 for fiscal year 2003; and $571,300,000 for fiscal year 2004. Amounts authorized under this subsection shall be the total amounts authorized to the National Science Foundation for a fiscal year for the Program, and shall not be in addition to amounts previously authorized by law for the purposes of the Program.''.

(b) NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION.—Section 202(b) of the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991 (15 U.S.C. 5522(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''From sums otherwise authorized to be appropriated, there'' and inserting ''There'';

(2) by striking ''1995; and'' and inserting ''1995;''; and

(3) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; $164,400,000 for fiscal year 2000; $201,000,000 for fiscal year 2001; $208,000,000 for fiscal year 2002; $224,000,000 for fiscal year 2003; and $231,000,000 for fiscal year 2004.''.

(c) DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY.—Section 203(e)(1) of the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991 (15 U.S.C. 5523(e)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''1995; and'' and inserting ''1995;''; and

(2) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; $106,600,000 for fiscal year 2000; $103,500,000 for fiscal year 2001; $107,000,000 for fiscal year 2002; $125,700,000 for fiscal year 2003; and $129,400,000 for fiscal year 2004.''.

(d) NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY.—(1) Section 204(d)(1) of the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991 (15 U.S.C. 5524(d)(1)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''1995; and'' and inserting ''1995;''; and

(B) by striking ''1996; and'' and inserting ''1996; $9,000,000 for fiscal year 2000; $9,500,000

for fiscal year 2001; $10,500,000 for fiscal year 2002; $16,000,000 for fiscal year 2003; and $17,000,000 for fiscal year 2004; and''.

(2) Section 204(d) of the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991 (15 U.S.C. 5524(d)) is amended by striking ''From sums otherwise authorized to be appropriated, there'' and inserting ''There''.

(e) NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION.—Section 204(d)(2) of the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991 (15 U.S.C. 5524(d)(2)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''1995; and'' and inserting ''1995;''; and

(2) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; $13,500,000 for fiscal year 2000; $13,900,000 for fiscal year 2001; $14,300,000 for fiscal year 2002; $14,800,000 for fiscal year 2003; and $15,200,000 for fiscal year 2004.''.

(f) ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY.—Section 205(b) of the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991 (15 U.S.C. 5525(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''From sums otherwise authorized to be appropriated, there'' and inserting ''There'';

(2) by striking ''1995; and'' and inserting ''1995;''; and

(3) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; $4,200,000 for fiscal year 2000; $4,300,000 for fiscal year 2001; $4,500,000 for fiscal year 2002; $4,600,000 for fiscal year 2003; and $4,700,000 for fiscal year 2004.''.

SEC. 4. NETWORKING AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

(a) NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION.—Section 201 of the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991 (15 U.S.C. 5521) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsections:

''(c) NETWORKING AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.—(1) Of the amounts authorized under subsection (b), $310,000,000 for fiscal year 2000; $333,000,000 for fiscal year 2001; $352,000,000 for fiscal year 2002; $390,000,000 for fiscal year 2003; and $415,000,000 for fiscal year 2004 shall be available for grants for long-term basic research on networking and information technology, with priority given to research that helps address issues related to high end computing and software; network stability, fragility, reliability, security (including privacy), and scalability; and the social and economic consequences of information technology.

''(2) In each of the fiscal years 2000 and 2001, the National Science Foundation shall award under this subsection up to 20 large grants of up to $1,000,000 each, and in each of the fiscal years 2002, 2003, and 2004, the National Science Foundation shall award under this subsection up to 30 large grants of up to $1,000,000 each.

''(3)(A) Of the amounts described in paragraph (1), $40,000,000 for fiscal year 2000; $40,000,000 for fiscal year 2001; $45,000,000 for fiscal year 2002; $45,000,000 for fiscal year 2003; and $50,000,000 for fiscal year 2004 shall be available for grants of up to $5,000,000 each for Information Technology Research Centers.

''(B) For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'Information Technology Research Centers' means groups of 6 or more researchers collaborating across scientific and engineering disciplines on large-scale long-term research projects which will significantly advance the science supporting the development of information technology or the use of information technology in addressing scientific issues of national importance.

''(d) MAJOR RESEARCH EQUIPMENT.—(1) In addition to the amounts authorized under subsection (b), there are authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation $70,000,000 for fiscal year 2000, $70,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, $80,000,000 for fiscal year 2002, $80,000,000 for fiscal year 2003, and $85,000,000 for fiscal year 2004 for grants for the development of major research equipment to establish terascale computing capabilities at 1 or more sites and to promote diverse computing architectures. Awards made under this subsection shall provide for support for the operating expenses of facilities established to provide the terascale computing capabilities, with funding for such operating expenses derived from amounts available under subsection (b).

''(2) Grants awarded under this subsection shall be awarded through an open, nationwide, peer-reviewed competition. Awardees may include consortia consisting of members from some or all of the following types of institutions:

''(A) Academic supercomputer centers.

''(B) State-supported supercomputer centers.

''(C) Supercomputer centers that are supported as part of federally funded research and development centers.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, regulation, or agency policy, a federally funded research and development center may apply for a grant under this subsection, and may compete on an equal basis with any other applicant for the awarding of such a grant.

''(3) As a condition of receiving a grant under this subsection, an awardee must agree—

''(A) to connect to the National Science Foundation's Partnership for Advanced Computational Infrastructure network;

''(B) to the maximum extent practicable, to coordinate with other federally funded large-scale computing and simulation efforts; and

''(C) to provide open access to all grant recipients under this subsection or subsection (c).

''(e) INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY EDUCATION AND TRAINING GRANTS.—

''(1) INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY GRANTS.—The National Science Foundation shall provide grants under the Scientific and Advanced Technology Act of 1992 for the purposes of section 3(a) and (b) of that Act, except that the activities supported pursuant to this paragraph shall be limited to improving education in fields related to information technology. The Foundation shall encourage institutions with a substantial percentage of student enrollments from groups underrepresented in information technology industries to participate in the competition for grants provided under this paragraph.

''(2) INTERNSHIP GRANTS.—The National Science Foundation shall provide—

''(A) grants to institutions of higher education to establish scientific internship programs in information technology research at private sector companies; and

''(B) supplementary awards to institutions funded under the Louis Stokes Alliances for Minority Participation program for internships in information technology research at private sector companies.

''(3) MATCHING FUNDS.—Awards under paragraph (2) shall be made on the condition that at least an equal amount of funding for the internship shall be provided by the private sector company at which the internship will take place.

''(4) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'institution of higher education' has the meaning given that term in section 1201(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1141(a)).

''(5) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Of the amounts described in subsection (c)(1), $10,000,000 for fiscal year 2000, $15,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, $20,000,000 for fiscal year 2002, $25,000,000 for fiscal year 2003, and $25,000,000 for fiscal year 2004 shall be available for carrying out this subsection.

''(f) EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY RESEARCH.—

''(1) RESEARCH PROGRAM.—As part of its responsibilities under subsection (a)(1), the National Science Foundation shall establish a research program to develop, demonstrate, assess, and disseminate effective applications of information and computer technologies for elementary and secondary education. Such program shall—

''(A) support research projects, including collaborative projects involving academic researchers and elementary and secondary schools, to develop innovative educational materials, including software, and pedagogical approaches based on applications of information and computer technology;

''(B) support empirical studies to determine the educational effectiveness and the cost effectiveness of specific, promising educational approaches, techniques, and materials that are based on applications of information and computer technologies; and

''(C) include provision for the widespread dissemination of the results of the studies carried out under subparagraphs (A) and (B), including maintenance of electronic libraries of the best educational materials identified accessible through the Internet.

''(2) REPLICATION.—The research projects and empirical studies carried out under paragraph (1)(A) and (B) shall encompass a wide variety of educational settings in order to identify approaches, techniques, and materials that have a high potential for being successfully replicated throughout the United States.

''(3) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Of the amounts authorized under subsection (b), $10,000,000 for fiscal year 2000, $10,500,000 for fiscal year 2001, $11,000,000 for fiscal year 2002, $12,000,000 for fiscal year 2003, and $12,500,000 for fiscal year 2004 shall be available for the purposes of this subsection.

''(g) PEER REVIEW.—All grants made under this section shall be made only after being subject to peer review by panels or groups having private sector representation.''.

(b) OTHER PROGRAM AGENCIES.—

(1) NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION.—Section 202(a) of the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991 (15 U.S.C. 5522(a)) is amended by inserting '', and may participate in or support research described in section 201(c)(1)'' after ''and experimentation''.

(2) DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY.—Section 203(a) of the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991 (15 U.S.C. 5523(a)) is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting a comma, and by adding after paragraph (4) the following:

''and may participate in or support research described in section 201(c)(1).''.

(3) NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY.—Section 204(a)(1) of the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991 (15 U.S.C. 5524(a)(1)) is amended by striking ''; and'' at the end of subparagraph (C) and inserting a comma, and by adding after subparagraph (C) the following:

''and may participate in or support research described in section 201(c)(1); and''.

(4) NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION.—Section 204(a)(2) of the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991 (15 U.S.C. 5524(a)(2)) is amended by inserting '', and may participate in or support research described in section 201(c)(1)'' after ''agency missions''.

(5) ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY.—Section 205(a) of the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991 (15 U.S.C. 5525(a)) is amended by inserting '', and may participate in or support research described in section 201(c)(1)'' after ''dynamics models''.

SEC. 5. NEXT GENERATION INTERNET.

Section 103 of the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991 (15 U.S.C. 5513) is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (c) to read as follows:

''(c) STUDY OF INTERNET PRIVACY.—

''(1) STUDY.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of the Networking and Information Technology Research and Development Act, the National Science Foundation may enter into an arrangement with the National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences for that Council to conduct a study of privacy on the Internet.

''(2) SUBJECTS.—The study shall address—

''(A) research needed to develop technology for protection of privacy on the Internet;

''(B) current public and private plans for the deployment of privacy technology, standards, and policies;

''(C) policies, laws, and practices under consideration or formally adopted in other countries and jurisdictions to protect privacy on the Internet;

''(D) Federal legislation and other regulatory steps needed to ensure the development of privacy technology, standards, and policies; and

''(E) other matters that the National Research Council determines to be relevant to Internet privacy.

''(3) TRANSMITTAL TO CONGRESS.—The National Science Foundation shall transmit to the Congress within 21 months of the date of enactment of the Networking and Information Technology Research and Development Act a report setting forth the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the National Research Council.

''(4) FEDERAL AGENCY COOPERATION.—Federal agencies shall cooperate fully with the National Research Council in its activities in carrying out the study under this subsection.

''(5) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Of the amounts described in subsection (d)(2), $900,000 shall be available for the study conducted under this subsection.''; and

(2) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking ''1999 and'' and inserting ''1999,''; and

(ii) by inserting '', $15,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, and $15,000,000 for fiscal year 2002'' after ''fiscal year 2000'';

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting '', and $25,000,000 for fiscal year 2001 and $25,000,000 for fiscal year 2002'' after ''Act of 1998'';

(C) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by striking ''1999 and'' and inserting ''1999,''; and

(ii) by inserting '', $10,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, and $10,000,000 for fiscal year 2002'' after ''fiscal year 2000''; and

(D) in paragraph (5)—

(i) by striking ''1999 and'' and inserting ''1999,''; and

(ii) by inserting '', $5,500,000 for fiscal year 2001, and $5,500,000 for fiscal year 2002'' after ''fiscal year 2000''.

SEC. 6. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.

Section 101 of the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991 (15 U.S.C. 5511) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (5) as subparagraphs (A) through (E), respectively;

(B) by inserting ''(1)'' after ''ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2) In addition to the duties outlined in paragraph (1), the advisory committee shall conduct periodic evaluations of the funding, management, implementation, and activities of the Program, the Next Generation Internet program, and the Networking and Information Technology Research and Development program, and shall report not less frequently than once every 2 fiscal years to the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate on its findings and recommendations. The first report shall be due within 1 year after the date of the enactment of the Networking and Information Technology Research and Development Act.''; and

(2) in subsection (c)(1)(A) and (2), by inserting '', including the Next Generation Internet program and the Networking and Information Technology Research and Development program'' after ''Program'' each place it appears.

SEC. 7. EVALUATION OF CAPABILITIES OF FOREIGN ENCRYPTION.

(a) STUDY.—The National Science Foundation shall undertake a study comparing the availability of encryption technologies in foreign countries to the encryption technologies subject to export restrictions in the United States.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the National Science Foundation shall transmit to the Congress a report on the results of the study undertaken under subsection (a).

SEC. 8. STUDY OF APPROPRIATIONS IMPACT ON INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY RESEARCH.

Within 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General, in consultation with the National Science and Technology Council and the President's Information Technology Advisory Committee, shall transmit to the Congress a report on the impact on information technology research of the fiscal year 2000 appropriations acts for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies; for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies; and for Energy and Water Development.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. HALL OF TEXAS

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 10 offered by Mr. HALL of Texas:

Page 5, lines 12 through 15, strike ''$439,000,000'' and all that follows through ''$571,300,000'' and insert ''$520,000,000 for fiscal year 2000; $645,000,000 for fiscal year 2001; $672,000,000 for fiscal year 2002; $736,000,000 for fiscal year 2003; and $771,000,000''.

Page 6, lines 14 through 17, strike ''$106,600,000'' and all that follows through ''$129,400,000'' and insert ''$120,000,000 for fiscal year 2000; $108,600,000 for fiscal year 2001; $112,300,000 for fiscal year 2002; $131,100,000 for fiscal year 2003; and $135,000,000''.

Page 8, lines 14 through 17, strike ''$310,000,000'' and all that follows through ''$415,000,000'' and insert ''$350,000,000 for fiscal year 2000; $421,000,000 for fiscal year 2001; $442,000,000 for fiscal year 2002; $486,000,000 for fiscal year 2003; and $515,000,000''.

Page 9, line 1, strike ''20'' and insert ''25''. Page 9, line 4, strike ''30'' and insert ''35''. Page 9, lines 6 through 8, strike ''2000; $40,000,000'' and all that follows through ''$50,000,000'' and insert ''2000; $45,000,000 for fiscal year 2001; $50,000,000 for fiscal year 2002; $55,000,000 for fiscal year 2003; and $60,000,000''.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I am offering with the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU) will adjust the funding authorized in the bill in response to the administration's budget request for fiscal year 2001. I would like to briefly describe the amendment and then turn to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU) for a description of the value and impact of the amendment.

The purpose of H.R. 2086 is to authorize the portfolio of information technology research activities that are formally coordinated among the Federal R&D agencies. This includes the authorization for new programs to implement the recommendation of the President's Information Technology Advisory Committee for a major new initiative focused on long-term, high-risk research.

This amendment addresses the two funding issues raised by the President's fiscal year 2001 budget request for information-technology research.

First, the budget request changes the baseline for formally coordinated research activities. The baseline now includes projects that the various agencies have been conferring on but that were not reported to the Office of Management and Budget for fiscal year 2000 as part of the formal interagency program.

H.R. 2086, as reported, is below the fiscal year 2001 request partly because the bill assumes the lower baseline level in determining the authorization level for the fiscal years 2001 through the year 2004.

The second funding issue the amendment addresses is a significant increase that the fiscal year 2001 budget request provides for new research support. I support this proposed increase because it will reverse the 36 percent shortfall in the appropriations level for fiscal year 2000 for the information-technology research initiative, as well as the 13 percent shortfall for all coordinated information-technology research programs.

The amendment also adjusts the level of the Department of Energy authorization to reflect the fiscal year 2000 appropriations level.

Finally, the amendment adjusts the outyear authorizations for the two agencies to maintain the same total percentage funding growth between fiscal years 2001 and 2004 as provided by H.R. 2086, as reported.

This long-term focus of the bill, I think, also will provide support for an area of great importance for all of our citizens. Most important to me in the entire bill is the biomedical research. Information technology has become increasingly important to the medical sciences. It holds the key to harnessing the vast quantities of genomic data being gathered in order to understand the expression and control of genes.

Statistical analysis of large databases is central to the diagnosis and treatment of medical illnesses. Medical imaging techniques rely on complex software and algorithms.

Other research under this initiative will address fundamental studies of robotics that will revolutionize the practice of medicine. Advances in robotics will lead to applications, for example, to allow surgeons to manipulate and repair blood vessels. Devices at the micron scale will provide physicians with the capability to search out and destroy cancer cells at the earliest stages of the disease.

Mr. Chairman, this bill will help enable the future. I commend the measure to my colleagues and ask for their support.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU).

Mr. WU. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), the ranking member, and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Chairman SENSENBRENNER) for working with me on this amendment, or allowing me to work

with them on this amendment, which would increase for fiscal year 2001 the NSF funding by $176 million and increase the outyear funding levels in conformance with that percentage increase. I believe that this adjustment enjoys bipartisan support, and it is also supported by the administration.

I am in receipt of a letter from the administration stating that the administration supports the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU) that would increase authorizations for FY 2001 for the National Science Foundation to the administration's budget request.

A few weeks ago, I had the opportunity to travel throughout my district with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Chairman SENSENBRENNER). We visited research universities, including Oregon Health Sciences University, Portland State University, and several high-tech companies where we were able to see firsthand the benefit of NSF grants.

At Portland State University, we learned about a unique collaboration between Oregon Health Sciences University, Oregon Graduate Institute, and the University of Washington to develop the State's highest speed access to Internet to facilitate research in areas such as biotechnology and medicine.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) has expired.

(At the request of Mr. WU, and by unanimous consent, Mr. HALL of Texas was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I continue to yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU).

Mr. WU. Mr. Chairman, the research link between these institutions will provide access to unique laboratories and equipment located at each of these schools. At Oregon Health Sciences University this means access to information from the Museum of Health in Medicine to reconstruct hearts in order to find gene defects.

''Collaboration'' is the keyword to research in this bill and in this amendment. The new resources made available by this amendment will make a significant contribution to strengthening NSF's role as the lead agency for Federal multi-agency and information technology research efforts. This research encompasses advances in software design, wireless networking, high-end computing and mathematics.

In addition, it will enable application of computing and networking and technology in many fields of science and engineering that would not be possible with current technology. It will train the scientists and engineers needed to sustain the economic growth fueled by information technology. This investment will deliver tools and capabilities that will benefit every field of science and society broadly.

The resources made available by the amendment will be used by NSF for several focused efforts. Foremost, the funding will be used to support fundamental, long-term, high-risk research. This work will encompass investigation of computer system architectures, information storage and retrieval, scalable networks, and totally new approaches to computation.

Another particularly important use of the new funding will be for education programs in information technology. These include scholarships and fellowships, support for undergraduate participation, and research projects and development of new curriculum. New graduate students will obtain the skills necessary for future generations of researchers that are in high demand in the postindustrial economy.

At home, NSF-funded research provides support for important projects at Oregon's Urban University, Portland State University. The school has received nearly $5 million for funding for NSF projects this year that involve undergraduate and graduate students in research. Much of this research relates to community needs and priorities, including training American workers to fill high-tech, high-wage jobs. High-tech companies now constitute Oregon's largest private sector employer.

Finally, the increase in NSF funding will be used to establish a second terascale computing facility to support the academic research community. NSF is the principal access to high-performance computing for the academic research community. Access to the most powerful computers is essentially for leading-edge research, as well as educating the next generation of computer and computational scientists.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), and I support his constructive amendment. This amendment would expand the definition of ''information technology'' under the NSF account and change the NSF numbers accordingly.

This year the administration expanded the definition of programs deemed ''information technology'' within NSF's budget. This expanded definition is compatible with H.R. 2086, and I am pleased to include the new NSF numbers in the bill.

The administration prioritization of NSF in 2001 also demonstrates that they have accepted the committee's philosophy for IT spending. The committee believes that the NSF is the best agency to run open competitive and peer review IT grant programs.

With the adoption of this amendment, H.R. 2086 will incorporate the new expansive definition of IT at NSF within the same stable and sustainable rate of growth passed by the committee with a 41–0 vote last year. Thus, NSF IT spending in the Networking and Information Technology Research and Development Act will remain the same total growth rate over the 5 years of the bill after this amendment is adopted as it had been before the new expanded IT definition was proposed.

While this amendment accepts the aggregated definition of NSF IT spending, I would like to point out that this amendment does not rubber-stamp the President's request. This amendment does not plus up any other agencies to the President's request, nor does it reflect the decreases in overall NSF spending after fiscal year 2001 found in the administration's fiscal 2001 request. With the exception of NSF, the committee will review on a case-by-case basis the requested increases for IT and other agencies during the consideration of those agencies' authorization bills.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment reflects a bipartisan agreement on the part of the committee to a bill that has strong bipartisan support. I commend the ranking member from Texas (Mr. HALL) for offering this amendment, and I urge its adoption.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF MICHIGAN

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 5 offered by Mr. SMITH of Michigan:

Page 16, after line 2, insert the following new paragraph:

(6) UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY.—Title II of the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991 (15 U.S.C. 5521 et seq.) is amended—

(A) by redesignating sections 207 and 208 as sections 208 and 209, respectively; and

(B) by inserting after section 206 the following new section:

''SEC. 207. UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY.

''The United States Geological Survey may participate in or support research described in section 201(c)(1).''.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would have been put on yesterday by our Committee on Science meeting except it would have involved the possibility of re-referral to the Subcommittee on Research and Development. With the consent of Mr. Young as well as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, and also the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. CUBIN) gave her support, we are offering this amendment at this time.

This amendment would allow the United States Geological Survey to participate in the Networking and Information Technology Research and Development Grant Program established by this bill.

□ 1415

In doing so, the USGS would join with the National Science Foundation and other participating agencies in helping focus government funding on information technology research.

The United States Geological Survey has a simple mission, to describe and understand the Earth. When I was young, I traveled around the country with my dad who was a topographic engineer with the USGS. Dad helped meet the challenge of mapping this country by taking to the field with the old fashioned rod and compass in hand.

Today, the topographic maps my father helped create are digitized and the data they contain augmented by readings from satellites, sensors buried in the ground, and experiments run in the lab. Today, the current shuttle radar topography mission to map the world is in its 5th day of sending back billions of bytes of data.

The USGS has spent the last 121 years building a collection of these maps, images, and other information assets as a way of answering some of our fundamental questions about the Earth and its processes. These assets now include extremely large data sets requiring extraordinary technology challenges to maintain and use. That is why this amendment is important.

It is difficult to get a grasp on the size of the challenge without resorting to an analogy. For example, the USGS information assets include petabyte size data sets. A petabyte is 2 to the 50th power bytes, one million gigabytes, a thousand trillion bytes, a number that even someone used to dealing with the Federal budget has a hard time understanding. To describe the vastness of this information in another way, these databases are the equivalent of 20 million four-drawer legal-sized filing cabinets stuffed full of text. The computers and processors that deal with these data sets must be correspondingly capable and the network connections that feed them must be adequately quick.

The USGS continues to research these technologies as part of their research agenda. Allowing them to partner in the research funded under this bill will help ensure that their technology needs are met. It will also allow them to bring their considerable skills to the table and help focus this research into the areas where it is sure to do the most good.

I should point out, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment does not authorize any new funding. This simply recognizes the USGS in its role as a participant in IT research. I am pleased to offer this amendment with the support of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) the chairman of the Committee on Science and the approval of the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) the chairman of the Committee on Resources and the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. CUBIN) the chairman of that committee's Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) has expired.

(On request of Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and by unanimous consent, Mr. SMITH of Michigan was allowed to proceed for 30 additional seconds.)

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH). He correctly states that the only reason this was not included in the bill when it was considered by the Committee on Science is that it would have triggered a sequential referral to the Committee on Resources which would have resulted in a delay. I would like to thank the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) for signing off on this amendment. This simply integrates the efforts of the U.S. Geological Service into the type of research that is being done so that their mapping efforts can be much better digitalized and, thus, much more effective.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I would conclude by requesting the support of my colleagues in the passage of this amendment.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support, of course, of this amendment by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH). It is entirely appropriate that the U.S. Geological Survey participate in the interagency information technology research program. I would also observe that the gentleman from Michigan learned this subject well at the feet of his father, a longtime member of the USGS team. We certainly support this amendment and urge its adoption.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MRS. MORELLA

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 14 offered by Mrs. MORELLA:

Page 8, after line 5, insert the following new subsection:

(g) NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH.—Title II of the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991 (15 U.S.C. 5521 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 205 the following new section:

"SEC. 205A. NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH ACTIVITIES.

''(a) GENERAL RESPONSIBILITIES.—As part of the Program described in title I, the National Institutes of Health shall conduct research directed toward the advancement and dissemination of computational techniques and software tools in support of its mission of biomedical and behavioral research.

''(b) Authorization of Appropriations.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Health and Human Services for the purposes of the Program $223,000,000 for fiscal year 2000, $233,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, $242,000,000 for fiscal year 2002, $250,000,000 for fiscal year 2003, and $250,000,000 for fiscal year 2004.''.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2086 will maintain our global leadership in information technology and prioritize our Nation's basic IT research by authorizing funding for six agencies that are undertaking civilian IT research and development initiatives. We have heard a lot about that.

These six lead agencies, NSF, NIST, NASA, NOAA, EPA and the Department of Energy, to use all those acronyms, all participate in programs involved with high-performance computing and communications and next generation Internet programs. One major agency, however, Mr. Chairman, the National Institutes of Health, is not among the group of agencies currently authorized in the bill.

My amendment would allow NIH to receive the funding authorization that it needs for vital information technology resources needed to map out the human genetic map, battle cancer and other life-threatening diseases, provide bioinformatic and molecular analysis, assist with telemedicine and advance computational medicine, among other efforts.

Mr. Chairman, let me provide just one example of the importance of cutting edge information technology for today's innovative medical research. The human genome project, overseen by NIH and the Department of Energy, is an international research program designed to construct detailed genetic maps and determine the complete sequence of human DNA and localize the estimated 50,000 to 100,000 genes within the human genome.

Later this year, researchers will complete the first draft of the entire human genome, the very blueprint of life. It is clear that the development and use of this genetic knowledge will have momentous implications for both individuals and society, potentially opening the doors to breakthrough medical discoveries that will allow all of us to live longer and improve our human condition. At the very heart of the human genome project are high speed, high performance computers that analyze and sequence the voluminous information collected by researchers. As more information is collected, these cutting edge computers must continually be advanced and upgraded to complete the job. In the past 6 years, Congress has made a priority of NIH research funding. Our wise investments in NIH research have already paved the way to a revolution in our ability to detect, treat, and prevent disease. Yet we must also ensure that the NIH is provided with the necessary information technology funds that are needed to conduct its very important medical research.

The amendment before us today would authorize $233 million in NIH information technology funding for fiscal year 2001, $242 million in fiscal year 2002, and $250 million in fiscal years 2003 and 2004. This funding level meets NIH's budget request for information technology and is consistent with an NIH letter requesting such funding sent to the gentleman from Virginia

(Mr. BLILEY) the chairman of the Committee on Commerce. I wish to thank the gentleman from Virginia for his collaborative efforts in preparing this amendment and indeed I want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) for their support. I certainly urge all my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MORELLA. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Maryland for yielding. I support her amendment. The reason this amendment is before us today on the floor is the same reason why the previous amendment was before us, and, that is that the NIH is not under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Science. Had we added this money in during the Committee on Science consideration of the bill, it would have delayed the bill's consideration through a sequential referral to the Committee on Commerce.

What the gentlewoman from Maryland is doing is closing an important hole in this bill, and I am happy to note that the chairman, the members, and the staff of the Committee on Commerce support her efforts in doing so. So this has been worked out without any brouhaha over committee jurisdiction. This makes a good bill better; and it gets the NIH into developing better information technologies, to develop better ways of making sick people better and preventing them from getting sick in the first place.

Mrs. MORELLA. I thank the gentleman for his very eloquent comments on the amendment. It is a pleasure to be able to offer this amendment to close that loophole.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I of course am privileged to congratulate the gentlewoman from Maryland and to recommend her amendment. It simply authorizes as the gentleman from Wisconsin has said the funding for National Institutes of Health. It formally funds the NIH contribution to the interagency research program. We urge the acceptance of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. LARSON

Mr. LARSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. LARSON:

At the end of the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. 10. REPORT TO CONGRESS.

Section 103 of the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991 (15 U.S.C. 5513), as amended by section 5 of this Act, is further amended by redesignating subsections (b), (c), and (d) as subsections (c), (d), and (e), respectively, and by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

''(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

''(1) REQUIREMENT.—The Director of the National Science Foundation shall conduct a study of the issues described in paragraph (3), and not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of the Networking and Information Technology Research and Development Act, shall transmit to the Congress a report including recommendations to address those issues. Such report shall be updated annually for 6 additional years.

''(2) CONSULTATION.—In preparing the reports under paragraph (1), the Director of the National Science Foundation shall consult with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the National Institute of Standards and Technology, and such other Federal agencies and educational entities as the Director of the National Science Foundation considers appropriate.

''(3) ISSUES.—The reports shall—

''(A) identify the current status of high-speed, large bandwidth capacity access to all public elementary and secondary schools and libraries in the United States;

''(B) identify how high-speed, large bandwidth capacity access to the Internet to such schools and libraries can be effectively utilized within each school and library;

''(C) consider the effect that specific or regional circumstances may have on the ability of such institutions to acquire high-speed, large bandwidth capacity access to achieve universal connectivity as an effective tool in the education process; and

''(D) include options and recommendations for the various entities responsible for elementary and secondary education to address the challenges and issues identified in the reports.''.

Mr. LARSON. Mr. Chairman, before I begin I would like to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) our esteemed chairman of the Committee on Science for his guidance and thoughtfulness in helping me construct this very fine bill and amendment but more importantly I would like to join the chorus of those who have indicated his outstanding work, and I am proud to be a cosponsor of the bill to which we are going to amend this legislation. But I think the highest sense of praise comes not only from his colleagues but having been out in San Francisco this past year attending a convention, to hear Bill Joy from Sun Microsystems stand up and say that this bill that was put forward by our chairman is clearly the most outstanding IT bill of its kind ever put forward before the United States Congress. I think that is high praise from someone who clearly understands technology and its importance.

In addition, I would like to thank both the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) for their help as well as the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) for holding a joint hearing of the Subcommittees on Technology and Basic Research of the Committee on Science last year on this important topic. Finally, I would be remiss if I did not also thank the former ranking member of the Committee on Science, Mr. Brown. He collaborated with me on this piece of legislation, and indeed I am sad today that he is not here but again want to thank him as well. I would also like to thank Javier Gonzalez from my staff.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is straightforward and it is practical, it is narrow and technical in its application, and very simply calls for the National Science Foundation to do a technological assessment of what is the most efficient and economical means of bringing forward the information superhighway to our public schools and our public libraries.

Here are the underpinnings, briefly. The Department of Commerce issued a study in July of last year citing that the digital divide in this country in fact is growing further apart. It is growing apart along the lines of race, gender, wealth, and geography. And so in order to look at closing that gap, it becomes important upon policy makers to make sure if we are going to provide universal, ubiquitous access to the information superhighway, that we have the best possible assessment available. This bill calls upon NSF in conjunction with NASA, the Department of Education, and other agencies it should so choose to make sure it brings this about in a timely manner so that we can make the best policy decisions as relates to this.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LARSON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to support this amendment. It is identical to a bill which he introduced and which I cosponsored earlier. We are talking about how to make information technology available in the cheapest possible way, particularly to our public schools and libraries. This is something that is timely and needed, and to make sure that the money we are authorizing under this bill is spent in the most efficient manner possible.

Mr. LARSON. Mr. Chairman, I would ask for my colleagues' support and move the adoption of this amendment.

□ 1430

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) who is a very thoughtful and hard-working Member of the Committee on Science. As a matter of fact, since entering Congress, he has been in the forefront of publicized problems of the ''digital divide.''

He has proposed a series of legislative measures to focus on this situation, including this amendment. I strongly concur in the policy behind these legislative efforts, which is to ensure that all communities, including rural and inner city areas, have adequate access to advanced information technology.

One of the keys to maintaining a surging economy that offers opportunities for all of our citizens is to provide

the very best educational tools to all of our Nation's students.

Mr. Chairman, if, for no other reason, there are many other reasons to support it, but if for no other reason, this amendment is worthy of support, because the study at a minimum will identify the true present status of high-speed large band width capacity access to all public, elementary, and secondary schools and libraries throughout the country and, as the gentleman from Wisconsin (Chairman SENSENBRENNER) said, at a fair figure.

In conclusion, I strongly support and urge the adoption of this amendment.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Chairman, as one of the few members of both the Science and Education committees, I rise today in support of Mr. LARSON's amendment to H.R. 2086.

As a member of both committees, it's of particular importance to me that our children have the access to technology in order to succeed in school and in their future endeavors.

Congressman LARSON's amendment is a step in the right direction to ensure that students have access to information and internet technologies and also that schools can better use these available technologies.

However, as we strive to make technology more available and effective, let's not focus only on the physical barriers, but also consider the cultural and social barriers as well.

The emerging ''digital divide'' that we are all concerned about will not only break along economic lines, but social lines as well.

For instance, girls generally do not continue to use technology as they get older the way boys do.

It won't do us any good to procure the best computers, and completely wire our schools, if there is a group of students who aren't encouraged to use this technology.

We need to create education and outreach programs to promote opportunities for girls in high-tech futures.

In fact, I've authored legislation that tracks girls from the 4th grade through high school in order to find ways to increase their awareness of high-tech careers and provide them with mentoring and hands-on experience to help them succeed.

Like my colleague from Connecticut, I believe all our children deserve every opportunity to succeed as they face the challenges of the 21st century. It is time we focus on getting our children ready to learn and ready to succeed by making certain schools have the technological tools and equipment.

I urge my colleagues to support Congressman LARSON's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further Members wishing to speak on the amendment?

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. HOEFFEL

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 11 offered by Mr. HOEFFEL:

Page 2, line 13, insert ''It is important that access to information technology be available to all citizens, including elderly Americans and Americans with disabilities.'' after ''responsible and accessible.''.

At the end of the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. 9. STUDY OF ACCESSIBILITY TO INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY.

Section 201 of the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991 (15 U.S.C. 5524), as amended by sections 3(a) and 4(a) of this Act, is amended further by inserting after subsection (g) the following new subsection:

''(h) STUDY OF ACCESSIBILITY TO INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY.—

''(1) STUDY.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of the Networking and Information Technology Research and Development Act, the Director of the National Science Foundation, in consultation with the National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research, shall enter into an arrangement with the National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences for that Council to conduct a study of accessibility to information technologies by individuals who are elderly, individuals who are elderly with a disability, and individuals with disabilities.

''(2) SUBJECTS.—The study shall address—

''(A) current barriers to access to information technologies by individuals who are elderly, individuals who are elderly with a disability, and individuals with disabilities;

''(B) research and development needed to remove those barriers;

''(C) Federal legislative, policy, or regulatory changes needed to remove those barriers; and

''(D) other matters that the National Research Council determines to be relevant to access to information technologies by individuals who are elderly, individuals who are elderly with a disability, and individuals with disabilities.

''(3) TRANSMITTAL TO CONGRESS.—The Director of the National Science Foundation shall transmit to the Congress within 2 years of the date of enactment of the Networking and Information Technology Research and Development Act a report setting forth the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the National Research Council.

''(4) FEDERAL AGENCY COOPERATION.—Federal agencies shall cooperate fully with the National Research Council in its activities in carrying out the study under this subsection.

''(5) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Funding for the study described in this subsection shall be available, in the amount of $700,000, from amounts described in subsection (c)(1).''

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to the information technology research and development authorization bill that would require the National Academy of Sciences to conduct a study on what barriers exist to accessing information technologies for the elderly and for disabled Americans and to recommend ways to overcome those barriers.

I would like to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Chairman SENSENBRENNER) for his cooperation and the cooperation and assistance of his staff, as well as our ranking member, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), for his cooperation and assistance as well.

Thanks to advances in medical technology and research, Americans are living longer lives. There are more than 50 million Americans alive today over the age of 65. There are over 20 million Americans, 15 years of age or older who are living with disabilities that impair their ability to work.

Mr. Chairman, as we move forward with information technology, we have to make sure that all Americans can reap the rewards of a strong economy and a rapidly changing technological landscape. Information technology has an enormous potential to improve the quality of life for elderly Americans and those with disabilities.

People who have trouble leaving their homes can now do all of their grocery shopping online. People who are ill can research their condition online, interact with others who suffer from the same ailments, and contact medical experts online.

Specialized information technologies can help blind people access information over the Internet. Speech recognition software can help people who cannot use a computer keyboard or mouse. Despite all of these opportunities and all of these advances, studies have shown that the information-technology revolution is leaving elderly and disabled Americans behind.

Mr. Chairman, studies have shown that those with disabilities are less than half as likely as nondisabled people to have access to a computer at home. And the disabled are only about 30 percent to be likely to access the Internet from home, possibly because they are unaware of technologies that would help them do it, possibly because they cannot afford the technologies.

The point is, Mr. Chairman, you cannot go surfing on the Net if you cannot get to the ocean. We have to reduce barriers for the elderly and for the disabled. My amendment would assess these problems and pose some solutions by calling for the National Science Foundation, in consultation with the National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research, to commission a study from the National Academies of Science that will identify current barriers to access to information technologies by individuals who are elderly, by individuals with disabilities; to identify research and development needed to remove those barriers; and to recommend any Federal legislative policy or regulatory changes needed to remove those barriers.

The digital divide that we are all concerned with may affect the elderly and disabled more than any other group of Americans.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and help ensure that advances in information technology are available to all Americans.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would authorize a $700,000 study by the National Research Council on IT accessibility by the disabled and elderly. I would note that there have been studies conducted by a number of different groups looking at similar issues, including the Federal Electronic and Information Technology Access Advisory

Committee, the University of Wisconsin Trace Research and Development Center, the California State University at Northridge Center on Disability, and the Worldwide Web Consortium Web Access Initiative have all taken or are taking a look at similar issues.

I had some misgivings about the amendment as it was originally drafted, but since the funding will now come out of the available funds and not as a separate authorization, I will not oppose this, and urge Members to adopt it.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of Mr. HOEFFEL's amendment to conduct a study to examine the accessibility to information technology for the elderly and persons with disabilities. This amendment will make certain that our seniors and individuals with disabilities are not left out of current technological advances that ensure easy access to our family and friends. Seniors and the disabled also stand to gain the most from medical information listed on the Internet. Information on nursing homes, health insurance and prescription drugs can easily be obtained within minutes.

As a cosponsor of this legislation, I am pleased to support this bill that will significantly increase our commitment to long-term research, information technology and networking. Not only will this bill help our universities in providing information technology research, it will also encourage further technological advances in elementary and secondary education, and move the nation forward in bringing technology into millions of American homes that do not have it today.

While this bill will greatly help our nation's researchers and students, adoption of this amendment will make certain that our nation's senior citizens and persons with disabilities are included in the benefits of accessible information technology. I encourage my colleagues to support passage of this amendment and final passage of this important legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ANDREWS

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ANDREWS:

Page 8, line 22, insert ''and counterinitiatives'' after ''including privacy''.

Page 8, line 23, insert ''(including the consequences for healthcare)'' after ''social and economic consequences''.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, this is an excellent piece of legislation that I am privileged to support. I think very rarely are we going to get more return on our investment than we are from this piece of legislation. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Chairman SENSENBRENNER) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), the ranking member, for bringing it forward.

The purpose of my amendment is to be sure that important research and development funds are invested in an event that I hope will never happen, and in an event I hope will happen.

The event to prevent something that I hope will never happen is the importance of providing information security, making sure what we refer to in the amendment as ''counter-initiatives'' are thwarted. The news media has been rife with reports in the last few days of what has been called cyber-vandalism, attacks on some well-known commercial Web sites throughout this country. It is very important that we stay more than one step ahead of those who would do us harm through cyber-terrorism or cyber-vandalism.

As my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), said in the general debate on this bill, those of us on the Committee on Armed Services are making a concerted effort in conjunction with the administration this year to be sure that our military cyber-defenses are prepared and ready.

I believe that this legislation, aided by this amendment, will be sure that we take the maximum steps to prevent this kind of cyber-terrorism in our civilian sector.

The event that I hope will happen will be the extension of high-tech medical technology, excellent medical technology to people all over the country and all over the world, through the initiative of telemedicine. My amendment directs and encourages that telemedicine research be one of the major priorities under this bill as well.

I am very privileged to have had the cooperation of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and his staff and that of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), and I urge support for the amendment.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey makes a very good bill even better, and I am pleased to support it and hope that the committee adopts it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON-LEE OF TEXAS

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 12 offered by Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

Page 21, after line 7, insert the following new section:

SEC. 9. COMPTROLLER GENERAL STUDY.

Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall transmit to the Congress a report on the results of a detailed study analyzing the effects of this Act, and the amendments made by this Act, on lower income families, minorities, and women.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, again I want to thank the Committee on Science and the chairman and ranking member for the vision of this legislation and to reinforce one of the unique features of this legislation, the funding amounts for the National Science Foundation, in particular I think the notation of the 20 grants of up to $1 million each in FY 2000 and 2001, and 30 grants of up to $1 million each in FY 2002 through 2004.

I raise that and bring that to the attention, because my amendment is a study. My amendment involves dealing with some of the additional populations that may need further assessment as to how this legislation will impact them.

I hope that I will garner the support of the committee for this amendment, because I believe it fits very neatly into two features of the legislation. One in particular for the National Science Foundation will complete a study comparing the availability of encryption technology in foreign countries to encryption technologies in the United States that are subject to export restrictions. In addition, as I earlier noted, we will also be giving out grants more hopefully to universities to do other kinds of research.

Today's economy is spurred by the unprecedented advances of our society, and we are reaping the benefits of technology. Therefore, it is critical that all Americans share in the digital age.

Currently, low income families, minorities and women are not actively participating in the information age. The National Telecommunications and Information Administration within the Commerce Department reports in its study named ''Falling Through the Net, Defining the Digital Divide,'' that, one, households with incomes of $75,000 and higher are more than 20 times more likely to have access to the Internet than those at the lowest income levels and more than nine times as likely to have a computer at home.

Whites are more likely to have access to the Internet from home than blacks or Hispanics have from any location, and that black and Hispanic households are approximately one-third as likely to have home Internet access as households of Asian-Pacific Islander decent, and roughly two-fifths as likely as white households.

My amendment empowers the Comptroller General to submit a detailed reported analyzing the effects of this act on lower-income families, minorities and women. This amendment will enable Congress to assess the overall impact of this act upon groups desperately needing government assistance concerning technology. Moreover, a targeted study will then provide critical data on the economic and educational benefits to Americans affected by the digital divide that separates our society to those who have and have not.

As I indicated, Mr. Chairman, we successfully made it through Y2K. I am gratified for that. In the course of doing so, however, we heard from small

businesses, nonprofits, individuals, libraries, and schools that we still needed to assess the digital divide.

I believe that this legislation, in its ability to give grants to the National Science Foundation, which then will allow various groups to access those dollars in $1 million grants, is a positive. This study I think will add to our knowledge base and allow us to move into the 21st century and to effectively be able to ensure that all of our citizens have access to this wonderful technology.

Mr. Chairman, today I rise to offer an amendment to the Networking and Information Technology Research and Development Act (HR 2086). Today's economy is spurred by the unprecedented advances of the Information Age; however, not all members of our society are reaping the benefits of technology. Therefore, it is critical that all Americans share in the digital age.

Currently, low income families, minorities, and women are not actively participating in the Information Age. The National Telecommunication and Information Administration within the Commerce Department reports in its study named, ''Falling Through the Net: Defining the Digital Divide'' that: ''(1) Households with incomes of $75,000 and higher are more than twenty times more likely to have access to the Internet than those at the lowest income levels, and more than nine times as likely to have a computer at home; (2) whites are more likely to have access to the Internet from home than Blacks or Hispanics have from any location; and that Black and Hispanic households are approximately one-third as likely to have home Internet access as households of Asian/Pacific Islander descent, and roughly two-fifths as likely as White households.''

The Jackson-Lee Amendment to H.R. 2086 empowers the Comptroller General to submit a detailed report analyzing the effects of this Act on lower income families, minorities, and women. This Amendment will enable Congress to assess the overall impact of this Act upon groups desperately needing Government assistance concerning technology. Moreover, a targeted study will then provide critical data on the economic and educational benefits to Americans affected by the ''Digital Divide'' that separates our society to those that have and have not.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Texas for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, let me say I am going to support the gentlewoman's amendment. Any Member can request a GAO study. Placing the language in the bill I think is a constructive addition because whether the GAO responds to the House as a whole or to an individual Member, this is an issue that has got to be addressed, and it has got to be resolved as we figure out how to make the rising tide of information-technology applications lift all of the boats in our society. So I thank the gentlewoman from Texas, and I hope the committee adopts her amendment.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

□ 1445

Mr. Chairman, I certainly join the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), the chairman of the Committee on Science, in recommending this amendment. It simply directs the GAO to conduct a study after 1 year of the effects of this bill on lower income families, minorities, and women.

This is one of many thoughtful and well-constructed amendments from the gentlewoman from Houston, Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE). I certainly support it and recommend that it be passed.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. CAPUANO

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. CAPUANO: Page 20, line 21, through page 21, line 7, strike section 9.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Chairman, this amendment I think is a very simple amendment. It actually strikes language that I put in in the committee at an earlier time when we were discussing this. I think the language is no longer relevant and no longer useful to this bill. It refers to a different fiscal year, and that is why I ask to strike it.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAPUANO. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, heaven rejoices when a sinner repents, and this amendment strikes language that the gentleman from Massachusetts added to the bill in committee. I commented at the time that I thought it was ill-advised to get the GAO involved in what amounted to a political debate over the budget. I am glad that the gentleman from Massachusetts has seen the light, and I hope that his amendment is adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. CAPUANO

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 9 offered by Mr. CAPUANO: Page 8, after line 5, insert the following new subsection:

(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION.—Notwithstanding the amendment made by subsection (a)(3) of this section, the total amount authorized for the National Science Foundation under section 201(b) of the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991 shall be $580,000,000 for fiscal year 2000; $699,300,000 for fiscal year 2001; $278,150,000 for fiscal year 2002; $801,550,000 for fiscal year 2003; and $838,500,000 for fiscal year 2004.

(2) DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY.—Notwithstanding the amendment made by subsection (c)(2) of this section, the total amount authorized for the Department of Energy under section 203(e)(1) of the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991 shall be $60,000,000 for fiscal year 2000; $54,300,000 for fiscal year 2001; $56,150,000 for fiscal year 2002; $65,550,000 for fiscal year 2003; and $67,500,000 for fiscal year 2004.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Chairman, what this amendment does is basically it takes half of the money it currently designated for the Department of Energy and shifts it over to the National Science Foundation.

The reason I offer this amendment is because I strongly believe that this money is best utilized as far out from government as we can get it into the private sector and to the universities, because I believe they do a better job in pushing along new technologies than does the government.

It is very interesting to note that though I have proposed this amendment now for a couple of days, I just literally 2 minutes ago got a communication from the Secretary of Energy that raises some serious and interesting questions about the amendment. Had I received it earlier, I would have been happy to discuss it at any time with the Secretary or any member of the Department, but I think it is a little late at this point in time.

However, I will say that if this amendment is adopted that I would be more than happy to work with the Secretary or any other member of the Department to discuss their concerns, and if appropriate, I would work with them to amend this amendment further or to reduce it or to strike it.

Nonetheless, having not received any communications of such note prior to this time, I still feel strongly that in concept, our money is best spent as close to the private sector as we can get it.

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Chairman, every dollar we spend on research and development, especially in high-technology, translates directly into growth for U.S. businesses and good, high-paying jobs for our working families.

For the same reasons I fervently support the Networking and Information Technology R&D Act, I rise in opposition to this Amendment that would shift R&D resources away from the Department of Energy and to the National Science Foundation.

As the ranking Member of the new Panel to oversee the Department of Energy's reorganization and as a Member with 2 National Laboratories in my district, I am intimately familiar with the Department of Energy's record on R&D. And it is superb. The Energy Department has been at the forefront of civilian science and computing for generations. They specialize in developing computing applications in areas ranging from material science to high-energy physics, and from atomic structure to biology.

For example, as early as the 1970's, the Energy Department developed the first interactive access to supercomputers via long-distance networks. And in the 1980's, the Department laid the groundwork for what became the

National Science Foundation's supercomputer centers. Over the years, Department scientists have won 70 Nobel prizes, discovered new heavy elements, advanced medical breakthroughs in breast cancer treatment and more.

Moreover, if this amendment becomes law, it will force the closure of the National Energy Research Scientific Computing Center at Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory—the most powerful unclassified computer center available for civilian research in the nation. It also will force the Department to end its joint research efforts with major U.S. computer and telecommunications firms including IMB and Quest Communications.

The National Science Foundation is also a worthy organization. But the two agencies have different missions, different personnel and different strengths. By dividing our R&D dollars between the two, we are creating the best environment for scientific and high-technology breakthroughs that will continue to fuel our economy and create jobs for our working families.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment and pass the overall bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TRAFICANT:

Page 21, after line 7, insert the following new section:

SEC. 9. BUY AMERICAN.

(a) COMPLIANCE WITH BUY AMERICAN ACT.—No funds appropriated pursuant to this Act may be expended by an entity unless the entity agrees that in expending the assistance the entity will comply with sections 2 through 4 of the Buy American Act (41 U.S.C. 10a–10c).

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—In the case of any equipment or products that may be authorized to be purchased with financial assistance provided under this Act, it is the sense of the Congress that entities receiving such assistance should, in expending the assistance, purchase only American-made equipment and products.

(c) NOTICE TO RECIPIENTS OF ASSISTANCE.—In providing financial assistance under this Act, the head of each Federal agency shall provide to each recipient of the assistance a notice describing the statement made in subsection (b) by the Congress.

Mr. TRAFICANT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say that our last quarterly trade deficit was $82 billion. Annualized, it will be over $328 billion for the year. For every $1 billion in trade deficit, the formula is a loss of 22,000 jobs.

I support this bill. I think the chairman has done a marvelous job, but I do not know if cyberspace is going to hire all of those workers who are losing manufacturing jobs. I sure hope they do.

The simple amendment says, abide by the Buy America Act; when possible, buy American-made products. Anybody getting any money under this bill should understand what the intent of Congress is, and in fact, get a notice so that they would know that they must comply with the Buy America Act.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), our distinguished chairman.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding. I have always supported Buy American provisions. I support his efforts again. Obviously the money that we are authorizing under this bill should, to the greatest extent possible, go to goods and services that are made in the USA and done by Americans, and I think the gentleman has emphasized that point. This amendment improves a very good bill.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), our distinguished ranking member.

Mr. HALL of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this is another of the gentleman's many efforts to urge buy American and to support and push this country. I urge the adoption of the amendment. I totally support it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we have come to the conclusion of the debate on a bill which the Committee on Science sincerely believes will be one of the most important pieces of legislation enacted in the year 2000 by the 106th Congress. Should the other body agree and we send this bill to the President for his signature, America will have made a commitment to the information technology research that we need to continue our country as number 1 in this area.

The pipeline for Federal research breakthroughs has slowed to a trickle as a result of some changes that have occurred since 1986. This bill provides a 5-year commitment to steady increases in funding for civilian information technology programs in the health areas as well as in the areas of computer science and information technology, and roughly doubles the funding for these programs over the next 5 years.

The legislation before us, H.R. 2086, focuses Federal efforts on basic research. Federal basic research nicely complements private sector-applied research. In many cases, the basic research that is done under this bill and which has been done in the past has been too high risk for the private sector to prudently invest their own money in. So having a Federal Government-private sector partnership where the taxpayers pick up the basic research that the private sector cannot do, and then the private sector goes and commercializes the results of successful basic research, will mean that we will continue our nationwide preeminence which provides good jobs for Americans, and I think has made our economy the healthiest in the world.

Mr. Chairman, all I can say is look where information technology has brought this country during the decade of the 1990s. We have the longest peacetime sustained growth rate in the history of our country. Unemployment is at a 30-year low, and inflation has been kept in check. One only needs to compare this success for Americans with the double-digit unemployment that has plagued the major countries in Europe and a Japan that has been teetering on the brink of depression for the better part of the last 10 years shows that we have done it right. A lot of the reason for America doing it right is the breakthroughs in information technology.

We cannot predict where the research authorized under this bill will lead other than that basic research breakthroughs will lead to applications in disciplines from A to Z. It has happened in the past, and it will happen in the future.

The bill before us provides better coordination of civilian information technology programs. Grouping these programs under one legislative umbrella will lead to better coordination and thus give the taxpayers more value for their dollar. The National Science Foundation has an enhanced role as the lead agency in this undertaking. They spend their money through competitive peer-reviewed grant programs. We have expanded the grant programs, but we have also made the grant programs more relevant to the private sector by requiring at least one representative from the private sector on each of these peer review committees.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), the ranking member, and to all of the members of the Committee on Science for working on this cooperative effort. I think that 20 years from now, as historians look back at what the 106th Congress did in the year 2000, should this bill pass through the Senate and be enacted into law, they will view this as probably the most important single piece of legislation that the Congress considers.

So as this bill passes, we all look forward to working with the Senate to make sure that this investment in our Nation's future ends up becoming a reality.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. OSE) having assumed the chair, Mr.

GILLMOR, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2086) to authorize funding for networking and information technology research and development for fiscal years 2000 through 2004, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 422, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2086, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

□

PRAISE FOR THE NETWORKING AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACT

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

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I just want to compliment the House on the action just completed. The Networking and Information Technology Research and Development Act is very important legislation. It will maintain the U.S. global leadership in information technology. When one is the first and one is the best, one has to work at maintaining that first place position, at securing the fact that one legitimately is the very best.

□ 1500

The $500 billion a year information technology industry has accounted for one-third of our Nation's economic growth since 1992, and created new industries and millions of new high-paying jobs. All across America people are benefiting from what has been done in information technology.

Once again, we are the leader, we are first, we are the best, and we have to work at maintaining that. We have to prioritize basic information technology research. There are a whole slew of very good ideas, but we have to have priorities. We have to go first with that which is most important. We have to produce the next generation of highly-skilled information technology workers.

This bill will help attract more students to science and to careers in information technology by providing grants for colleges and companies to create for-credit courses which include internships. Participating companies must commit to providing 50 percent of the cost of the program.

So for a whole host of very legitimate reasons, the Committee on Science and this House have done themselves proud. We are moving forward, we are not just satisfied to rest on our laurels. We are going forward. This is, indeed, the Information Age, and we are the leaders. We have to maintain that position.

I am a great unabashed baseball fan, and on the 17th of this month, just a couple of days hence, the pitchers and catchers will report to spring training. The one team that I am most interested in is the New York Yankees, because they are the world champions.

If I may draw an analogy, let me point out that the Yankees are not resting on their laurels, they are continuing to improve and invest in their club. That is why they are the world champions, and we cannot afford to rest on our laurels.

I thank my colleagues for their unrelenting support of this bill. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Chairman SENSENBRENNER) for the leadership he has provided. I thank the ranking member, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) for his strong support and leadership.

This is truly bipartisan legislation serving the best interests of the American people.

□

IN OPPOSITION TO CAPUANO AMENDMENT NO. 1 AND NO. 3 TO H.R. 2086, NETWORKING AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACT

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

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the amendment that was just offered by my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO) concerning the Department of Energy and National Science Foundation.

There is no doubt that the National Science Foundation should be commended for their fine work in making research funds, including those for information technology research. Their record of accomplishment is impressive, and certainly qualifies them for increased responsibilities. That is why I was a cosponsor of this bill that we are going to be considering later on, or voting on.

While I support the bill and the increased NSF funding, I nonetheless strongly oppose that amendment because, while very generous to NSF, much of the more than $3 billion provided by this bill is newly authorized funding, yet this provides no new funding for the Department of Energy's programs, and the amendment that was considered would further erode, if not eliminate, such programs.

Would we cut off funds for such research by the Department of Energy and the laboratories strictly by virtue of the agency that oversees it? It is unfortunate that neither I nor other Members of the Committee on Science were given the opportunity to discuss the IT research successes of the Department of Energy when the bill was marked up by the committee in September, but the sponsor of this amendment, my colleague on the Committee on Science, did not offer the amendment at that time.

This amendment seriously jeopardizes many of the basic research collaborations, and will ensure that DOE has no role in the future of information technology research. I do not believe that this is a prudent course for us to take today, and I am sorry that I was not here to speak against that amendment. I do want to voice my displeasure with that.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the amendment offered by my colleague from Massachusetts.

There is no doubt that the National Science Foundation should be commended for their fine work in managing research funds, including those for information technology research. Their record of accomplishment is impressive, and certainly qualifies them for increased responsibilities.

That's why I am a cosponsor of the legislation that would give the National Science Foundation the lead in this federal I.T. research initiative, and provide almost $3 billion for the NSF's information technology research activities.

While I support the bill and increased NSF funding, I nonetheless strongly oppose this amendment. The NSF's fine record of accomplishment is no excuse to cut in half the Department of Energy's information technology research programs. The two are not mutually exclusive; they are, in fact, complementary.

This bill is very generous to the NSF; much of the more than $3 billion provided by this bill is newly authorized funding. Yet this bill provides no new funding for the Department of Energy's programs, and the amendment we are considering right now would further erode—if not eliminate—such programs.

The DOE is engaged in significant computing research and development. DOE's research has led to important advances in the field of information technology, especially in the area of parallel computing. The DOE is also involved in the development of highly advanced computer ''technology tools'' which allow scientists to model and analyze complex scientific problems and collaborate with other researchers to meet national needs.

DOE-supported computational research provides many benefits to the broader research community. In my own district, computer scientists at Argonne National Laboratory developed an extremely high performance ''computational kernel'' for use in a wide range of

simulations, from petroleum reservoir modeling to understanding air flow over the surface of a wing. Two of the four 1999 Gordon Bell Awards were given to Argonne researchers for applications using this computational kernel. The Gordon Bell Award is the most prestigious award in the application of parallel processing of scientific and engineering problems.

Would we cut off funding for such research strictly by virtue of the agency that oversees it?

Software developed by Argonne for the reconstruction of metabolic pathways is being provided on a Website available to the community of biological researchers. The software is widely used in such applications as establishing the function of proteins, and for simulating the functional behavior of higher organisms. In awarding the developers, Genetic Engineering News called the Website one of the most useful in biological science.

Again, should such work be ended strictly because another parent agency is the target of our funding largesse?

It is unfortunate that neither I nor other Members of the Science Committee were given the opportunity to discuss the IT research successes of the Department of Energy when this bill was marked up by the Committee in September. But the sponsor of this amendment, my colleague on the Science Committee, did not offer his amendment at that time.

This amendment seriously jeopardizes many of these basic research collaborations, and will ensure that DOE has no role in the future of information technology research.

I do not believe this is the prudent course for us to take today, and I would have strongly urged my colleagues to oppose the amendment if I had been here prior to its acceptance.

□

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Any record votes on postponed questions will be taken after debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules.

□

OMNIBUS PARKS TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS ACT

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 149) to make technical corrections to the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 and to other laws related to parks and public lands.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendments:

Page 2, after line 25, insert:

(4) In section 104(b) (110 Stat. 4101), by—

(A) adding the following after the end of the first sentence: ''The National Park Service or any other Federal agency is authorized to enter into agreements, leases, contracts and other arrangements with the Presidio Trust which are necessary and appropriate to carry out the purposes of this title.'';

(B) inserting after ''June 30, 1932 (40 U.S.C. 303b).'' ''The Trust may use alternative means of dispute resolution authorized under subchapter IV of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code (5 U.S.C. 571 et seq.).''; and

(C) by inserting at the end of the paragraph ''The Trust is authorized to use funds available to the Trust to purchase insurance and for reasonable reception and representation expenses, including membership dues, business cards and business related meal expenditures.''.

(5) Section 104(g) (110 Stat. 4103) is amended to read as follows:

''(g) FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT.—Nothwithstanding section 1341 of title 31 of the United States Code, all proceeds and other revenues received by the Trust shall be retained by the Trust. Those proceeds shall be available, without further appropriation, to the Trust for the administration, preservation, restoration, operation and maintenance, improvement, repair and related expenses incurred with respect to Presidio properties under its administrative jurisdiction. The Secretary of the Treasury shall invest, at the direction of the Trust, such excess moneys that the Trust determines are not required to meet current withdrawals. Such investment shall be in public debt securities with maturities suitable to the needs of the Trust and bearing interest at rates determined by the Secretary of the Treasury taking into consideration the current average yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturity.''.

(6) In section 104(j) (110 Stat. 4103), by striking ''exercised.'' and inserting ''exercised, including rules and regulations for the use and management of the property under the Trust's jurisdiction.''.

(7) In section 104 (110 Stat. 4101, 4104), by adding after subsection (o) the following:

''(p) EXCLUSIVE RIGHTS TO NAME AND INSIGNIA.—The Trust shall have the sole and exclusive right to use the words 'Presidio Trust' and any seal, emblem, or other insignia adopted by its Board of Directors. Without express written authority of the Trust, no person may use the words 'Presidio Trust', or any combination or variation of those words alone or with other words, as the name under which that person shall do or purport to do business, for the purpose of trade, or by way of advertisement, or in any manner that may falsely suggest any connection with the Trust.''.

(8) In section 104(n) (110 Stat. 4103), by inserting after ''implementation of the'' in the first sentence the words ''general objectives of the''.

(9) In section 105(a)(2) (110 Stat. 4104), by striking ''not more than $3,000,000 annually'' and inserting after ''Of such sums,'' the word ''funds''.

(10) In section 105(c) (110 Stat. 4104), by inserting before ''including'' the words ''on a reimbursable basis,''.

(11) Section 103(c)(2) (110 Stat. 4099) is amended by striking ''consecutive terms.'' and inserting ''consecutive terms, except that upon the expiration of his or her term, an appointed member may continue to serve until his or her successor has been appointed.''.

(12) Section 103(c)(9) (110 Stat. 4100) is amended by striking ''properties administered by the Trust'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''properties administered by the Trust and all interest created under leases, concessions, permits and other agreements associated with the properties''.

(13) Section 104(d) (110 Stat. 4102) is amended as follows—

(A) by inserting ''(1)'' after ''FINANCIAL AUTHORITIES.—'';

(B) by striking ''(1) The authority'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''(A) The authority'';

(C) by striking ''(A) the terms'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''(i) the terms'';

(D) by striking ''(B) adequate'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''(ii) adequate'';

(E) by striking ''(C) such guarantees'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''(iii) such guarantees'';

(F) by striking ''(2) The authority'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''(B) The authority'';

(G) by redesignating paragraphs (3) and (4) as paragraphs (2) and (3) respectively;

(H) in paragraph (2) (as redesignated by this section)—

(i) by striking ''The authority'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''The Trust shall also have the authority'';

(ii) by striking ''after determining that the projects to be funded from the proceeds thereof are creditworthy and that a repayment schedule is established and only''; and

(iii) by inserting after ''and subject to such terms and conditions,'' the words ''including a review of the creditworthiness of the loan and establishment of a repayment schedule,''; and

(I) in paragraph (3) (as redesignated by this section) by inserting before ''this subsection'' the words ''paragraph (2) of''.

Page 16, after line 3, insert:

(6) In subsection (h)(2), by striking ''ration'' and inserting ''ratio''.

Page 16, after line 21, insert:

SEC. 129. BOUNDARY REVISIONS.

Section 814(b)(2)(G) of Public Law 104–333 is amended by striking ''are adjacent to'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''abut''.

Page 21, after line 24, insert:

(5) Section 10(g)(5)(A) of such Act (112 Stat. 3050) is amended by striking ''Daggett County'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''Dutch John''.

Page 23, after line 2, insert:

SEC. 305. NATIONAL PARK FOUNDATION.

Section 4 of Public Law 90–209 is amended—

(1) by inserting ''with or'' between ''practicable'' and ''without'' in the final sentence thereof; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: ''Monies reimbursed to either Department shall be returned by the Department to the account from which the funds for which the reimbursement is made were drawn and may, without further appropriation, be expended for any purpose for which such account is authorized.''.

SEC. 306. NATIONAL PARKS OMNIBUS MANAGEMENT ACT OF 1998.

Section 603(c)(1) of Public Law 105–391 is amended by striking ''10'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''15''.

SEC. 307. GRAND STAIRCASE-ESCALANTE NATIONAL MONUMENT.

Section 201(d) of Public Law 105–355 is amended by inserting ''and/or Tropic Utah,'' after the words ''school district, Utah,'' and by striking ''Public Purposes Act,'' and the remainder of the sentence and inserting in lieu thereof ''Public Purposes Act.''.

SEC. 308. SPIRIT MOUND.

Section 112(a) of division C of Public Law 105–277 (112 Stat. 2681–592) is amended—

(1) by striking ''is authorized to acquire'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''is authorized: (1) to acquire'';

(2) by striking ''South Dakota.'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''South Dakota; or''; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

''(2) to transfer available funds for the acquisition of the tract to the State of South Dakota upon the completion of a binding agreement with the State to provide for the acquisition and long-term preservation, interpretation, and restoration of the Spirit Mound tract.''.

SEC. 309. AMERICA'S AGRICULTURAL HERITAGE PARTNERSHIP ACT AMENDMENT.

Section 702(5) of division II of the Public Law 104–333 (110 Stat. 4265), is amended by striking ''Secretary of Agriculture'' and inserting in lieu thereof ''Secretary of the Interior''.

SEC. 310. NATIONAL PARK SERVICE ENTRANCE AND RECREATIONAL USE FEES.

(a) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to retain and expend revenues from entrance

and recreation use fees at units of the National Park System where such fees are collected under section 4 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 4601–6a), notwithstanding the provisions of section 4(i) of such Act. Fees shall be retained and expended in the same manner and for the same purposes as provided under the Recreational Fee Demonstration Program (section 315 of Public Law 104–134, as amended (16 U.S.C. 4601–6a note).

(b) Nothing in this section shall affect the collection of fees at units of the National Park System designated as fee demonstration projects under the Recreational Fee Demonstration Program.

(c) The authorities in this section shall expire upon the termination of the Recreational Fee Demonstration Program.

SEC. 311. NATIONAL PARKS OMNIBUS MANAGEMENT ACT OF 1998.

Section 404 of the National Parks Omnibus Management Act of 1998 (Public Law 105–391; 112 Stat. 3508; 16 U.S.C. 5953) is amended by striking ''conract terms and conditions,'' and inserting ''contract terms and conditions,''.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 149 is a noncontroversial bill that makes a number of technical corrections to the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 and to other laws related to parks and public land management.

Mr. Speaker, as Members are aware, in each congressional session a large number of individual pieces of legislation are passed and written into law. Often small mistakes and errors are made in drafting and printing the final language that becomes the actual law. For example, the wrong number of a map might be found, a period is missing from a sentence, or a word is spelled incorrectly.

The administration is very proficient in discovering these technical mistakes and have brought many of them to the attention of Congress. This bill makes numerous technical corrections to language which has been written into many of our various laws, and makes certain that the language is correct and consistent.

After passing the House last year, H.R. 149 was amended by the Senate with some other necessary changes that were brought to our attention. Included in the Senate amendments are changes dealing with the Presidio Trust, the North Carolina Park Foundation, the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument, and the retention of National Park entrance and recreation fees at the unit where it is collected.

I believe now we have addressed all the corrections that need to be made. This bill is supported by the administration, and I urge my colleagues to give their support on H.R. 149, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, if I may continue, during the consideration of H.R. 149, the Senate committee adopted a number of technical and clarifying amendments which were explained in detail in the section by section analysis below.

In addition to the technical and clarifying amendments, the committee adopted amendments which expand the authorities of the Presidio Trust. The amendments, one, authorize the Trust to expend funds for insurance and business-related expenses appropriate to the business activities of the Trust; two, make clear that the Administrative Dispute Resolution Act applies to the Presidio Trust, and that the Trust has the same authority to pursue binding arbitration under that act as any other executive agency, as defined in Section 103 and 105 of title V of the United States Code; three, clarify that the term ''proceeds'' as used in section 104(g) of public law 104–333 includes all revenues of the Trust; four, clarify that the scope of the Trust rules and regulations includes rules and regulations for the use and management of the property under the Trust jurisdiction.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 149 is a housekeeping measure that originally passed the House in February of 1999. The bill made numerous technical corrections in the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Act of 1996 and other laws to fix punctuation, map references, and other minor drafting errors that we exist.

We have no objection to the bill.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my support for a provision in H.R. 149 which is of importance to the people of Iowa's Second District. H.R. 149 authorizes the change of designation for the America's Agriculture Heritage Partnership from the Agriculture Department to the Interior Department.

The Omnibus National Park and Public Lands Act of 1996 (P.L. 104–333) established the America's Agriculture Heritage Partnership, more commonly known as Silos and Smokestacks, to present and interpret the history of agriculture in America. Along with Silos and Smokestacks, this act established nine other historical tourist parks as National Heritage Areas. When originally created, Silos and Smokestacks was the only National Heritage Area not designated under the Interior Department.

Since 1996, all of the other National Heritage Areas have been able to coordinate their efforts because of the coalition they formed under the Interior Department. While the Board of Trustees for Silos and Smokestacks originally sought authorization through the Agriculture Department in 1996, the current Board of Trustees is seeking to change its designation to the Interior Department.

I introduced the America's Agriculture Heritage Partnership Amendments of 1999 (H.R. 1493) to change this designation at the request of the current Board of Trustees. I am pleased that this legislation was included in H.R. 149. H.R. 149 will allow Silos and Smokestacks to be included in the coalition and continue its efforts to provide a unique view of our nation's agriculture heritage.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the bill, H.R. 149.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□

CARTER G. WOODSON HOME NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE STUDY ACT OF 1999

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3201) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating the Carter G. Woodson home in the District of Columbia as a national historic site, and for other purposes

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3201

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Carter G. Woodson Home National Historic Site Study Act of 1999''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Dr. Carter G. Woodson, cognizant of the widespread ignorance and scanty information concerning the history of African Americans, founded on September 9, 1915, the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History, since renamed the Association for the Study of African-American Life and History.

(2) The Association was founded in particular to counter racist propaganda alleging black inferiority and the pervasive influence of Jim Crow prevalent at the time.

(3) The mission of the Association was and continues to be educating the American public of the contributions of Black Americans in the formation of the Nation's history and culture.

(4) Dr. Woodson dedicated nearly his entire adult life to every aspect of the Association's operations in furtherance of its mission.

(5) Among the notable accomplishments of the Association under Dr. Woodson's leadership, Negro History Week was instituted in 1926 to be celebrated annually during the second week of February. Negro History Week has since evolved into Black History Month.

(6) The headquarters and center of operations of the Association was Dr. Woodson's residence, located at 1538 Ninth Street, Northwest, Washington, D.C.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act, the term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the National Park Service.

SEC. 4. STUDY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date on which funds are made available for such purpose, the Secretary, after consultation with the Mayor of the District of Columbia, shall submit to the Committee on Resources of the United States House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the United

States Senate a resource study of the Dr. Carter G. Woodson Home and headquarters of the Association for the Study of African-American Life and History, located at 1538 Ninth Street, Northwest, Washington, D.C.

(b) CONTENTS.—The study under subsection (a) shall—

(1) identify suitability and feasibility of designating the Carter G. Woodson Home as a unit of the National Park System; and

(2) include cost estimates for any necessary acquisition, development, operation and maintenance, and identification of alternatives for the management, administration, and protection of the Carter G. Woodson Home.

SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

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

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3201, introduced by my colleague, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

H.R. 3201 serves to honor the prolific accomplishments of the great American historian, Dr. Carter G. Woodson, by establishing his home, located at 1538 Ninth Street, Northwest, Washington, D.C., as a national monument.

Dr. Woodson, the second black to ever graduate from Harvard, was an eminent historian of African-American life and history. His life was devoted to educating African-Americans and the American public of the contributions black Americans made in the formation of our Nation's history and culture.

His efforts led to the establishment of the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History in 1915. Its purpose was to counter the racist propaganda and the influence of Jim Crow prevalent at the time.

Every aspect of Dr. Woodson's life was dedicated to the Association's purpose. Even the headquarters and center of operation was located in his home. In 1926, under his leadership, the Association instituted Negro History Week.

This week of commemorating black achievements gradually gained support and participation from schools, colleges, and other organizations, and led to the establishment of Black History Month.

The original mission of the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History, since renamed the Association for the Study of African-American Life and History, remains the same. Dr. Woodson's vision continues to serve and educate people of the importance of African-American history.

H.R. 3201 is an authorization for the Secretary of the Interior to study the feasibility of designating the Carter G. Woodson home as a national historic site. To enact this bill in the month of February, Black History Month, would be a meaningful gesture of bipartisan cooperation.

H.R. 3201 authorizes the Secretary to conduct a resource study on the Carter G. Woodson home and the headquarters of the Association for the Study of African-American Life and History. After 18 months, the study is then to be submitted to the Committee on Resources and the Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources. The focus of this study will be on the feasibility of designating the Carter G. Woodson home as a unit of the National Park System.

To include Dr. Woodson's home as a National Historic Site would serve to heighten the public's understanding of African-American history, and honor the legacy of Carter G. Woodson and his association.

Mr. Speaker, I reiterate my support for H.R. 3201, and ask for Members' endorsement to move ahead in the process of preserving this historic site and honoring this great teacher.

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

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

(Ms. NORTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, may I begin by thanking the leadership, and especially the gentlemen from Texas, Mr. ARMEY and Mr. DELAY, for their great cooperation and courtesy to me in delaying this bill until the end of the day. I had to attend a funeral this morning of a particularly tragic variety. Two model teenagers were killed, and the funeral was being held at precisely the time that this bill was due on the floor. I very much appreciate the courtesy of the leaders in postponing this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I want also to thank the chairman, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) for working closely with me to quickly bring to the floor H.R. 3201, the Carter G. Woodson Home National Historic Site Study Act of 1999.

I also want to thank the gentleman from Alaska (Chairman YOUNG) of the full committee for his strong support. I appreciate that I have been able to work closely and collegially with both the full committee and subcommittee not only on H.R. 3201, but on several issues affecting the Nation's capital.

I am grateful also for the great assistance to me of the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER), the ranking member of the full committee, and the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO), the ranking member of the subcommittee.

I especially appreciate that the committee has expedited my bill to assure the possibility of bipartisan passage on the House floor this month as a concrete way for the Congress to commemorate Black History Month.

The man we honor today, Dr. Carter G. Woodson, and the organization that he founded, the Association for the Study of African-American Life and History, were responsible for establishing the annual black history celebration.

□ 1515

Dr. Woodson was a distinguished American historian who began the process of uncovering African American history and the contributions of African Americans to our Nation's history. The time is overdue to begin a feasibility study on designating his home at 1538 Ninth Street, Northwest, in the Nation's capital, as a national historic site within the jurisdiction of the National Park Service.

Today it stands boarded up in the historic Shaw District. In giving Dr. Woodson's home its rightful place, the bill begins the process of uncovering the living black history right here in the Nation's capital, where Dr. Woodson lived and worked as the founder and director of the Association for the Study of African American Life and History.

Dr. Woodson, the son of former slaves, earned his Ph.D. degree from Harvard University in 1912, becoming only the second black American to receive a doctorate from Harvard after the great W.E.B. DuBois. Woodson's personal educational achievement was extraordinary in itself, especially for a man who had been denied access to public education in Canton, Virginia, where Woodson was born in 1875.

As a result, Dr. Woodson did not begin his formal education until he was 20 years old, after he moved to Huntington, West Virginia, and received his high school diploma 2 years later. He then entered Berea College in Kentucky, where he received his bachelor's degree in 1897. Woodson continued his education at the University of Chicago where he earned his A.B. and M.A. degrees.

During much of Dr. Woodson's life, there was widespread ignorance and very little information concerning African American life and history. With his extensive studies, Woodson almost single handedly established African American historiography. Dr. Woodson's research in literally uncovering black history helped to educate the American public about the contributions of African Americans to the Nation's history and culture. Through scholarship and painstaking historical research, his work has helped reduce the stereotypes captured in basically negative portrayals of black people that have marred our history as a Nation. To remedy these stereotypes, Dr. Woodson in 1915 founded the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History, since renamed the Association for the Study of African American Life and History.

Through the Association, Dr. Woodson dedicated his life to educating the American public about the contributions of black Americans to the Nation's history and culture. This work in bringing history to bear where prejudice and racism had held sway has

played an indispensable role in reducing prejudice and making the need for civil rights remedies clear. Among its enduring accomplishments, the Association, under Dr. Woodson's leadership, instituted Negro History Week in 1926 to be observed during the week in February of the birthdays of Abraham Lincoln and Frederick Douglas.

Today, of course, Negro History Week that was mostly celebrated in segregated schools, like my own here in the District when I was a child, and historically black colleges and universities, has gained support and participation throughout the country among people of all backgrounds as Black History Month.

To assure publication under Dr. Woodson's leadership, the Association in 1920 also founded the Associated Publishers, for the publication of research on African American history.

Dr. Woodson published his seminal work, The Negro in Our History, in 1922 and many others under Associated Publishers and the publishing company provided an outlet for scholarly works by numerous other black scholars. The Association also circulated two periodicals, the Negro History Bulletin, designed for mass consumption and the Journal of Negro History that was primarily directed to the academic community.

Dr. Woodson directed the association's operations from his home on Ninth Street here in Washington, D.C. From there, he trained researchers and staff and managed the association's budget and fund-raising efforts while at the same time pursuing his own study of African American history.

This Victorian-style house built in 1890, where African American history was both made and uncovered, already listed as a national historic landmark, needs to be opened to the public. With today's bill, this landmark can become a national historic site with care lodged with the National Park Service.

I ask my colleagues to pass H.R. 3201, to commemorate the work of Dr. Carter G. Woodson and the association he founded as a particularly appropriate way for the House of Representatives to celebrate Black History Month.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN), a member of the subcommittee.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3201, the Carter G. Woodson Home National Historic Site Study Act, and I commend my friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), for introducing this bill. I also thank my chairman, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN), and the ranking member, for their support in bringing the bill to the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, Carter G. Woodson, the son of former slaves James and Eliza Woodson of Buckingham County, Virginia, dedicated his life to the study and history of African American life and culture. As we heard, he received his A.B. and M.A. degrees from the University of Chicago in 1908 and his Ph.D. from Harvard University in 1912, following W.E.B. DuBois as the second African American to receive a doctorate from Harvard.

His teaching and travels abroad, including a year of study in Asia and Europe, as well as a semester at the Sorbonne, gave him a mastery of several languages. His distinguished career as an educator included serving as the supervisor of schools in the Philippines, dean of the Schools of Liberal Arts at Howard University and West Virginia State College.

In 1915, he founded the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History because of what he saw as the great need to educate the American public about the contributions of black Americans in the formation of the Nation's history and culture. It is because of the efforts of Dr. Woodson that Black History Month is celebrated across the country today.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on to recount many more of the accomplishments and contributions that Dr. Woodson made during his lifetime; but we have heard many of them, and we will hear others listed by those who make remarks in support of this bill today.

It is entirely fitting, though, as the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) has pointed out, that we honor this great American, particularly during Black History Month, by having the National Park Service study the feasibility and suitability of designating his home on Ninth Street here in Washington, D.C. as a national historic site.

I understand that the National Park Service is strongly supportive of this study, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to once again thank the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN), and his staff for their very expeditious attention to this bill and for the way in which they have strongly supported it.

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her kind remarks.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and add extraneous material on H.R. 149 and H.R. 3201, the two bills just considered.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3201, the Carter G. Woodson Home National Historic Site Study Act. Carter G. Woodson, a son of former slaves who worked in the mines and quarries until the age of 20, who matriculated at Berea College and received his MA in history from the University of Chicago and his doctorate in history in 1912 from Harvard.

Carter G. Woodson is generally recognized as the Father of Negro History because of his quest to open the long-neglected field of African American history. His thirst for life and quest for truth institutionalized the study of Afro-American and African societies and cultures in the United States.

Among his notable accomplishments are: Negro History Week, which was instituted in 1926 and has since evolved into Black History Month; the widely consulted college text "The Negro in Our History", and the Associated Publishers, a publishing outlet to bring out books on black life and culture.

Yet despite these towering achievements, there is at present no suitable memorial for Carter G. Woodson. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I heartily support the idea of designating the Carter G. Woodson home in Washington, DC, as a national historic site. To do so recognizes the great debt we owe this important founding father of Afro-American scholarship.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the Negro History Bulletin, the Journal of Negro History, the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History, Black History Month—these were the creations of Carter G. Woodson. Carter G. Woodson said we must know and celebrate our history. And, he made it his life's work to see to it that we do.

From his home, Dr. Woodson ran the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History. At his home, Dr. Woodson trained the scholars and staff that researched, collected, catalogued and preserved the history of a people.

I rise in support of the designation of Dr. Woodson's home as a national historic site. There is no fitting tribute to the man and his work * * * and to the understanding and appreciation of a people that more than any other has made our Nation what it is today.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3201.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces that the question will be put on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal immediately following this vote, and that that will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 413, nays 1, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 20]

YEAS—413

Abercrombie	Baldacci	Bateman
Ackerman	Baldwin	Becerra
Aderholt	Ballenger	Bentsen
Allen	Barcia	Bereuter
Andrews	Barr	Berkley
Archer	Barrett (NE)	Berman
Armey	Barrett (WI)	Berry
Baca	Bartlett	Biggert
Bachus	Barton	Bilbray
Baker	Bass	Bilirakis

Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Green (TX)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—1

Paul

NOT VOTING—20

Baird
Bonior
Brown (OH)
Callahan
Campbell
Capps
Clay
DeFazio
Gephardt
Graham
Green (WI)
Hinojosa
Hutchinson
Kasich
Lowey
McCollum
Pelosi
Radanovich
Sanford
Vento

□ 1547

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSE). Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, the pending business is the question of the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. LANTOS. 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 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 375, nays 33, answered ''present'' 2, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 21]

AYES—375

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Capuano
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Green (TX)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Packard
Pallone
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman

Sherwood	Stupak	Walden
Shimkus	Sununu	Walsh
Shows	Talent	Wamp
Shuster	Tanner	Watkins
Simpson	Tauscher	Watt (NC)
Sisisky	Tauzin	Watts (OK)
Skeen	Taylor (MS)	Waxman
Skelton	Terry	Weiner
Slaughter	Thomas	Weldon (FL)
Smith (MI)	Thornberry	Weldon (PA)
Smith (NJ)	Thune	Wexler
Smith (TX)	Thurman	Weygand
Smith (WA)	Tiahrt	Whitfield
Snyder	Tierney	Wilson
Souder	Toomey	Wise
Spence	Towns	Wolf
Spratt	Traficant	Woolsey
Stabenow	Turner	Wu
Stark	Udall (CO)	Wynn
Stearns	Upton	Young (AK)
Stenholm	Velazquez	Young (FL)
Stump	Vitter	

NOES—33

Bilbray	Hastings (FL)	Schaffer
Borski	Hefley	Strickland
Brady (PA)	Hilleary	Sweeney
Coburn	Hilliard	Taylor (NC)
Costello	LoBiondo	Thompson (CA)
Dickey	McDermott	Thompson (MS)
English	Peterson (MN)	Udall (NM)
Filner	Pickett	Visclosky
Ford	Ramstad	Waters
Gibbons	Rogan	Weller
Gutknecht	Sabo	Wicker

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—2

Carson	Tancredo

NOT VOTING—24

Baird	DeFazio	McCollum
Blunt	Gephardt	McKinney
Bonior	Graham	Oxley
Brown (OH)	Green (WI)	Pascrell
Callahan	Hall (TX)	Pelosi
Campbell	Hinojosa	Radanovich
Capps	Kasich	Sanford
Clay	Lowey	Vento

□ 1557

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was not present for roll call votes Nos. 19, 20 and 21 because I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes'' on all counts.

□

TRIBUTE TO SUSAN B. ANTHONY

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, 188 years after her birth, Susan B. Anthony is still remembered as a prominent and influential figure in our Nation's history.

One of the greatest foremothers in the drive for women's rights, she became a leader in the fight for equal rights for all.

Mr. Speaker, today marks the anniversary of Susan B. Anthony's birth. We know her as a fierce opponent of slavery, who also championed to protect the rights of those who today have become the most dispossessed in our society, the unborn.

Susan B. Anthony considered one of her greatest achievements to have saved the lives of the unborn. She said ''sweeter ever than to have had the joy of caring for children of my own has it been to help bring about a better state of things for mothers generally, so that their unborn little ones could not be willed away from them.''

To Susan B. Anthony, as well as all the early suffragists, the rights of unborn children could never and should never have been separated from the promotion of women's rights.

As today marks the 180th anniversary of her birth, I ask that we remember her efforts to secure equality for all and to rededicate ourselves to her life's work of guaranteeing full rights for both women and their unborn children.

□

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE REV. DR. ALBERT T. ROWAN

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

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Valentine's Day, in the Eleventh Congressional District of Ohio, we hosted the homegoing celebration of the Reverend Dr. Albert T. Rowan, one of the religious giants in the faith community and on the national level. Dr. Rowan had served as the pastor of Bethany Baptist Church, my church home, for more than 34 years.

Dr. Rowan and his life partner and best friend, Mrs. Carrie Mae Rowan, were married for 52 years, the proud parents of five children, 11 grandchildren, and two great-grandchildren. The homegoing ceremony was a joyous ceremony, exemplifying the happy lifestyle that Dr. Rowan lived.

I was particularly blessed because Dr. Rowan had been my pastor since I was 13 years of age. He celebrated my high school, college and law school graduation, my marriage, my first election as a judge, the birth and christening of my son, and my subsequent elections as judge, prosecutor and Congresswoman. I will always remember how he encouraged me to keep going and how he fostered my growth as a Christian woman, wife, mother, and leader. I will always be deeply indebted to Dr. Rowan.

The celebration was particularly moving because Reverend Dr. Stephen Rowan, the son of Dr. Albert T. Rowan, delivered the eulogy. What greater testament to a father, than to have his son eulogize his life.

Seventy-two years ago, in Kansas City, Missouri a bright star entered into the lives of the family of Albert and Florence Rowan their son Albert T. Rowan. Throughout his life he would bring comfort and joy to those whose lives he touched.

Dr. Albert T. Rowan was educated in the Kansas City public schools and held a Bachelor Degree in Religious Education and Theology, a Master of Divinity Degree in Pastoral Psychology and Counseling and the Doctor of Divinity Degree. For more than thirty-four years Rev. Rowan served as shepherd to the flock at Bethany Baptist Church. Under his prayerful leadership Bethany continued providing spiritual guidance to its expanding congregation and also developed new spiritual and community programming including: New Missionary Groups; 8:00 a.m. and 10:45 a.m. worship services; Youth Seminars; a fast growing credit union; and a Head Start school.

Rev. Rowan loved people. He had the ability to inspire diverse groups to work together for worthy causes. He worked in behalf of many organizations including: The Ministerial Head Start Assoc.; The National Baptist Convention; the Interchurch Council of Greater Cleveland; The Cleveland City Planning Commission; the Ohio State Martin Luther King Commission; and the Minority Organ Tissue Education program.

From the pulpit Rev. Rowan often jokingly reminisced about his courtship and his marriage to his life partner and best friend, his bride of fifty-two years, Carrie Mae McBride Rowan. They were blessed with a large and loving family including their children and spouses: Richard and Virginia Rowan, Brenda and Larry Moore, Stephen and Cynthia Rowan, Allana and Elijah Wheeler, and Allan Christopher and Marshara Rowan; eleven grandchildren; two great-grandchildren. Rev. Rowan also had five sisters and brothers, two who predeceased him.

Rev. Rowan was instrumental in shaping my life from the age of 13 years. He played a major part in my development as a young person, as a parent and as a public figure. He kept me grounded and was always there for me. He will live on in my life because of who he helped me become, both personally and professional.

On behalf of the Congress of the United States of America and the citizens of the 11th Congressional District, Ohio, I express our gratitude to Rev. Albert T. Rowan for all of his efforts to nourish the hearts and improve the lives of his fellow man. On behalf of my entire family I extend condolences and love to Mrs. Rowan, the family and friends.

□

SPECIAL ORDERS

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

□

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

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

□

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

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

□

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. CLAYTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

□

□ 1600

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

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

□

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MORELLA addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

□

HEATING OIL CRISIS IN NORTHEAST

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

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, today in the Northeast, we are confronted with a heating oil crisis of epic proportions. We have seen the price of petroleum skyrocket 166 percent over the course of a year. The diesel fuel that is required in order to move goods from one end of the State to the markets in Boston and New York has gone over $2 a gallon. There are potatoes in storage of the current crop. It is estimated that there are 16,000 per hundredweight that were cultivated and grown and that are in storage and 13,000 of them are still there, unable to be moved to market, and if they are forced to stay there, the United States Government, the United States Department of Agriculture will have to pick up the tab. We have many sectors of the economy that we have seen a negative impact. Airline ticket prices have had surcharges. There have been traffic and tourism and economic development that has not taken place because of the higher fuel cost. We had a meeting last week with the Secretary of Energy in the Longworth House Office Building where over 40 Members, Democratic and Republican and Independent, all voiced the concerns of the citizens and the constituents that we all represent to the Secretary that the action of the administration was not sufficient given the crisis that was confronting people.

In my State of Maine, we are confronted with double hardships, because in our State which is 36th in per capita wage income, where people have a hard time making ends meet, anyway, have very few dollars for disposable income. Yet they have seen their oil bills double and triple. Maine's older population, they are a poorer population, they are living in a rural area that depend upon fuel and utilities to be able to stay warm, to be able to make sure that they are getting their goods and medicine, and to be forced to be choosing between fuel, food and medications is a triple hardship for these people.

We have been asking for a concerted effort, a comprehensive approach to this situation here with the Federal Energy Secretary Richardson who is coming to Maine and to Boston tomorrow as part of an energy summit. We are asking the President to engage in strong diplomacy with OPEC and non-OPEC states, because within our region of the country, most of the petroleum and the distiller products which they refer to end up coming from the Gulf Coast region of the country into the Northeast region. But we still have petroleum products that are coming in from Venezuela, from the Virgin Islands and from Canada. It is important for this administration to be making sure that that fuel is getting into the market and that the prices are stabilized or decreasing. We are recognizing that even Iraq is withholding oil from the energy mix just to penalize people during this very difficult time. When we have aided the countries of Mexico and Venezuela and other countries, Saudi Arabia, we have aided them in their times of need, we are asking the President and the Secretary of Energy to engage in strong measures to make sure that those countries recognize that we need them to increase the output. We are looking at gasoline prices being at record levels. Tourist season is down the road and one of the largest industries in our region of the country and we are going to see this negatively impacted.

As a matter of reference, there was testimony today before the Transportation appropriations subcommittee that because of the higher prices of fuel, we are seeing a decline in automobile and truck traffic and we are seeing a negative impact on our surface transportation dollars that were gauged for a certain amount of activity, we are seeing a negative impact. We have seen a negative impact on agriculture estimated by the United States Department of Agriculture, $1 billion of lost farm income because of the circumstances here that we are looking at with these higher costs that have to be borne by the farmers. We are seeing it going across the board.

I recognize that there may be some regions of the country that are not experiencing these higher prices. But I also recognize that we have the impact that goes across the board. One thing has always been certain here in Congress, when one part of the country has been hurting, we all stand together because at other times through our country's history in the last years, we have seen these impacts throughout the country on a national basis with emergencies and disasters.

We are asking for comprehensive legislation with these special orders, we are asking for action on the part of the administration so that people do not have to be victimized in the Northeast again.

LIVE FIRE MILITARY TRAINING ON PUERTO RICAN ISLAND

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, a tragedy has recently occurred in the defense of our Nation and the protection of the men and women who serve in its defense. Specifically, we sent our USS Bataan Amphibious Ready Group, with the 22nd Marine Expeditionary Unit embarked, into a high threat area without the proper training and instruction required. The frustrating point about it was the training was available, planned and scheduled. But due to political considerations, it was canceled, leaving our Marines and sailors vulnerable and frankly unprepared.

I am speaking about Vieques, a tiny island that is part of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico that the Department of the Navy has been using since 1950 as a live fire bombing range. The range provides the ability for the Navy and Marine Corps to conduct simulated amphibious landing operations while using combined arms of artillery, naval gunfire, and close air support. It serves as the culminating exercise for a series of workups that the ARG goes through prior to deploying to the Mediterranean for a 6-month cruise. Vieques is a unique training site. It is the only facility on the East Coast with unfettered air and sea space, deep water access, amphibious landing beaches, nearby military ports and airfields, and the capability to support live naval gunfire operations. Additionally, it allows the Navy and Marine Corps to conduct amphibious combined arms training, Naval surface fire support training, end-to-end strike training and high altitude air tactics. Our Marines and sailors are combat ready for all contingencies because of the realistic live fire training afforded by Vieques. The current situation on Vieques where the President ordered a cease to all operations on the range initially and has since worked out a ''deal'' with the Governor of Puerto Rico where inert ordnance vice live ordnance will be used turns this into a readiness issue. If our Marines and sailors cannot train, they will not be ready. We send them to hostile areas to protect a presence, show the Flag, with the understanding that if crises should arise, they will be prepared to quell it. I am here to report that we have dictated a mission that cannot be accomplished. Yet the solution is simple. Open the Vieques range to live fire bombing, naval gunfire, and artillery.

We allow live fire bombing in nearly every State of the union. Why would we stop bombing a commonwealth when bombs continue to be dropped and rounds fired in Utah, Nevada, California, Florida and other places? Might I add that these bombs and rounds are fired in closer proximity to our civilian population, more so than on Vieques where there is a 10-mile buffer zone.

The reason, I guess, is because there are no votes to be garnered by the Puerto Rican population in New York for not bombing those States. Think of the precedent we now set by compromising with officials from Puerto Rico. Closing Vieques could set off a host of issues in other countries as well as our own States where we currently conduct training. The net result is having a military that can put rounds on target in theory only. Without practical application, we put our forces in harm's way without even sending them to hostile areas. I do not think we should stand by and jeopardize our servicemen for someone else's political gain.

There is no compromise when it comes to reopening Vieques. Opening the range as proposed for inert ordnance is not practical. More can be gained by conducting separate, compartmentalized exercises on ranges that accept live ordnance. Training with dud ordnance excludes artillery, mortars and direct fire weapons system as these systems either do not have inert ammunition available or insufficient quantities are on hand to conduct training. Limiting the range to inert ordnance denies the naval services from achieving essential live fire training and eliminates essential ''arms'' from the combined arms network that makes the Navy and Marine Corps so successful on the battlefield. Using live ordnance is the only way to simulate actual combat conditions. It instills confidence in our Marines and sailors on their procedures and equipment and validates every aspect of weapon employment. Without live fire training, the Navy-Marine team would deploy without having tested its ability to integrate, organize, execute and sustain high tempo combat operations with all weapons systems and live fire ordnance.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot look myself in the mirror knowing that we have sent our troops out to do a job that we have not prepared them for when the tools to prepare them are in place and ready for use. Is it not unusual that the decision to end the live fire bombing rides on the coattails of the President's decision to grant clemency to convicted Puerto Rican terrorists? We can mask the reasons for the decision by saying that the bombing was stopped to prevent further casualties, but the real purpose seems to be political. Mr. Rodriguez was killed in a live fire accident several months ago in Vieques. However, his death is not justification to threaten several thousand of our military members by closing the range. If we stopped training every time we had a training casualty, we would never train.

I implore my fellow Members of Congress to look at this situation carefully and apply some common sense. The encroachment of military training areas is alarmingly on the rise and this is another example. We must provide our military with the best possible facilities so they can be ready to respond to any contingency. This is proven in the recent events in Bosnia and East Timor where we called upon our service members and thrust them into hostile environments with the assumption that they were prepared and trained. Without Vieques, our naval forces are dealt a severe blow. With that, I make it a point to ensure that the island of Vieques is reopened indefinitely for live fire training with the intent that we provide our young men and women like those currently deployed with the USS Bataan Amphibious Ready Group and the 22nd Marine Expeditionary Unit with the best possible training before sending them into harm's way.

□

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

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

□

INTRODUCTION OF MILITARY FAMILY FOOD STAMP TAX CREDIT BILL

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

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I want to read part of a transcript from the June 25 edition of ''20/20'' which featured a story on our military families who cannot make ends meet. I quote from the transcript.

''We begin with a shameful story about the men and women we count on to protect us, members of the United States armed services. They are prepared to die for us, but did you know that some of them must stand in food lines to help feed their families?''

Again, I quote from the transcript:

''It is a shocking sight to see proud American soldiers accepting charity and Federal aid just to get by.''

The show also featured a 26-year-old computer operations specialist who has served 6 years in the Navy, Mr. Speaker, but makes only $18,000 a year to care for his wife and three children. He said, and I quote, ''I've talked to managers at fast food restaurants who make more money than I do. And I'm prepared to die for my country if necessary. And sometimes that seems really unfair.''

A reported 600,000 enlisted troops, almost half the entire military base, make a base salary of $18,000 or less. On May 21 of last year, ''CBS This Morning'' did a profile during its ''Eye on America'' on the state of our military families. The reporter interviewed a church volunteer and former military wife by the name of Pat Kallenbarger who works to help our military families in need.

She said, and I quote, ''It's not unusual for me to find a family sleeping on the floor for lack of beds and eating on the floor because they don't have a table and chairs, and they don't have the money to either buy them or rent them.''

I further quote:

''I find babies in cardboard cartons. They'd be in a dresser drawer, except the family doesn't own a dresser.''

□ 1615

Mr. Speaker, this is shameful. These are our military families. In fact, I introduced a bill, H.R. 1055, a year ago, that would help give these men and women on food stamps a $500 tax credit. I am urging our leadership, both Republican and Democrat, this year to please make sure before we end this session in October that we have spoken to this issue of our men and women on food stamps.

Mr. Speaker, I have before me a Marine. This Marine is holding in his arms his baby daughter named Bridgett, and the young lady standing on his feet is his 3-year-old daughter named Megan.

Mr. Speaker, this Marine is getting ready to deploy for Bosnia. The sad part of all of this, this Marine represents all of our men and women in uniform and represents those 600,000 that are making under $18,000.

We must remember that these men and women that are willing to die for this country, 60 percent of them have families. I think about this little girl, Megan, because you can see in her eyes a concern, and maybe that concern even at that young age is the fact that her daddy might leave and never come back. I do not know. But I do know this, Mr. Speaker, as a Member of this Congress, that those of us on both sides of the political aisle, we have an obligation, and in fact I think it is deplorable and unacceptable that we have not begun to help those men and women in uniform on food stamps.

So I urge my colleagues, we have about 80 Members of this House, both Republican and Democrat, on this bill, and I encourage my colleagues to please join me in this effort to make sure that this year, before we leave, that we do something tangible to help those men and women on food stamps.

□

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

□

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

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

HOME HEATING OIL PRICES MUST BE BROUGHT DOWN

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, the issue I want to talk about is the issue of the skyrocketing cost of home heating oil in the Northeast, particularly in New York and New England. It is an extremely, extremely serious problem.

The problem was brought to my attention, quite frankly, by the good work and the efforts of our U.S. Senator from New York who was seen nightly on the television programs, CHUCK SCHUMER, talking about the imminent problem that we are now faced with.

I, along with the gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), introduced legislation to provide the Secretary of Energy with the authority to draw down the Nation's reserve oil supply in the Strategic Oil Reserve. That will go a long way to reducing the cost of home heating oil immediately, as was demonstrated back during the Iraqi conflict in 1991 when then President Bush opened the Strategic Petroleum Reserve and, overnight, the cost of home heating oil dropped by $10 a barrel, affording millions of people in this country more home heating oil.

President Clinton has indicated that he will not draw down the supplies; but I, along with many of my colleagues, will press him in this matter. Hence, I have joined with a number of my colleagues in both political parties asking him to reconsider his refusal to use these reserves.

We have a massive oil supply problem, and I believe the best way to address this issue and see a sharp decline in the cost of oil is to open these reserves and bring this oil into the market.

Last week Secretary of Energy Bill Richardson addressed a number of Congressmen and women from the Northeast, and, although he too expressed reluctance to open up these reserves, by listening to us and the stories of our constituents, such as Dorothy Alteri of Dudley Avenue, who saw her energy bill skyrocket this year, I hope we can sway him to reconsider.

Mr. Speaker, I have before me here two bills to two constituents. Phillip Occhino from the Bronx, his bill for the last month was $414. I dare say it has more than doubled this past month.

I have another one here from Thomas Donohue from Woodside, Queens. His, too, his home heating bill for last month was $410.39, well above what they paid in the past for the same home heating oil.

I fear that after last year's warm winter and the resulting profit losses of the oil refineries, that they are trying to recoup past deficits by overcharging this year. To reinforce this contention, I have noticed that the price of oil, diesel fuel and fuels in general, are much higher in the New York and New England region than they are in other parts of the country.

For example, I got a letter from Vincent Fullone, the president of Fullone Trucking, who told me the national average price for diesel fuel on February 9, 2000, was $1.47 a gallon. On that very same day in New York, a gallon of diesel fuel cost $2.29 a gallon. It just is not fair that diesel fuel trucks in our region are paying more for their diesel than other regions of this country.

It is safe to be said for the home heating oil industry and our gasoline prices as well that there is a serious price differential from what we here in New York pay versus what other people in different States pay. For that reason I am working with my colleagues and demanding an investigation by Attorney General Janet Reno and the Department of Justice into any price fixing that may have been orchestrated by the fuel oil industry.

I am also pleased that the House has held a hearing on OPEC, the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries. I am glad that my committee, the Committee on International Relations, has also held a hearing investigating OPEC's price-fixing schemes.

OPEC are the same people that brought us the 1977–1979 oil shortages, as well as 1973; and I fear they are at it again, cutting supply to raise their profit margin at the expense of Americans. The U.S. must stop this practice of OPEC.

For lower-income seniors I am also a supporter of the President's releasing more of the Nation's reserve funds in the LIHEAP program. The Low Income Energy Assistance Program is a Federal program that provides assistance to low-income Americans to pay for fuel and utility costs. Recently, the President released $175 million of LIHEAP surplus funds, with $36.6 million going to New York.

Although I was pleased the President has begun releasing the reserve funds in this account, I was troubled to see the flawed formula used by the administration. Instead of targeting the States with the greatest need, like New York and the New England States, virtually every State in the U.S. and U.S. territories benefited from this Federal program for home heating assistance, including the Virgin Islands, Florida, Arizona and Texas. I am urging the President to release more money from this reserve account, but asking him to do it in a way targeting those people hurting the most, like the people in New York.

In New York City there are too many seniors who live only on Social Security checks. They cannot afford any increase in the cost of home heating oil. This LIHEAP reserve fund is there to help offset the high cost of home heating fuel for these lower-income individuals. These funds should be used to aid those with the most need.

I am also one of the principal supporters of legislation sponsored by my friend, the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), legislation that would create a home heating oil reserve that the President could draw down upon when oil fuel prices skyrocket, like they have this winter. This legislation is based on a 1998 Department of Energy study that outlined that a home heating oil reserve would be an effective method of stabilizing home heating oil prices in the future.

Some of this oil, 2 million barrels, would be stored in containers in New York Harbor. I understand the Secretary of Energy has recently expressed some interest in this idea, and I am grateful for that. Although the solutions I speak of will not resolve any of the difficulties this winter, it would address these problems in the upcoming years. I want to let you know that we are working tirelessly on this issue.

I received a petition just yesterday from a number of senior citizens in the Bronx in my district complaining about their high cost of home heating oil. The reality is we may not be at war with the Middle East nations, but we are in economic war with OPEC. The people to be the victims in this war will be the senior citizens, the people least able to afford to pay for home heating oil.

□

ON THE KEEP THE PROMISES ACT, H.R. 3573

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

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I know you know that this House is very attuned to the ongoing debate over reining in the abuses of the managed care industry in general. But today I would like to bring attention to a more specific injustice, one that is not addressed by the managed care reform legislation under consideration by the House-Senate conferees committee.

Mr. Speaker, before this session is out, we need to pass legislation that will address the worst HMO in the country, our military health care system. As is the case with all managed care abuses, our military system is failing to deliver the benefits for which its beneficiaries have paid.

These patients were promised fully funded health care for life in exchange for 20 years of military service. That is a defined benefit, just like those benefits defined in civilian-managed care plans. You pay the premium, and you should receive the benefit.

Our military retirees paid for their benefit with 2 decades of service. In return, they were guaranteed that they would not have to pay out of pocket for health care by having access to military health care facilities or supplemental insurance, CHAMPUS, that would pay the bills at civilian hospitals if military facilities were not available.

That is the coverage that Sergeant First Class John Nation and his wife,

Barbara, of Southport, North Carolina, thought they had after John served 21 years in the Army. That service included two tours in Vietnam with the artillery. Sergeant Nation was certified by the Veterans Administration as suffering cancer from exposure to Agent Orange during that war.

Here is the benefit that Sergeant Nation received: because there was not an Army or VA hospital within 2½ hours of their home, they had to seek civilian treatment. Because Barbara had private health insurance through her job at Carolina Power & Light, CHAMPUS refused to accept primary responsibility for John's treatment. When CHAMPUS received the portion of John's bills not covered by the private insurance, they still refused to pay for the vast majority of the care. They told Barbara, his wife, that the charges exceeded their rate schedule, so they were not obligated to pay anything. On bills that were within their rate schedule, CHAMPUS rejected the majority of chemotherapy, radiation, and hospital charges on technical grounds. John passed away. Barbara was forced to surrender her entire retirement savings to pay the bills rejected by CHAMPUS.

Now, I ask every Member of this House, is this fully funded health care for life as promised? Does the treatment that Sergeant First Class John Nation received from the U.S. Government qualify as having provided the benefits that he and his family were promised?

John Nation honored his part of the contract. We failed to honor ours. It is time we made good on our promises to the Nation's military retirees; and I urge each and every one of you to support H.R. 3573, the Keep Our Promises to America's Military Retirees Act. 260 Members have now cosponsored this bill so that we may keep our word. It is important that the Federal Government keep its word. You cannot expect retention to improve in the military; you cannot expect that people are going to stay in as a career, when we will not keep our word to them.

Mr. Speaker, this should be one of our top priorities, because it is the right thing for the United States Government to do for the men and women that risked life and limb to defend this Nation.

□

HEATING OIL CRISIS IN NEW YORK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to bring to the attention of Congress the situation of the people that I represent in Monroe County, New York. Some of them are up there now trying to shovel snow off their roofs. We have the dubious distinction this year of having had more snow than anyplace in the United States, a distinction that we really prefer go to Buffalo or Oswego.

I have an extraordinary number of retired persons as well. In addition to the high cost of prescription drugs, they are now being forced to decide whether they will eat or pay the soaring home heating costs.

□ 1630

The families have seen the price of home heating oil rise on an hourly basis. There has been no way to understand it, to plan for it, or to budget for it. They are upset, and those who are on low and fixed incomes are having to choose again between everything else that they do and heating their homes, which really is not a choice. With the temperatures that we have had this January and February, we have had over 21 days of straight snow this year. There is no option but not to freeze to death.

We have had numbers of truckers who have called us and told us that the extraordinary high rise in diesel fuel, over $2 a gallon an increase, has made it impossible for many of them even to continue to run their rigs and they have put them aside until, as Washington says, help is on the way.

I understand what the President said that once this cold snap is over, that we hope that the prices will go down, but in the meantime, I have people who are in severe crisis. I am happy that there is going to be a summit tomorrow on this, but I frankly think that the cautious approach that the White House is taking is too little and too late.

We know that actions will speak louder than words. It is really critical that this year, because this is a debate, as my colleagues have pointed out, that we have year after year, that we do something about it to take care of these permanent needs that the Northeast has for heating assistance. I have joined on to legislation that I hope will do just that this year.

We hate to come every year and talk about how our people again are freezing to death, although I think we are really quite generous in helping when other Members of Congress come to the floor with problems in their district that nature has given to them. But it is really important that we do something about this this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure why the prices have risen. I agree with the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) who spoke previously that it needs a good investigation to make sure that at this time when temperatures are low that these costs are not deliberate. It is very important that we look at that.

In the meantime, I would like to urge the President and the Secretary of Energy to really include the action right now of releasing some oil from the strategic petroleum reserve. We must, as I said before, start a home-heating oil reserve in the Northeast so that we can have a long-term solution to this crisis.

One solution may be, as many speakers before me have pointed out, and I know that the President had brought up one year, is that why should LIHEAP money, which is really used for low-income heating, be sent throughout the 50 States and the territories. Might it not be more important that we send it to places where it is needed, and I would like to have that looked into as well. But action and not delay is needed now.

So, on behalf of all of my constituents today who are out trying to shovel off the roof, to make sure that the pipes are not frozen, keeping the heat in the house as low as they can so that they can afford to eat, I want to say to my colleagues and to everyone in this Congress that Mother Nature waits on no one and that quick action is needed for the people of the Northeast.

□

PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFITS

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

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, Congress is back in session; and while we are resuming our work, we have to attend first to part of the unfinished business of last year. All across this country, seniors are finding it harder and harder to take their prescription drugs, because they simply cannot afford to take the medication that their doctors tell them they must take. They are not following doctor's orders, simply because they cannot afford their medication. We have looked at this issue over the past year, the Democrats have looked at this issue, and are ready to go again, ready to do some work to relieve the problems that seniors and others are facing all around this country.

We need to do two things. First, we need to stop price discrimination against seniors. Second, we need to provide a universal prescription drug benefit under Medicare.

Let us start with what is going on in the real world. In the real world, many seniors are not filling their prescriptions or, when they do, they are taking one pill out of three. However, all across this country, they are finding they simply cannot afford to take the drugs that their doctors tell them they have to take.

Starting in my district of Maine, the First District of Maine and extending all across this country, the democratic staff of the Committee on Government Reform has done a series of studies. The first of those studies which I released in July of 1998 show this: on average, seniors pay twice as much for their medication as the drug company's best customers. Well, who are the best customers? They are HMOs, big hospitals, and the Federal Government itself buying prescription drugs for Medicaid recipients or for the Veterans' Administration. Twice as much. Seniors pay twice as much as the drug company's best customers.

Second, a study first done in October of 1998 and now replicated around the country revealed that citizens in Maine and across the country pay 72 percent more than Canadians and 102 percent more than Mexicans for the same drugs in the same quantities by the same manufacturer.

A third study that I released in November of 1999 showed that when drugs are manufactured for human use and sold to pharmacists, the charges are, on average, 151 percent more than when the same drug is sold to veterinarians for animal use. Any way we look at it, there is rampant price discrimination in this country against seniors and all of those other Americans who do not have coverage for their prescription drugs. The industry has engaged in this widespread price discrimination because frankly, what they are trying to do is to charge whatever the market will bear. So seniors, who have no insurance for their prescription drugs, pay the highest prices in the land because they have no bargaining power.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, we have to do two things. We have to stop price discrimination, and we have to provide a universal prescription drug benefit under Medicare. As one can see from this chart to my right, seniors are 12 percent of the population, but they buy 33 percent of all prescription drugs. Mr. Speaker, 37 percent of all seniors have absolutely no coverage at all for prescription medications. Another 25 to 30 percent have very inadequate coverage for their medications, so 60 percent or more are really struggling simply to take the medications that their doctors tell them they have to take.

Now, let us contrast the situation with the pharmaceutical industry. The pharmaceutical industry is the most profitable industry in the country. Every year, the Fortune magazine shows which industries are the most profitable, and every year by every measure it is the pharmaceutical industry. Just to give my colleagues one example, in terms of return on revenues, the pharmaceutical industry brings in 18.5 percent, on average. That is an average for those 10 or 12 pharmaceutical companies. The next most profitable industry comes in at 13.2 percent, a 40 percent plus difference.

In short, it comes down to this: the most profitable industry in the country is charging the highest prices in the world to those least able to afford it, primarily our seniors who do not have prescription drug coverage under Medicare. We aim to change that in two ways.

The Democrats tomorrow will begin a discharge petition to bring to this floor two bills, H.R. 664, the Prescription Drug Fairness for Seniors Act, and H.R. 1495, which would provide a Medicare prescription drug benefit. Here is what the Prescription Drug Fairness for Seniors Act does. This bill is very simple. It would allow pharmacists to buy drugs for Medicare beneficiaries at the best price given to the Federal Government. Remember, we were talking about that price discrimination, and this is the way to end price discrimination. It would give senior citizens the benefit of the same discount received by hospitals, big HMOs, and the Federal Government. It does not involve any significant increase in government spending. It creates no new bureaucracy.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell my colleagues that the pharmaceutical industry does not want this to happen, just as the pharmaceutical industry does not want a prescription drug benefit under Medicare. They will run TV ads saying they do, but they have helped to fund a group called the Citizens for Better Medicare which says seniors need a benefit, but I can tell my colleagues the pharmaceutical industry is blocking every effort to improve Medicare, to strengthen Medicare, to make sure that our seniors get what they need, which is coverage under Medicare and a prescription drug benefit.

I found that in my district, many seniors are confused when they get these Citizens for Better Medicare mailings. They think this is a group trying to improve our health care system, trying to extend coverage, but it is not. The fact is, it is a group that is funded by the pharmaceutical industry. They ran all of those ads featuring Flo last year, and now in some areas Flo is back. But over and over again the industry is the obstacle. We really can support one of two groups. One can line up with the pharmaceutical industry, or one can line up with our seniors.

Mr. Speaker, for H.R. 664 we have over 140 cosponsors in the House. Unfortunately, not one Republican has stepped forward. Not one Republican will support this legislation to give a discount to seniors who are already in a Federal health care plan called Medicare which does not provide prescription drug coverage, and all we are saying is give them the same break that hospitals get, that HMOs get, that the Veterans' Administration gets. That is all we are saying. Seniors deserve a break on the price of their prescription drug medications.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that so many of my colleagues have come here tonight to speak on this issue. I want to begin by yielding to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) for doing such a great job, in providing leadership in helping seniors get the medicines they need and to get them at fair prices. The gentleman is outstanding. Thanks a lot.

Mr. Speaker, prescription drugs are not affordable to the people who need them the most, and that is our seniors and other people on Medicare. That is not acceptable, point-blank, unacceptable. For many seniors, prescription drugs for arthritis, diabetes, high blood pressure and heart disease are simply a fact of life or death. However, because of the high cost of prescriptions, many seniors are forced to choose between buying food and buying medicine. That is not right.

In the case of Ivera and Roy Cob, residents of my district, paying for the prescriptions that they both need is impossible. So, Roy goes without some of his medications, medications he also needs, but he does that because he believes Ivera needs her medications more. They cannot afford his and hers. Seniors like Roy and Ivera should be deciding how much time to spend with their grandkids, not deciding who is going to get the medications they need to survive.

One reason many seniors cannot afford the drugs they need is because as the gentleman from Maine told us, the Nation's largest drug companies favor HMOs, insurance conglomerates, and government buyers with negotiating power, those who pay much less for prescription drugs, while many, many seniors on Medicare pay much higher prices for the same drugs.

According to a study I requested of the House Committee on Government Reform, seniors in my northern California district are being overcharged for the drugs they need to survive. In Sonoma County, California, seniors pay, on average, 145 percent more for the commonly used drugs than the favored customers pay. That is 145 percent more. In Marin County, California, just south of Sonoma, also my district, seniors pay 137 more.

Take, for example, Zocor, a drug used to lower cholesterol. Favored customers pay $35 for a dosage, but Sonoma County seniors pay $119, a price difference of 242 percent. That is outrageous.

The Republican leadership must stop dragging its feet and enact a meaningful prescription drug benefit for our seniors, a benefit that eliminates price discrimination. Our seniors do not have time to wait for the Republicans to play their political games. They need their medications and they need them now.

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow I will join my colleagues in signing a discharge petition to bring prescription drug legislation to the floor. The longer the leadership stalls, the less time one more child will have to spend with grandma or grandpa. Providing a prescription drug benefit and eliminating price gouging is a big job. It is a job that we must do, because treating our seniors with respect is our responsibility.

It is time for the majority leadership to step up to the challenge and give our seniors a break. It is a small measure for them to have prescription drugs that they can afford, but it is a measure that does not even compare to what they have done for us.

□ 1645

I thank the gentleman for making this possible tonight.

Mr. ALLEN. I thank the gentlewoman from California for her leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the other gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO).

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here today to further address the urgent need for decent prescription drug coverage for America's elderly citizens. Prescription drugs help keep our seniors well and they help hold down the cost of medical care in America. Many of these drugs, such as the blood pressure and cholesterol medication, serve as the valuable ounce of prevention, saving lives, cutting medical treatment costs.

The need for prescription drug coverage has always been a major priority among senior citizens. Now, with the steep increases in prescription drug costs and the growing importance of these drugs in preventing and treating diseases, the need for prescription drug coverage for all Medicare beneficiaries is more important than ever.

Opponents of a Medicare prescription drug plan would say that most Medicare beneficiaries already get prescription drugs through other sources, and therefore, they do not need the government's help. However, we do know that the Medicare program generally does not cover prescription drug costs. It is estimated that over 13 million Medicare beneficiaries have no prescription drug coverage.

Opponents of a Medicare prescription plan claim that Medicare beneficiaries get their prescription drugs from retiree health plans. However, there is only a very lucky few, about one-quarter of these, that have access to employee-sponsored retirement plans.

Opponents of the prescription drug benefits state that many seniors may also purchase drug coverage through a Medigap prescription drug policy. However, these are very expensive. Depending on the State, the premium could run from $100 a month up. These costs increase substantially with age, as drug coverage under this plan becomes priced out of reach. The burden particularly affects women, who make up 73 percent of those over age 85.

Opponents would say that if seniors want prescription drug benefits, they should enroll in a Medicare HMO. However, they are not available in all parts of the country. In addition, the Medicare+Choice plans limit coverage to $1,000 or less for each beneficiary per year.

Recent studies also show that seniors who buy their own medicine because they do not belong to HMOs or have additional insurance coverage are paying twice as much on average than HMOs and insurance companies, Medicaid, Federal health programs, and other purchasers. Pharmaceutical companies are charging competitive prices that are tantamount to price discrimination against our seniors.

These seniors, Mr. Speaker, live on fixed incomes. They either have to choose between food, oil to warm up, or to medicate themselves to be able to live. They cannot afford to take the drugs that their doctors prescribe them, and they stretch, as we have heard, many different ways, or they do not take them.

We should not force them to choose between paying for food, paying for heating costs, or paying for medicine. We cannot afford not to cover drug prescriptions. What we will save as a result of seniors' access to these medicines is going to exceed the cost that may be incurred as a result of debilitating illnesses that seniors will suffer if they cannot get these drugs.

We must stop this price discrimination. We in Congress cannot continue to stand by and see our elderly, our seniors, mentors, and family members suffer. Let us enact an effective Medicare prescription drug benefit and support H.R. 664 offered by the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman very much for all her good work on this issue.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY), who has been a real leader on this particular issue and has felt the efforts, I guess I would say, of the pharmaceutical industry to stop her from speaking out. But she is back. We are glad she is here.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. I am back. First of all, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN), for all the work he has done in the leadership. Right now I do not think there is a bigger issue facing seniors in Oregon and elsewhere in the United States than prescription drugs.

Two months ago, Mr. Speaker, a massive ad campaign was undertaken in the Portland media market attacking me for defending senior citizens who cannot afford the high cost of prescription drugs. The ads were paid for by Citizens for Better Medicare, a group that looks grass roots, an organization that claims to be representing interests of patients and seniors, but as we all know, looks can be deceiving. In reality, this ad campaign was primarily funded by the pharmaceutical companies.

Mr. Speaker, let me set the record straight, I do not want to get in a shoving match with the pharmaceutical industry. These companies spend tens of millions of dollars to develop cures for diseases, and we should take great care to work with them and help them make these essential medicines more affordable for our seniors and working families.

But in that same light, I am not going to let multi-million dollar ad campaigns prevent me from doing something in this Congress to act on this issue.

As Members can see, I have heard from a lot of people in my district. This is just part of it. I could not carry it all over. Some of it is in my Oregon office. People have sent me letters. They have sent me copies of their drugs. I want to tell the Members something, in many cases they are paying 50 percent of their take-home income that is being spent on prescription drugs. They are demanding some kind of relief in Washington, D.C.

This is just a month's worth of receipts from Harry Percy, a constituent of mine in Salem, Oregon. He had to pay over $200 this month for prescription drugs, even though he is enrolled in a health maintenance organization. The sad thing is, Mr. Percy is not any different from the thousands of other seniors I have talked to, or from the hundreds of letters that we see here.

At my request, the staff of the Committee on Government Reform recently conducted a study to determine how much more people like Harry Percy in the Fifth Congressional District in Oregon are paying for their medication than customers are paying in countries like Mexico and Canada.

I requested this study because I found out that a lot of my seniors were going to Canada to buy their drugs. I was surprised to learn that in the Fifth Congressional District of Oregon, they pay 83 percent more for the same drugs than consumers in Canada, and they pay 82 percent more, on average, for prescription drugs than Mexican consumers. These are the same drugs, the same amount, sold by the same pharmaceutical companies.

For example, an uninsured senior in my district who had to take Prilosec to treat an ulcer must pay over $80 more than in Mexico or $86 more than in Canada for that same drug. I also did a study, a comparison of how much those uninsured seniors paid compared to the most favored customers that the drug companies sell to. In that case, they paid almost twice as much than their favored customers.

We have to change this. Congress is having a hard time agreeing on how to make such an effort work. We need to work together, but lately the big drug companies have been getting into the mix. What they are trying to do is scare seniors into thinking that prescription drug costs will rise if the government tries to help those seniors in the middle. Yet, we know that over one-third of seniors have no prescription drug coverage, so they must pay for their medication with their own limited resources.

As I stated earlier, they have made remarkable progress in finding new drugs, in helping people live a better life, but it does not do any good if they cannot afford to take those drugs. Seniors I know that do not take the drugs that have been prescribed to them live in pain and discomfort. Many times, if they do not take them they end up in a nursing home, or the worst case, a hospital, or they die prematurely. They also suffer anxiety and depression over the fact that they have a hard time paying for their medication.

American seniors should not pay the highest prices in the world for their

prescription drugs. Frankly, it is unfair, it is wrong, and it is time for this Congress to act.

For any of my constituents that happen to be watching this, they can rest assured that I will remain committed to making prescription drugs more affordable and accessible. Tomorrow I will also sign the discharge petition to try to get this bill on the floor of the House.

I know we can reach a solution through reasoned debate and bipartisan compromise, but it is time for Congress to act to assure that no older American anywhere has to choose between buying medicine or food, between paying their heating bill or their drugstore account, or between taking their medicine or living in pain and anxiety.

Again, I thank the gentleman for his effort. He has been a great leader.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY) very much. I appreciate all she has done.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from the great State of Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY), a short way down.

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maine for helping us highlight this issue, which is very important to me.

As the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY) alluded to, I was also unmercifully attacked by the pharmaceutical companies. It has only made me more resolute in my desire to provide relief for my older Americans who simply cannot afford the high cost of prescription medication. I quite agree with the gentlewoman when she states, what is the point of being able to create these wonderful miracle drugs if we cannot afford to take them? That is a serious problem in my district.

I rise today in strong support of including a prescription drug benefit in Medicare. I am also in favor of lowering the high cost of prescription drugs for older Americans. As a cosponsor of both H.R. 664, the Prescription Drug Fairness for Seniors Act, and H.R. 1495, the Access to Prescription Medications in Medicare Act, I believe Congress must act now to ensure that our Nation's seniors have access to affordable prescription drugs.

Why is this issue so important to me? Because I have the fastest growing senior population in the United States in southern Nevada. Each week when I return to southern Nevada, I hear story after story from seniors experiencing great difficulty paying for their prescription medications. They are asking for relief. They are begging for relief.

In particular, one constituent's story resonates in my mind. I would like to share that with the gentleman. Sister Rosemary Lynch is an 83-year-old Franciscan nun in my hometown of Las Vegas who is currently taking multiple prescription drugs to treat glaucoma, high blood pressure, and severe allergies. Every month she struggles to pay for these costly medications.

Sadly, she is not alone. Unfortunately, there are 14 million other Medicare beneficiaries in our Nation with no prescription drug insurance. Last spring, I asked the Committee on Government Reform to investigate prescription drug price discrimination in the congressional district that I represent, which is the First Congressional District in Nevada.

I was appalled, I was appalled, to discover that the evidence showed that seniors are charged 126 percent more for their prescription drugs than are drug companies' most-favored customers. Who are those? The HMOs and the Federal government.

In addition, a second study showed that Nevada seniors pay more than 90 percent more for prescription medication, the exact same medication, mind you, that seniors pay for in Canada and Mexico. The result of this is that I have many, many senior citizens who live in Las Vegas, Nevada, live in southern Nevada, live in Henderson or north Las Vegas, that travel all the way to Mexico in order to be able to afford the prescription medication that their doctors in southern Nevada are prescribing.

I have made a firm commitment to the seniors in my district, the seniors in the United States, and now Congress must make a firm commitment to our seniors, as well, and pass a comprehensive prescription medication benefit for all Medicare beneficiaries.

Tomorrow I will be standing here proudly signing the discharge petitions to urge consideration of the prescription drug bills of which I have spoken. It is my hope, it is my fervent hope, that the leadership in Congress will bring these proposals to the floor so that all seniors can have access to affordable prescription medication.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Nevada very much.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER), who with the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY) and me is a co-chair of the Prescription Drug Task Force. No one has worked longer or harder on this issue to try to get some fairness for seniors, trying to stop price discrimination and get to a Medicare benefit. I thank the gentleman for being here tonight.

□ 1700

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to be here with all of the Members who have spoken on this issue. I really do appreciate the fact that we have this hour to talk about this very important issue. It has been almost 2 years since we first addressed the problem of discriminatory pricing in drugs, the problems of lack of access to prescription drugs at affordable prices. I appreciate the leadership the gentleman has given, as well as the leadership of the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY) here tonight on the floor next to me from Arkansas, and on my left the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. SHOWS), who has filed a discharge petition. That is why we are here tonight talking about this issue, because tomorrow we are going to have for the first time an opportunity to get a chance to bring this issue to the floor of the House of Representatives.

After these many months of collecting support, of cosponsors, I believe we have close now, with over 140 Democrats who have joined wanting to do something about the high price of prescription drugs. Tomorrow we will have that chance by joining and signing the discharge petition that will bring the bill that the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN), the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY), and I introduced back almost a year ago, as well as the other bill to provide a prescription drug benefit under Medicare.

This issue hits very close to home for all of us. I know in my district, I have 84,000 senior citizens, the highest number of seniors in any congressional district in Texas. I hear from them. We saw the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY) bring to the floor a stack of letters. I have a similar stack. Seniors are concerned about the problem of the high price of their prescription medications.

Just to give an example, I visited with a lady over a year ago in a pharmacy in Orange when we were going around talking about this issue initially, Ms. Frances Staley. She is 85 years old. Mrs. Staly is blind. She is a beautiful lady. She spends about half of her $700 Social Security check every month just on her prescriptions. That is her sole source of income, Social Security.

I had a letter from Billy and Joe O'Leary. I have met them and know them well and they wrote, they live down in Silsbee, they spend $400 a month for eight prescription medicines.

I want to read just a little section from the letter that they sent to me. It really makes a whole lot of sense. We hear this cry from the big drug manufacturers that, oh, well, we cannot do anything about drug prices or we will not have any money for research. Well, none of us want to cut off funds for research in the pharmaceutical industry. We have a lot of new drugs that have come on the market, done a lot of wonderful things but here is what Mr. and Mrs. O'Leary had to say about it in their letter to me. They said, what good is research and finding cures for disease if a large part of our population cannot afford the medicine for the cure?

That is the bottom line. We have to be sure that our seniors have access to affordable prescription drugs.

Archie and Linda Davidson of Vidor, Texas, have spent more than $3,500 in the last 6 months just for their prescription medicines.

I had a nice visit with a gentleman down in Hull in Liberty County, Texas, a few months ago; and he came up to me, and this is hard to believe, but he has told me, he said, my wife and I both have a lot of prescription medicines we have to take every month. He

says, it costs us $1,400 a month. Now, I do not know how long the gentleman from Hull can pay that kind of cost; but the truth is, everyone that has had to buy prescription medications knows that the prices are higher and higher and higher every month that passes.

This is, indeed, a national problem, and I think that it is time that we do something about it.

Let us look at the big picture. Senior citizens spend three times as much of their income on health care as compared to that which is spent by the average American. The elderly, who are 12 percent of our entire Nation's population, purchase one-third of all prescription drugs and yet nearly 40 percent of all senior citizens have no prescription drug coverage.

One in five of our elderly citizens takes at least five prescription drugs a day, and more than 2.2 million seniors spend more than $100 a month for medication and many pay much more.

The bottom line is, senior citizens in our country today are paying the highest prices for prescription drugs of anyone in our society. The studies which the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) did, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY) did, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. SHOWS) did, and many of the others that are here, show indisputably that senior citizens pay on average twice as much as the favored customers of the big drug manufacturers.

The favored customers are the big hospital chains, the big HMOs. Those are the folks who are getting the good deals and our senior citizens, without prescription drug coverage, who walk into their local pharmacy, are paying twice as much as those favored customers. That is just not right.

When we did the international study, we found that folks in the United States are paying over twice what the folks in other industrialized countries around the world are paying. We have to do something about this problem. We have to do something about it soon, and tomorrow is our first opportunity to sign the discharge petition, which is a procedure that we use around here to force an issue to the floor that we feel strongly about.

I thank the gentleman for the leadership he has given, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN), on this critical issue.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER). He summarized this issue very, very well.

If I could just add one other point. The situation gets worse year by year. If we think the situation is bad now, spending on prescription drugs is going up 15 to 18 percent year after year after year. The problem on average will be 15 to 18 percent more a year from now than it is today. Think about those seniors that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) was talking about. They are a part of the biggest health care plan in the country. It is called Medicare. The way the law works now, it is okay for the Veterans Administration to get a discount. It is okay for the medicaid program to get a discount. It is okay for big HMOs and hospitals to get a discount, but it is not okay for people who are Medicare beneficiaries, who have worked hard all their lives, played by the rules, now they are in a Federal health care plan called Medicare and they cannot get a discount under existing law.

That is what we are trying to do, trying to stop price discrimination and provide a prescription drug benefit under Medicare that will cover all Medicare beneficiaries.

I want now to turn to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL). He, too, has been the object of attack from the pharmaceutical companies. I have to say that I hope that conveys to the constituents in his district how hard he has been working on this issue that they would single him out for attack.

We are very pleased to have the gentleman here tonight and I yield some time to him.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN), for yielding to me. I thank him for his leadership on this very important issue.

Mr. Speaker, Juanita Johns is one of my constituents back in the Second District in Colorado, and she told me she used to keep her thermostat at 60 degrees so she could pay her drug bills. In addition to that, a few times a week she would visit the food bank so she could eat, and eventually she sold her house and moved in with her son so she could afford her medicines.

Now this is intolerable. Seniors should not be forced to make that kind of decision between buying food or buying their medicine or paying their utility bills. Her story, Juanita's story, is one of many that I have heard from seniors in my district.

I, too, had a study done by the House Committee on Government Reform that found that seniors in my district who pay for their own prescription drugs pay more than twice what the drug companies' most-favored customer, such as HMOs and the Federal Government, pay.

It is clear that rising prescription drug prices and eroding coverage are squeezing seniors' incomes. My colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER), mentioned that seniors make up 12 percent of the population, but they use one-third of all prescription drugs. They have the greatest need for these drugs, but they often do not have adequate insurance coverage to pay for them. That adds up to more than 15 million seniors in our Nation who do not have any sort of drug benefit.

As the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) mentioned, Medicare's basic package does not include it. Employers are scaling back or dropping retiree health coverage, and premiums for supplemental medigap policies and drug coverage has in many cases reached unaffordable levels. That is why I am a strong supporter of H.R. 664, the Prescription Drug Fairness for Seniors Act.

This simple and important piece of legislation would end unfair drug pricing discrimination and could save seniors up to 40 percent of their drug bills.

It is hard to understand why anyone would be against making prescription drugs more affordable, but during the winter recess, as the gentleman referenced, a group called the Citizens for Better Medicare ran attack radio and TV ads against me because of my efforts to help seniors fill their medicine cabinets with affordable, lifesaving medications. It struck me that it was an Astroturf campaign that was designed to look like a grass-roots initiative; but it was really intended, in my opinion, to protect the profits of the pharmaceutical companies, scare seniors, and spread misinformation.

As the gentleman remembers, these ads confused H.R. 664 with President Clinton's proposal to have Medicare directly cover seniors' drug costs. The ads had a toll-free number for seniors; and when the seniors called the phone bank, then the operator asked them if they would like to be connected to my office, and then they were directly connected to my office.

Oftentimes when the seniors reached my office, they did not know who they were talking to or really what was going on. It also served the purpose of tying my office up for an entire week. I received thousands of telegrams in addition to these phone calls.

To summarize, it was really a classic bait and switch kind of campaign, where the ads attacked me for being on the bill of the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN), but all of the communication my office received was about the President's proposal.

Now I have not expressed a position on the President's proposal; but, however I, do support a Medicare prescription drug benefit that is fiscally responsible and fair.

Needless to say, this ad campaign did not wash with Coloradans.

I want to quote from a couple of newspapers. An editorial in the Denver Post described the ads as ''vicious and outrageous untruths.'' The Boulder Daily Camera called these ads ''a vaguely worded and deceptive advertising campaign.'' Thankfully, many people saw through this well-organized campaign and called my office to offer their support.

I looked with interest last month at the news that the drug companies are dropping their opposition to creating this drug benefit under Medicare. The change in their rhetoric is significant. It shows they realize there is a problem and they are willing to work with the Congress on a solution. As I think many of the previous speakers mentioned, we all here have been supportive of the research and development tax credit so the pharmaceutical companies can find these lifesaving

medications, but we also feel that there ought to be fair pricing.

There will be plenty of time for politics later this year. I am not interested in playing politics with this issue, and I do not think the 15 million seniors who do not have prescription drug benefits want to play politics, either. I am looking for solutions. Let us end this price discrimination. Let us provide universal prescription drug coverage for seniors. People like Juanita Johns in my district and people all over the country are counting on us.

I again thank the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) for all his good work on this issue.

I would like now to turn to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. SHOWS). The gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. SHOWS) may be a freshman, but he has been an early and enthusiastic supporter and is now the author of the discharge petition on H.R. 664, which all of us have been working on so hard. I am just very pleased that the gentleman is going to be the sponsor of this discharge petition on the bill; and I trust that a very large group from this caucus, the Democratic Caucus, will come in tomorrow and sign that discharge petition and try to get this bill to the floor over the opposition of the Republican leadership; because the fact remains, as urgent as this problem is, we do not have one single Republican as a cosponsor of H.R. 664, and there is absolutely no indication that the leadership would bring this bill to the floor or bring to the floor a bill that would provide a Medicare prescription drug benefit for all Medicare beneficiaries.

Mr. SHOWS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN), for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am hoping they are going to have a vision when this discharge petition comes to the floor because I think when their seniors start calling them about whose side are they on, are they on our side or the pharmaceutical side, I believe they are going to have a vision that they need to get on our side and sign this discharge petition, because I guess so many of us, in my district, and I live in Jeff Davis County in the Fourth Congressional District in Mississippi, and we have so many people that they do not have the means to buy their medication.

One of the problems we have, we have a lot of high unemployment in Mississippi right now. In my congressional district, and I am putting this in perspective in the cost of these prescription drugs, we have lost somewhere around 4,000 jobs because of NAFTA. They are in Mexico right now. Our problem, we have a lot of people who do not have the money to buy these drugs. I can give an instance from around every corner. We have a Ms. Bruce who used to live by herself in Clinton, Mississippi. She enjoyed all the freedoms of being a senior, except when it came time to buy her prescription medicine, which absolutely forced her from living by herself independently to moving in with her daughter.

□ 1715

She pays hundreds of dollars each month for prescription medicine while living on a fixed income. She told me that if it was not for her daughter, she did not know exactly what she would do. And what she worries about and what she is concerned about, I say to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN), is what about some of these seniors who do not have family to help take care of them? It is a crying shame.

My own mother-in-law who, if it was not for my wife and my brother-in-law's helping to take care of her, would be in the same situation. Mr. Speaker, she feels a burden on her daughter for having to do this. She should not have to be doing this.

The bad thing about it, she is having more visits to the hospital, so her costs may increase because of more medication she may have to take. I can think of no other issue that needs to be addressed more than the costs of medicine to our seniors.

Because of Ms. Bruce and millions of others like her not only in Mississippi but the seniors across this country, that is the reason we are going to file this discharge petition February the 16. Because of the job that you have done, I say to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN), we would not have the opportunity to do that.

I thank you personally for that, not only for myself, but for the millions of Americans in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I filed a discharge petition to force a vote on H.R. 664, the Prescription Drug Fairness for Seniors Act. I do not think we can wait. I do not think our seniors can wait any longer for this to happen.

I am like a lot of other Congressmen in my district. We went back and we did a survey of all of our drug stores and I know this may be repetitive and a lot of other people might have talked about it, but I am finding the same numbers that the other Members on the Democratic side are finding. We are finding disproportionate costs for people in America, in Mississippi, in buying prescription medicine. It is more expensive than purchasing them in Mexico, Canada, or Europe or even the HMOs.

Mr. Speaker, I can give you a for instance. In Collins, Mississippi, when we were doing our bus tour, we had an audience, a lot of people, a lot of them were seniors, and this elderly man and woman came in, the gentleman had a cane and his wife was there helping him in the room. He got in there and I referred him to Annette, who handles some of our Social Security cases and so on.

I noticed, I looked at him, within a few minutes, he was crying, I say to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN). The man was crying. His wife, she was trying to support him. He went to the hospital.

Here is a man that probably fought in World War II and probably lived through the Depression, went through the hardest time this century has ever seen to make sure our country is free. Now he is having another war, and that war is trying to pay for his prescription medication and his health care.

What had happened when he went to the hospital, he lost his insurance. He was late on paying the insurance bill. He could not pay. Then after they were given the bill 3 times, they had to turn them over to the credit bureau, the collection agency.

And to add insult to injury, he cannot even afford his prescription medication. This gentleman does not know what to do. I mean, he is depressed. He does not really know where to go. Where can he go?

He ought to be able to come to us and try to get some help trying to make sure these affordable costs should be affordable.

We can go to Ellisville, Mississippi, there is a Don Skoggins of Skoggins Drug Store there in Ellisville, Mississippi. And I had a lady come in there, she was on Medicare. And her problem was she has been totally disabled. She heard what we are talking about. She said her medication costs her $700 a month, $700 a month, her income is $399 a month.

She told me if it was not for her sons and daughters taking care of her, there was no way she could even buy her food. And this can go on. I know we have all our stories, but this is the reason we are trying to do this.

Everybody says this is not the way to do it. This is the way to do it. The way I look at it, we are using 39 million people in Medicare as a leverage to negotiate a better price for the prescription medicine, just like the Wal-Marts do, just like the Rite-Aids do, just like the Federal Government does with the veterans.

What is the difference? They are all made up of people. They are all made up of people. Medicare, yes, that is not 39 million people. Why not use that as a leverage to negotiate a fair price for your prescription medicine? It does not make sense not to do that. Any good businessman would do that.

Mr. Speaker, this is what we are trying to do with H.R. 664. I am sure they might have to raise the price. But let us let them raise their price in Mexico. Let us let them raise their price in Canada. Let us let them raise their price in Europe. Why should the American citizen, the senior pay the highest price for prescription drugs in the world? It does not make sense.

I am going to tell you when this thing comes down and I have got to choose on my right hand pharmaceutical companies, on my left hand the seniors, I will tell you who I am going to pick; I am going to pick those

seniors, just like I believe the majority of this Congress will.

It is almost like the Patient's Bill of Rights. We could not get the bill passed. When that discharge petition was filed and the constituents back home started seeing who was not supporting them and they found out who their real friends were, guess what, that bill passed.

I have to believe that is going to happen right here. And I thank the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) for doing this.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, those stories are legend. I have these letters from women who say I do not want my husband to know, but I am not taking my medication, because he is sicker than I am, and we cannot both afford to take the medications that our doctors tell us we have to take. It is a national scandal. We need to do something about it.

One of the people who has been working on this now steadily for the last couple of years is the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY), who is a cochair with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) and myself of the Prescription Drug Task Force in the Congress. And the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY) has been terrific.

I thank the gentleman for his leadership on all of this.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN). I want to also acknowledge his great leadership, not only for the United States Congress, but for the State of Maine. Of course, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. SHOWS) have done a great job also in moving this issue forward.

We have heard a lot of stories here this afternoon. Who we are talking about is the greatest generation that Tom Brokaw wrote so eloquently about, the people that were born and grew up during the Depression fought World War II and then built this country into the greatest Nation it has ever been.

They thought they were working hard, playing by the rules and going to be able to retire in a decent situation, but because of the incredible costs of prescription medicine only in the United States, they have been forced to deal with untenable situations in their own personal economics.

Each day in our congressional office, we hear from more and more seniors that have to choose between food and medicine. I think we should make the point that the retail pharmacies are not making this money. The retail pharmacies have done heroic work in trying to provide this product to our senior citizens and to other Americans at a fair price. They have kept their margins down. Many times they have sacrificed not only their own profit but their own economic well-being trying to provide this medicine to the people that need it.

Mr. Speaker, the prescription drug manufacturers are the people that are making this money. They are the most profitable companies in the world. They pay less taxes than any other business in this country. The American taxpayer pays for much of the research and development of the new products that we hear so much about.

The drug companies will tell you if we lose these massive profits, we will not be able to develop new products. We have heard that story before. When generic drugs were made legal in this country, they said you are going to destroy us. They have more than doubled their investment in research and development, because they get a patent on their product. They have an exclusive right to sell it for 20 years.

We know that that just simply is not true. The point that has already been made, and I thought made well, what good does it do to have a new product if you cannot afford to buy it? I think that is a very good point.

Our seniors are put in that position every day where they cannot afford to buy the product that they need to keep them alive. Then the manufacturers chooses to sell these same products all over the world. You go anyplace else in the world, it does not matter, you can buy it for half as much as you pay here, or a third as much, sometimes a tenth as much.

It is unbelievable to me that we would allow that to happen, that we just let that go on and on and on. Mr. Speaker, I am not against the drug companies making profits. I think we all want them to be successful. We want them to do very well. We want them to keep doing research and development.

They do a great job of it. We want them to make money, but not by taking the food from the mouths of a senior citizen that has worked hard, played by the rules and deserves a whole lot better, and we promised them a lot better.

It is time for us to do something about it. Seniors spend more on prescriptions than they do for hospital and doctor bills now. When Medicare was first brought into being, that was not the case, the great fear in health care was that you have a big hospital or doctor bill.

But in the day of the world marketplace and in the Internet, it is unbelievable that we have laws in place in this country to give the prescription drug manufacturers a captive market. Only in this country do they charge these outrageous prices.

Another point I would make is that inflation for prescription medicines is about 15 to 18 percent a year, 3 to 4 times as much as for the rest of the economy. And many of these prices that go up every year 15 to 18 percent are on products that were brought on to the market 50 years ago. They have been around almost as long as I have, some of them longer.

We still keep raising the price and raising the price for no good reason, except that they can get by with it, except that we allow it to happen, because we do not have a competitive marketplace.

Mr. Speaker, the seniors in the First Congressional District of Arkansas over and over ask me when are we going to get some relief. It is a heartbreaking thing, as my colleague from Maine can attest to, to have to face these seniors and say I do not know, we are working on it. That does not help these folks much when their drug bills are from $200 to $300 a month to over $1,000 a month, and maybe their Social Security check is $500; that does not do much for them.

I do not blame them when they look at me, like what are you talking about? I need some help right now. It is time to do something. I am so pleased that the Democratic Caucus decided it is time to do something. We are going to sign those discharge petitions. We are going to do something about this.

It is time for the United States Congress to do what is right, to move this issue forward and to treat our senior citizens with the respect and dignity and fairness that they have absolutely earned.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, very well said, I say to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY), very well said.

I turn now to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. THURMAN) who has been working so hard on this issue working in the Committee on Ways and Means and in her own district to try to lower the costs of prescription drugs for seniors.

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) for yielding. I would also like to have the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) join in this because I know our time is very limited.

Mr. CROWLEY. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mrs. THURMAN. I do just want to say, we had a hearing in the Committee on Ways and Means on prescription drugs, and I will tell you if people are watching this tonight, maybe they will turn on C–SPAN when this hearing is replayed, because it gave us some very interesting new information or at least information that has been around that was kind of reiterated.

I think one of the big issues that I heard today is just on the whole issue of the R&D and what is happening. One of the things that they pointed out, if I can find it here, was something done by Merrill Lynch who actually said that, and under your bill, basically said the toughest proposal on the table in Washington, because it is the best benefit, because it gives seniors about a 40 percent break in their costs, said assumed would provide a 40 percent price break for all Medicare beneficiaries, would reduce drug industry sales revenue by 3.3 percent, because of the volume prices.

I think what the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) will tell you, if he will just give me some time back and forth, I will yield, you are going to

hear why from our constituents. These are such compelling stories. This is not a partisan debate.

We went to our constituents and said, please tell us what is happening to you. And I say to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), I would love to hear what some of his folks are saying.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. THURMAN). I call now the main man on this issue, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN), he is the main man as we say back in New York on this issue.

□ 1730

I have a letter here from two constituents of mine, Don and Gert Schwartz from Long Island City. I will not go into their ages, but they are considerably older than I am. And he talks about the fact that he had to purchase for his wife Prilosec, a hundred tablets, $394 dollars for just one prescription of Prilosec.

Somebody had a study done thanks to the help and aid of the office of the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN). When you compare the prices between what people in New York and Queens and the Bronx are paying for prescription drugs and what they are paying just over the border in Canada, it is amazing. For the same drug in Canada, $184; $394 in New York. It is ridiculous. It is simply ridiculous.

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is ridiculous. Let me just give my colleagues some ideas of what happens when they get into the situation.

This is a letter, and I have not been able to ask them for permission to use this, so I am just going to kind of read an outset. ''My father has threatened to give up his medications just so my mother can continue taking hers. This would mean he would die in a very short time.'' That is another kind of compelling thing.

I have another one from a woman who has taken her mother, who had a stroke, in her house. So not only is she having to care for her and having to have somebody come in and care for her, she is also having to pick up her prescription drug because she has no benefit; and she says it is absolutely crippling them.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have another example here from a gentleman in Middle Village in Queens, New York, another constituent. He has to purchase efudex. He paid $104 in New York, which is the going rate. He did a lot of shopping around. His daughter brought back the same prescription for him when she was visiting Ireland, and she paid only $13 for the two; and that is without any insurance whatsoever. The price of $13 and go over to the other side of the Atlantic and it is $104.

Again, just the constituents alone. We are grateful to do the studies. We do not have to do these studies to find out. We just listen to our constituents, and they will tell us exactly what these findings are saying. There is something wrong here in this country.

And the work that the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. THURMAN) are doing to pass this bill, which is so important to the people of this country, I really do applaud them all and all those people in this Congress who are supporting this measure. It is really what the American people want to see happen right now.

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Speaker, another thing that is happening, and the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) can tell us, too, and certainly from the area that he is from, I mean, I have been absolutely envious of what New England is looking at doing and I think probably precipitated by the work my colleague has done here in Congress, all of a sudden they are starting to get a lot of heat in the State legislatures to try to do something about this and pooling, which really goes back to what we are doing here.

Mr. CROWLEY. The New Yorkers are doing the same thing, as well.

Mrs. THURMAN. Right, you are doing it with them because of the amount of people you can bring together. But it is because this issue has been raised by people like the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN), who have said, enough is enough, and there just comes a saturation.

But do my colleagues know what is even harder in all of this? It is a moving target on the costs. The target keeps moving for these people. Their incomes are not going up. And all of a sudden one month they go to the pharmacist and the pharmacist says this medicine, and here is a woman who is actually taking something to treat both advanced and early stage breast cancer, that is what the medicine is for, in May it was $132.22. In December it was $156.59. It is outrageous.

I do not know what is going on out there, but I tell you what, we are going to find out. I applaud the efforts, and I look forward to signing this petition tomorrow.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues and I thank all of the Members who have been here. Our mission is simple. We are trying to stop price discrimination and provide a Medicare prescription drug benefit, and we can do this. The Democratic Caucus is committed to those goals. If we can just get some Republicans on board, we can achieve it in this Congress.

Some seniors struggle monthly to buy medicine for themselves. Social Security payments rise with inflation, but drug prices have risen even more. Lanoxin, the most prescribed drug for older people, increased 15 percent from 1998 to 1999. More than 87 percent over 5 years.

I read conflicting statistics about drug prices. One editorial may say that prescription drugs Americans can already afford. They say the average cost of drugs is $350 per American per year. But they do not tell that this price included the entire population, old and young alike.

Seniors at the low end of the income scale, transplant patients, and the disabled need drugs continually to stay alive. By bringing the Stark-Dingell and Allen-Turner-Shows bills to the floor we can begin the dialogue needed to move forward.

Nearly half of those on Medicare have incomes less than $15,000 a year. A prescription drug benefit is what seniors on the low-income scale want and these two bills address those needs. We know we need to move forward in our discussions, and get these prescription drug bills on the House floor to discuss. We need to protect our elderly, Mr. Speaker.

Medicare should guarantee access to a voluntary prescription drug benefit and provide comprehensive coverage for seniors. Also, Medicare prescription drug benefit must not reduce access to other Medicare benefits.

I request that these two bills come to the floor so that we can all take part in a discussion on how to improve Medicare coverage, affordability, administration, and the quality of prescription drug access. Prescription drugs can prevent, treat, and cure more diseases than ever before. Prolonging and improving the quality of life. No one would design Medicare today without including coverage for prescription drugs.

For example, there is the case of a 70-year-old Durham, NC, widow with emphysema, high blood pressure, and arthritis whose monthly bills for Prilosec, Norvase, two inhalers, and nitroglycerin which has forced her daughter to take out a second mortgage on her home. (Testimony of Michael Hash, Deputy Administrator, Health Care Financing before the House Commerce Committee, Subcommittee on Health & Environment, Sept. 28, 1999.)

Only one in four Medicare beneficiaries or 24 percent has private sector coverage provided by former employers to retirees. I might point out, that the number of firms offering retiree health coverage dropped by 25 percent from 1994 to 1998 (Foster-Higgins research firm).

Currently, less than 1 in 10 Medicare beneficiaries has drug coverage from a supplemental Medigap plan. Costs for these policies are rising rapidly, by 35 percent between 1994 and 1998 according to Consumer Reports.

We need to talk about these two drug bills on the House floor today. The ranks of people of the age 65 will double to 70 million by the year 2030. On average, people over 65 fill between nine and a dozen prescriptions a year, compared with two or three for people between the ages of 25 and 44. These numbers are not hidden from the general population. They are in the Wall Street Journal. However, if the elderly do read and must make a choice between reading the Wall Street Journal and obtaining drugs to maintain daily life, perhaps, they are hidden from the population that is currently on Medicare.

I could go on, Mr. Speaker, but I feel that it is time to bring these bills to the floor. Therefore, I request the discharge of these two bills.

□

HMO REFORM AND CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

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

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, I want to speak about HMO reform and about campaign finance reform today. Let me start out with HMO reform.

A few years ago down in Texas, the Texas Legislature passed a series of HMO reform bills almost unanimously in their State legislature. These bills addressed issues like emergency room care. If you had a crushing chest pain and thought you were going to have a heart attack, you could go to the emergency room and then the HMO could not come back and say afterwards if the EKG was normal, well, we are not going to pay for this.

The Texas legislature addressed issues like access to specialists. They addressed issues like when an HMO would say we do not think that that treatment that your doctor and your specialist have recommended is medically necessary and then deny that care just arbitrarily.

So they held a big debate in Texas. This was now about 3 or 4 years ago. And the Texas legislature passed a series of bills, some of them almost unanimously, without dissenting vote I think in the Texas Senate and maybe with only two dissenting votes in the Texas House, sent those bills to the governor's desk, and he allowed them to become law.

At that time, the HMO industry in Texas said the sky would fall, the sky would fall. You will see a plethora of lawsuits; you will see premiums go out of sight; you will see the HMO industry in Texas shrivel up and move away.

Well, what has been the actual result? The actual result has been that, since Texas passed its law, there have only been about four lawsuits filed in the last several years; and those were primarily when the HMOs did not follow the law. The premiums did not go up significantly. There were 30 HMOs in Texas when the bills were passed, and there are over 50 now. That law is working.

So we passed a bill here in the House that was modeled after that Texas legislation, legislation that Governor Bush, for instance, has said that he agrees with and thinks ought to be Federal law. We passed that bill. And, once again, the HMOs said, the sky will fall, the sky will fall; premiums will go out of sight; etcetera.

Well, we got a score back from the Congressional Budget Office on the cost of the bill that we passed here on the floor by a vote of 275–151. And over 5 years, the Congressional Budget Office said the cost of that legislation would cause premiums to go up about 4.1 percent total, nothing in the first year probably, and then maybe about 1 percent each year for about 4 years and that would be it.

The cost of that reflected in the average premium for a family would be about the cost of a Big Mac meal once a month. Not exactly the sky is falling, the sky is falling. In fact, the part of the bill that cost the most was the part that is designed to prevent lawsuits, and that was the internal and external reviews part.

So I would call my colleagues' attention to the Congressional Budget Office. But be careful, because the HMO industry in the past has said that these percentage increases are annual percentage increases. That is wrong. When we see 4 percent, okay, that is 4 percent cumulative over 5 years. So be careful on that.

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

Mr. GANSKE. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I have seen the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE) on the floor of the House so many times talking about this issue. And I have learned a lot. I have learned a tremendous amount, and it was ultimately why I was very happy to support his legislation.

I represent a district with a lot of Democrats, a lot of Republicans, a lot of conservatives, a lot of moderates and liberals. It is a very mixed district. But in one town meeting I had in Greenwich, Connecticut, which is pretty much a more conservative area of my district, I had a number of people at a town meeting. They were young. They were old. I could tell from the very issues they were talking about that they were the whole range of the political spectrum. And I asked this question, I said, ''How many of you think that if an HMO causes the injury or death of someone that they should be held accountable or liable?''

I expected about maybe two-thirds of the hands to go up. Every hand went up. In fact, in some cases both hands went up. And then there was story after story. And I also submitted to my constituents a questionnaire asking them about health care and there were various choices, and one of them was we should keep the health care system the way it is. Only 3.5 percent responded that we should keep it the way it is. This really kind of shocked me. Twenty-five percent wanted to eliminate HMOs.

Now, I am a strong supporter of health maintenance organizations, but to have 25 percent of the 15,000 people who responded to my questionnaire wanting to get rid of HMOs for me was a big wake-up call. And it just spoke volumes about how we need to do what is in the legislation that my colleague has championed. To be able to have a process that would encourage people to get the proper health care that they need without going through a litigation process makes eminent sense. But, in the end, there always has to be that final hammer to try to encourage sometimes proper behavior.

I want to thank my colleague for being such a fighter on this issue. And I know and I hope that we will eventually get to another issue that is near and dear to both him and me. But I appreciate what he has done for so long on this issue.

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) joining me for this special order because I think that we are going to have some fun with some of these issues.

This is one of the reform issues that we are dealing with here in Congress. My colleague has been a leader on one of the other reform issues, and that is campaign finance reform; and I have been happy to work with him on that issue. I am glad that he is here. Because now that this issue, campaign finance reform, has really come to the front of the presidential campaigns, I hear things said by some candidates that make me concerned. It is almost like you could not be a Republican if you support campaign finance reform, even though there are a lot of Republicans who support campaign finance reform.

There are a lot of Republicans who support campaign finance reform, and I worked with the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) on this issue all across the political spectrum. I have a pretty darn conservative voting record, and there are lots of other conservatives who have joined with him on this issue because we feel so strongly that this is so important to the honesty and integrity of our political system.

I mean, we have a gentleman like the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. WAMP) who is really a conservative Republican. We have a conservative Republican, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), who has stuck with us on this issue. And so I want to address the issue today.

When we talk about campaign finance reform, let us do a little education of our colleagues on this. I wonder if the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) can sort of share with us how this issue got started really full blast in 1995 and 1996. Why do we need campaign finance reform?

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, there are a number of reasons why we need it; and we need it more desperately as each year goes. But I would first say that we have needed to reform the system for many years.

One of the things that is very clear is we have had a hard time finding consensus because we each have our own campaign finance reform bill. So one of the first key things to do was to see if we could build consensus amongst different groups.

But in terms of why we need it, we need it because, in this democrat system of government, we need to make sure that decisions are being made based on merit and based on what is right for our country and not based on who gave me this campaign contribution or that campaign contribution.

□ 1745

When you had the abuses in 1974 centered around Watergate and all that was involved, the majority party made two decisions. One, they were going to hold President Nixon accountable and they were secondly going to reform the

system. They did both. I have been hard pressed to know why we did not take the same tack as this new majority. We needed to hold President Clinton accountable, and we needed to reform the system. Our failure to reform the system then calls into question in the minds of some of our constituents, ''Well, you're just doing this to get the President.'' No, we needed to hold the President accountable, but then we needed to reform the system to make sure the decisions, to the best of our ability, are based on merit, not based on the kind of money that was contributed.

Now, in 1974 they devised a system, you would limit what a candidate could spend and you would limit what a candidate could raise in terms of individual contributions, and you would have a system where both of them worked. The Supreme Court said it is constitutional to limit your overall individual contributions but you cannot limit what someone spends, so a wealthy person can spend whatever they want, and a wealthy person under the law can spend whatever they want helping a particular candidate as long as they do not work with that candidate. But once they begin to work in tandem with that candidate, then they come under the contribution limitations. Those contributions were $1,000 for an individual and $5,000 for PAC contributions.

One of the confessions I would say as I worked on this issue, I thought the real problem were the political action committees because they were, quote-unquote, the ''special interests'' and so I looked to eliminate political action committee money. As I went around the country and around my State arguing on this issue and debating people, I felt I was losing the argument. I began to realize that people had a right to assemble under a political action committee for whatever special interest they want. And then a candidate has the right or not to accept it. But a political action committee contribution is $5,000. That is it. That is the limit.

Soft money, which is the unlimited sums contributed by individuals, corporations, labor unions, and other interest groups have made political action committee money look saintly because it is unlimited, and it has brought in such incredible amounts of money that most reasonable people could concur, and concur rightfully, that Members' votes are affected by the large contributions that are given.

Mr. GANSKE. Let us take an example from today. Governor Bush has raised $67 million. There is nothing wrong with that. That money that he raised was from individual donations under Federal law at $1,000 maximum per individual.

Mr. SHAYS. That was the maximum that he could receive.

Mr. GANSKE. That was the maximum he received. He received millions of smaller contributions, just as all the presidential candidates have. That is the current law. We ought to be clear. There is nothing wrong with that. You do not think there is anything wrong with that. I do not think there is anything wrong with that. I do not think there is anything wrong with a political action committee working on an issue, getting people of a similar interest together, forming a political action committee and making a contribution under current law to a candidate.

I would say that that is not what we are talking about, where the problem is. For goodness sakes, Governor Bush with $67 million, does anyone think that any one of those $25, $50, $500, or even $1,000 donations is going to unduly influence the Governor from Texas? Of course not. Just like it does not influence anyone here in Congress. However, what we are talking about in the soft money area is not a maximum of $1,000. We are talking about donations of half a million dollars or one million dollars from individuals, or from labor unions, or from corporations, donations of that magnitude that are basically unregulated by the Federal Election Commission, that were originally designed for party building. We will talk about the issue ads.

Mr. SHAYS. Let me if I could just say that the significance is that soft money creates a gigantic loophole. It allows corporate treasury money to be contributed, whereas the law in 1974, the individual contribution limits and the political action committee never allows for corporate treasury money to be contributed to a candidate. It allows for labor unions to get around the law because it is illegal for labor unions to contribute to political campaigns.

Mr. GANSKE. Other than through their political action committee.

Mr. SHAYS. They can set up a political action committee and they can advertise and their members can also contribute as individuals. But the 1974 law made it illegal for foreign individuals, not citizens of the United States, not residents of the country, made it illegal for them to contribute, but they too can contribute soft money. It is the gigantic loophole.

Let me just back up and give a little more detail. In 1907, Theodore Roosevelt got elected, he actually got elected before then, but he got elected using corporate treasury money. The public was outraged by it, and Theodore Roosevelt and Congress decided to ban any corporate treasury money from being contributed to campaigns. They did not mind individuals contributing. They thought it was wrong for corporations to contribute.

In 1947, actually earlier during World War II, it was illegal for union dues money to be used in campaigns. And then Congress codified this executive order in 1947 in the Taft-Hartley law, making it illegal for union dues money to be contributed to campaigns. And in 1974, Congress and the President made it illegal for foreign money to be contributed to campaigns. Now, the amazing thing is it is illegal and yet all three things are happening.

I know my colleague has his own personal experience as it relates to union dues money, but beforehand let me just introduce what I saw in the newspaper on February 13. This was an AP story. It said, ''The labor federation is committing $40 million to put GORE in the White House and to win back control of Congress for its allies, traditionally Democrats.'' I look at this and I say $40 million of union dues money, that is illegal. They cannot do it. Except they can do it with this soft money loophole.

Mr. GANSKE. This brings back to me vivid memories of 1995 and 1996. Let me give the gentleman an example. In 1995, President Clinton started his White House soirees and fundraising and the Lincoln Bedroom and all of that and helped the Democratic National Committee raise $44 million, basically through soft money, donations, large donations that came from individuals, corporations, and labor unions and went to the Democratic Party. Now, that money is supposed to go for party building. What did it go for? It went for this. Here was an ad that was run against Senator Bob Dole, paid for by soft money.

''America's values, Head Start, student loans, toxic cleanup, extra police, protected in the budget agreement. The President stood firm. Dole-Gingrich's latest plan includes tax hikes on working families, up to 18 million children face health care cuts, Medicare slashed $67 billion. Then Dole resigns, leaving behind gridlock he and Gingrich created. The President's plan? Politics must wait. Balance the budget, reform welfare, protect our values.''

Now, that is a campaign ad. I have seen a lot of campaign ads, and that was run all during the summer of 1996 when Senator Dole did not have any money. And it was raised from soft money.

Mr. SHAYS. But there are really two parts to this.

Mr. GANSKE. There are two issues here, I agree. One is the issue advocacy ad and the other is the soft money. But the funding for those ads came from soft money. Now, I do not have a problem with a labor union forming a PAC and using that PAC money, under the rules for those ads.

Mr. SHAYS. The reason you do not have a problem is it is voluntary, the members can contribute or may not but it is not taken out of their union dues money.

Mr. GANSKE. Let me give the gentleman another example. The Democratic National Committee ran this ad. Soft money again.

''Protect families. For millions of working families, President Clinton cut taxes. The Dole-Gingrich budget tried to raise taxes on 8 million. The Dole-Gingrich budget would have slashed Medicare $270 billion and cut college scholarships. The President defended our values, protected Medicare

and now a tax cut of $1,500 a year for the first 2 years of college, most community college is free, helps adults go back to school. The President's plan protects our values.''

Paid for by soft money.

Here is one. This is a really interesting ad. This is from 1995–1996, paid for by soft money to Citizen Action from the Teamsters. We can talk about this connection. This is how corrupting the soft money can be, but here is the ad that Citizen Action put out:

''They've worked hard all their lives, but Congressman Cremeans voted five times to cut their Medicare, even their nursing home care, to pay for a $16,892 tax break he voted to give the wealthy. Congressman Cremeans, it's not your money to give away. Don't cut Medicare. They earned it.''

Soft money paid for it.

An investigation was done on this. The Teamsters set up a deal. They gave a big contribution from their union funds to Citizen Action, which is fine. They can give to charitable organizations. The deal was that Citizen Action would give back money to one of the candidates running for President of the Teamsters, and the Democratic Party was involved in this, also. But the point of this is that this is where these big chunks of money can be moved around behind the scenes. And we do not even know who gave the money to some of these organizations that run these ads. It is, quote, soft money. We do not know how the money is intermingled with legitimate contributions to parties and then with these huge soft money donations.

Here is another example of a soft money donation. I know this one real well, because this one was run against me:

''It's our land, our water. America's environment must be protected. But in just 18 months, Congressman Ganske has voted 12 out of 12 times to weaken environmental protections.'' By the way, I sent a rebuttal on that to the Des Moines Register. ''Congressman Ganske even voted to let corporations continue releasing cancer-causing pollutants in our air.'' By the way, I helped pass one of the best environmental bills. ''Call Congressman Ganske. Tell him to protect America's environment, for our families, for our future.''

Soft money. And also the issue ads.

We need to think about what brought this on primarily. We saw in the 1995–1996 election cycle an explosion of behind-the-scenes giving of huge contributions by individuals, corporations, and unions to parties; and then the parties took that money and they did not use it to just go out and get a voter registration guide, they used that money for issue ads on TV that were nothing less than full campaign attack ads. Independent surveys have shown that 80 percent of those, quote, issue ads were actually attack ads.

Mr. SHAYS. I am torn by this feeling that I want to kind of clarify and be a little more precise between soft money and what I call sham issue ads which are really good campaign ads, much like you might want to correct me in some of the intricacies of HMO reform.

Mr. GANSKE. Some issue ads are funded by soft money.

Mr. SHAYS. I am going to hope the gentleman will be patient with one aspect of this. Congress last year passed in early September campaign finance reform. It was a bipartisan effort.

It dealt with four basic issues. First, it banned soft money, thereby getting rid of the loophole that allowed corporations, labor unions, and foreign money to filter itself into campaigns because soft money was not defined as campaign money even though you have clearly illustrated it is.

Second, we called the sham issue ads what they are, campaign ads. We do not ban them. We call them campaign ads. As soon as you do that, out goes the corporate money, the union dues money, and foreign money. And really what you were faced with in a technical term, soft money goes to the political parties, and it goes to the leadership PACs.

□ 1800

You were faced with the unions taking, frankly, union dues money, and spending it on a sham issue ad, but because it was not called a campaign ad. The 1947 Taft-Hartley law did not come into effect. You were basically faced with this almost unlimited sum of money that kept coming in.

The third thing that we did is we required FEC enforcement, Federal Elections Commission enforcement, right away, and we had disclosure on the Internet right away, filing on the Internet and disclosure on the Internet, so the FEC could hold you accountable before the election, rather than 6 years after.

There is that wonderful memo, I call it wonderful, from Mr. Ickes to the President that said to the President, we are going to be fined about $1 million because of campaign violations. He said this while the campaign was going.

The President, this is what I consider wonderful, the President wrote next to it, ''ugh,'' in his signature. He knew they were breaking the law, he was not happy about it, but he also knew it would be dealt with 3 or 4 or 5 or 6 years later and the public would not be focused on it.

The last thing we did was establish a commission to look at all the things we have not dealt with. Without getting into a lot of detail, maybe the individual contribution limit should be increased, maybe the amounts contributed to the political parties should be increased, maybe 50 percent or more of your contribution should be in State or not. We did not deal with those issues, because when we started this conversation, we were trying to build a consensus on a bill we could pass.

This bill went to the Senate, and this bill had more than 50 percent of the Members supporting it, 55. The bottom line to it was it needs 60 percent. So you had 52 members supporting it, 53, 54, 55; but you need 60 to break the closure, that would invoke closure, so you could then vote on the bill.

So a majority in the Senate support campaign finance reform. I would love to get into this area that I just think is the reason why I am really out on this floor today. You are a Republican; I am a Republican. We could have invited our Democrat colleagues to participate. But we supported this bill.

One of the things we are hearing is quote-unquote ''This bill will hurt Republicans.'' Well, I would like to make a few comments. First off, that is truly an irrelevant statement if in the end we are doing what is right for the country. Now, it is not irrelevant that it should treat both parties fairly; one should not gain an advantage over the other. That is clearly the implication of the argument.

But it is not really about that, and I believe that some of the opponents who say that really do not believe it. What I think they think is it will hurt certain people in the party. It will hurt those who have been able to amass great sums of money; and then they, some leaders, the national parties, get to dole it out to the candidate who is doing what they want.

So not only are you seeing a corruption of this process with big corporate money and big union money and foreign money, which is made legal through the sham-issue ads and the soft money, not only have you seen that kind of corruption; but we are seeing another kind of corruption, because some people get this money, and then they are able to direct it to the people they want to have it.

You know what, you may not get that money, Mr. GANSKE, because you may not be in the image that they want you as a Republican. The Democrats may not see some money, certain Democrats, because they are not in their image, even though you are representing your constituents exactly the way you should.

Let me get in more detail, if you would allow me.

Mr. GANSKE. Let me just interject. The gentleman is right. I was talking about two issues at the same time. One was the issue of personal advocacy and the other was soft money. Some of these issue ads were run with millions and millions of dollars of soft money, i.e., the ads that President Clinton ran through the Democratic National Committee.

It is reported, but it is in unlimited amounts.

Mr. SHAYS. If it comes from the political parties, if it comes from some leadership PAC, it is probably soft money. But the union dues money and all the special interests, they do it primarily through the sham-issue ads.

Mr. GANSKE. And the sham issue ads may be funded by soft money, i.e., if

they are paid for by the national parties. But they may also be paid for by who knows who.

Mr. SHAYS. Who knows.

Mr. GANSKE. Who knows. Who knows. Then you have basically a lack of truth in labeling, because you could have some committee set up that sounds great, the Committee to Save Medicare or something like that.

Mr. SHAYS. And you do not know who is a part of that.

Mr. GANSKE. You do not know who is part of that. But, you know what? Maybe some of those funds were given to this ''charitable'' organization out of a national party, and those were soft money funds used by those donations from the national party.

We have talked about the Democrats, okay, and the examples I have given were that. This occurs on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. SHAYS. It is more fun to talk about the other side of the aisle. Is that what you are telling me?

Mr. GANSKE. What I want to say is this: I agree with you. This should not be an issue decided on what is the best thing for my party, okay? I do not make that kind of decision when I look at this legislation. I think about what is best for the country.

It looks to me like when everyone in the country knows that special interests here in Washington are giving millions of dollars at a time to gain access, to maybe put a bill on the floor or keep a bill off the floor and to influence legislation, then it really hurts the process.

But I would also say this: the bill that we passed here in the House of Representatives, the Shays-Meehan bill, that was a fair bill. It was fair to both parties. Both parties have been involved in this soft money issue, both sides have used issue ads. In my opinion, this is a fair bill, and we ought to talk about that for a bit.

Mr. SHAYS. I would love to just talk about the actual numbers. So you and I do agree that the first issue should not be does it help or hurt one party; it should be what is in the best interests of our country to save our democracy from these unlimited sums of corporate and union dues money and other special interest money, the unlimited sums. But I could ask it in reverse and say how would this have hurt our party?

Well, you could say well, just take the 1996 presidential election. Republicans raised in soft money $138 million. Democrats raised $124 million. Both raised a significant sum of money, which, by the way, certain people can direct just to the places they want to direct it to. So Republicans would have lost that $14 million advantage. But it is $14 million. When you are looking at numbers of $124 and $138 million, it is a small percent.

By the way, right now our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have raised more soft money in the DNC, in their congressional committee, than Republicans have.

Mr. GANSKE. If the gentleman would yield, we just saw a report in Roll Call, the newspaper that covers the Hill, that shows that the Democratic Congressional Committee has raised more in soft money than the National Republican Congressional Committee.

Mr. SHAYS. Right. So some years we might raise more; some years they may. But just comparing 1996, what my side of the aisle does not want people to know, those people who oppose campaign finance reform, in hard money, this blows my mind, Democrats raised $221 million in hard money contributions.

Mr. GANSKE. These are the maximum $1,000 donations.

Mr. SHAYS. The difference between soft and hard money, soft money is unlimited, hard money is limited campaign contributions. The Supreme Court said clearly, they just affirmed it in the Missouri case just a few weeks ago, it is constitutional and proper to limit what individuals can contribute. In the limited dollars, which we do not impact, Democrats raised in 1996 $221 million. That is a lot of money. What do you think the Republicans raised? Democrats raised $221 million. Republicans raise $416 million. So we saw $195 million raised more by Republicans than Democrats in hard money, and we do not change that law.

Now, I will say what I think evens it out is my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have a lot of friends in Labor. While Labor cannot under our bill contribute soft money, and while they cannot have the sham-issue ads where they can use union dues money, they can still have ads; but they have to use political action committees. They still have a plethora of union workers to go to the polls and stand outside. So they have a clear advantage there.

We have a clear advantage in the hard money contributions. They have a clear advantage in the number of workers they can get out on election day and make some calls beforehand.

But our bill prevents all that. Corporate treasury money that goes to both parties, all the union dues money that goes, it is illegal. It has been against the law since 1907 for corporate treasury money to be contributed to campaigns; it has been against the law since 1947 for union dues money, and against the law since 1974 for foreign national money.

Mr. GANSKE. If the gentleman would yield, because I think this is important, some people talk about paycheck protection as a part of campaign finance reform. By that they mean that every so often an employee who is in a labor union would have to give affirmative assent to having part of his dues used for political purposes. But tell me what the current law is on that?

Mr. SHAYS. The current law is it is illegal, and I have a hard time understanding why my side of the aisle wants to legalize a process where if we are just talking now as Republicans who are being criticized for somehow allowing unions to do something that Republicans do not want; it is against the law for union dues money to be contributed to campaigns.

Mr. GANSKE. Is it not true that a member of a labor union can tell his union, I do not want any of my union dues used for that?

Mr. SHAYS. That is another issue. I would just like to respond to that. Let me make this point, and I will get right to that point. I have a personal example to respond to your question.

The point that I first want to make is, paycheck protection, I voted for it. But paycheck protection would allow a union member to use his union dues in campaigns when the 1947 law makes it illegal. I am hard pressed to understand why my side of the aisle, that professes not to want to see union dues money in campaigns, why they would want to allow union dues money to be used if a union member says fine, because it is not necessary. A union member can contribute to a PAC.

Why would they want to overturn the 1947 law that makes it illegal? They should want to enforce it by banning the sham-issue ads, out goes the corporate and union dues money, and enforcing the 1947 law that says the corporate money goes out.

What I am talking about is a very interesting issue, the Beck case. I can give you a real live example. Someone in my family, a schoolteacher, supported the Republican candidate. Before the Republican candidate could even be interviewed by the labor unions, her teachers' union, the CEA, the Connecticut Education Association, they had already endorsed the Democrat candidate.

My wife was a Republican and supported the Republican. She was outraged that they did not, ''outraged'' is a strong word, she was unhappy. She voiced her unhappiness, rightfully so, and she learned that she did not have to have her union dues money go to this. She just simply said, Take me off as a union member; I will pay the agency fee.

Now, that is the way the Beck law works. The problem is, and we have it in our bill that passed, we need the unions to proactively tell their employees that they do not have to see any money go for this.

Mr. GANSKE. This is a very important point, because this is part of the bill that we passed in the House.

Mr. SHAYS. Yes. And the bill that we passed in the House made it a proactive responsibility of the union to notify their members that if they did not want their union dues money to be going to any campaign through the soft money, that loophole, and the sham-issues ads, that other loophole, they could say they did not want it and withdraw as a member of the union and still pay the agency fee, which is the union dues money minus what goes for political purposes.

My wife took advantage of it. She took advantage of it, and for a number

of years her money was not contributed to places she did not want. The sad thing clearly was that she was forced to have to withdraw from the union.

Mr. GANSKE. I think it is also true that some Departments of Labor under different Presidents more vigorously than others required that that Beck decision be made known to members of unions.

Mr. SHAYS. And the Beck decision was this: it was a decision that if you were not a member of a union, you did not have to have your money go for political purposes. It was not a decision that said if you were a member of a union that you did not have your money go. You had to leave the union, and then your money did not go for political purposes.

□ 1815

Mr. GANSKE. Now, some people say that these issue ads, banning them would just protect incumbents. I disagree with that. Issue ads are run on both sides. They are run for incumbents, and they are run for challengers. Would the gentleman care to respond?

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, that is true. The point I need to make is issue ads can continue as campaign ads. It is a real surprise to me that people said, if we do not allow an issue ad, we have deprived people of their voice. No. They can still advertise. If one is a strong believer in right to life, one can raise as much money from one's members under the requirements of the law, and whatever one raises, one can spend.

Does anyone doubt that the right to life organization has the ability to raise millions and millions and millions and millions and millions. A good example, actually, Right to Life right now is attacking one of the candidates who is supporting the bill that we support. They are saying that he has denied them their voice. The interesting thing is, this time, they are using PAC contributions.

So they have affirmed that they can do exactly what we said they could do. They are right now campaigning against one of the candidates in South Carolina. This is an individual that they campaign against who is pro-life, but they do not like the fact that they support legislation to ban soft main and sham issue ads, campaign ads, and they are advertising against that person, not with sham issue ads, they are doing right up front. They are doing it with political action committee money.

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, this needs to be reemphasized. When we are talking about banning phoney issue ads, we are not talking about organizations that cannot put up those ads. We are just talking about the way they have to be financed.

Mr. SHAYS. Exactly, Mr. Speaker. The key is that if one calls it a campaign ad, how goes that corporate treasury money and the union dues money, which is, it seems to me, what both sides of the aisle should want to have happen.

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, there are many proposals out there for campaign finance reform. One of the more interesting ones I have recently seen was a proposal that would prevent incumbents from transferring funds from one Federal campaign to another, i.e., let us say that a Member of the House had a campaign fund set up for his reelection to the House, but then he decided to run for the Senate. Under current law, one can roll that over, whatever amount one has in there over into one's Senate run.

Now, I would suggest to my colleagues that the reason why whoever wrote this bill in the Senate did not think that that was a good idea was because if one was a Senator and one included a provision that said, nobody in the House could roll over their House congressional fund into a Senate fund, that would be a Senate incumbent protection act.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, as we debate this issue, there are so many responses one can make as to why someone would support legislation or not. Actually, there is a part of me that thinks that makes sense and the gentleman does not. It is a wonderful illustration of how we came together on the four key points. Because there were a number of people, particularly on my side of the aisle, and I happen to agree with them. I think most of the money should be raised in State. I do not think one should raise most of the money out of State.

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. SHAYS. The challenge we had, there were others who came from districts that were very poor and had to reach out across district lines who were supporting the legislation where we were able to build consensus with our colleagues on both sides of the aisle. This truly was bipartisan, and with respect to my Democrat colleagues, there were more Democrats who supported this legislation than Republicans, but there was a large number of Republicans as well that did.

Bipartisan bill: Ban soft money, call the sham issue ads what they are, campaign ads, and by doing that we eliminate the loophole and enforce the 1908 law that bans treasury corporate money, the 1947 law that bans union dues money, and the 1974 law that makes it illegal for foreign governments to contribute to campaigns. It just seems to me such a sensible way to proceed.

One of the things, in closing; we do not have to use all of our 14 minutes left, or now 10, but I would say to the gentleman that I am excited by the fact that campaign finance reform has proved to be an issue the American people want debated. It is not just about the issue of campaign finance, it is about something a little deeper, and that is what do we do to protect the integrity of our democracy; what do we do to protect the integrity of the House and the Senate and the White House. These are very big issues.

When I asked this question in my questionnaire, I made a statement, I asked my constituents to say whether they agreed or not and 15,000 responded. In this number, a total of 82 percent of my constituents believe this statement: that our democracy is threatened by the unlimited sums contributed by corporations, labor unions, and other interest groups, and they are right.

I am excited, because we are going to hear a debate tonight on our side of the aisle, and I think campaign finance reform is going to be a major factor. I hope both candidates will support banning soft money and calling the sham issue ads what they are and having people advertise campaign ads and pay for them as campaign ads. If we see that happen, I think we will see our democracy not under the thumb of so many special interests.

If I could have the courtesy of my colleague just to say to him that some of our colleagues take offense by my suggesting that somehow, we have been compromised. But the fact is, when we get $100,000 or $500,000 or $1 million that goes to one group on one issue, one has been compromised. This system slowly corrupts everyone that is in it.

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, even if there is not wrongdoing, then there is certainly the appearance of wrongdoing.

Let me give the gentleman an example. One of the largest contributors to the Democratic National Committee was the chairman of Loral. Now, Loral needed an authorization to sell satellite technology to China. The administration gave them that authorization even though it is possible that that technology is now being used on missiles from China, based in China that can target the United States with nuclear weapons.

Now, I do not have the information to know exactly how that decision was made by the administration, to give Loral authorization to sell that technology to China, but I do know this: that when the public sees that this CEO gave $350,000 or some such similar very, very large amount in soft money to the Democratic Party, then the public starts to wonder whether, in fact, that type of huge soft money donation has influenced policy. I think that is very detrimental to our public process.

Mr. SHAYS. So, Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is, we would like to restore some sanity to this process and a majority of Members in this House want to, a majority in the Senate want to, but not enough to end debate and to have an up or down vote on campaign finance reform.

But the American people are being exposed to this issue and candidates, all four of the major candidates now are coming forward with their versions of campaign finance reform, and in

every instance touching at least on soft money as it relates to corporations and union dues; some reluctant to deal with the sham issue ads.

It is a healthy debate, it is one that the American people are paying attention to, contrary to what some of our colleagues here said that the public just does not care. They care a whole lot about this issue, of restoring integrity to our political system.

I really thank my colleague for letting me join him in this colloquy and for the opportunity to speak, and I thank our Speaker for his patience in allowing us to have our full time.

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Connecticut for being a leader on this issue, and I hope that Congress is able to proceed with actually getting some legislation signed into law.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I would be derelict in my duty if I did not acknowledge that the gentleman too has played a major effort in this, and in many cases more than I have in the gentleman's constant effort and his own personal experiences in dealing with the flawed campaign system.

□

BLACK HISTORY

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

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, we passed a bill today which deals with black history. Black history is being featured this month, the month of February. A number of my colleagues said they might join me to go further in the exploration of important aspects of black history tonight. I welcome them.

I also think that what I have to say tonight about the budget and the proposed Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget is very much related to our concerns with black history. There is an opportunity here with this budget this year and the budgets that come for the next 10 years, an opportunity to deal with an overriding question that ought to concern more Americans, and that is what does one do about the impact and the long-term effects of the 232 years of slavery, the 232 years which denied one group of Americans the opportunity to own property and to gain wealth and, therefore, all of their descendents are behind the rest of the American mainstream population because they did not have any people to inherit anything from; and it appears that for some reason that is related to them individually or genetically, that they just cannot keep up economically with the rest of America. If we look at it without looking at history and without examining the fact that 232 years of slavery denied the right to own property and to accumulate wealth, then one cannot explain the phenomenon.

So, as we look at the preparation of the budget for this year in a time of great surplus; we are projecting a surplus over the next 10 years of $1.9 trillion. We will have more in revenues than we spent, even after we take out Social Security surpluses and Social Security surpluses are put in a separate so-called lockbox, we still have, after preserving all of the surpluses in Social Security, we still have $1.9 trillion projected over the next 10 years. It is an opportunity to deal with some deficiencies that have been on the books for a long time. It is an opportunity to emphasize the need for programs or the initiation of programs for people on the very bottom.

We passed a bill today related to Carter G. Woodson and Carter G. Woodson's role in keeping the whole idea of black history alive. I am going to try to show tonight that we have an opportunity by examining black history, examining the history of African Americans in the United States of America, we have an opportunity to understand some greater truths and to understand how we can utilize the present window of opportunity in terms of a budget surplus of unprecedented magnitude which can allow us to take steps to make some corrections of some of the conditions that are highlighted when we examine black history, some of the injustices that are highlighted.

□ 1830

Carter G. Woodson never emphasized the concept of reparations, but at the heart of the matter of the concept of reparations is that somehow this great crime that took place in America for more than 232 years ought to be rectified. There ought to be some compensation.

Every year, every session of Congress, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) for the last 10 years has introduced a bill which deals with reparations. I want to relate how the passing of the legislation related to Carter G. Woodson and the study of black history is related to the reparation legislation that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) introduces every year.

I want to go beyond that and show how it is also relevant to a recent book published by the head of TransAfrica, Randall Robinson. It is called ''The Debt;'' D E B T, ''The Debt.'' Then I want all of that to come back and be applied to our development of the Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget.

As I said, I will be joined by some colleagues of mine who will talk about various aspects of black history.

I had a history professor when I was at Morehouse College who had great contempt for the whole idea of celebrating or in any way highlighting black history. He thought that when we pull out separate facts and dates and heroes from one set of people and we magnify that and make it more visible and try to build history around that, it was the wrong way to proceed; that scholars like himself always saw history as a complicated, interwoven set of developments, and we cannot really have history that highlights certain basic facts about one people or another.

Well, I think that the scholar of history has a point there. We understand that when we are dealing with history as a matter of the record to be read mainly by other scholars and journalists and various people who have a great interest with dealing with history at that level, where it is most accurate, most comprehensive, there may be an argument.

But in terms of popular education, the fact is that those same scholars and historians over the years were leaving out, totally leaving out consideration of any developments that related to African-Americans or to slaves or the descendents of slaves, and that Carter G. Woodson wanted to let African-American children and adults know that here is a history that they are part of in the most constructive way.

So he started by highlighting positive achievements of Negroes in America, positive achievements of the descendents of slaves and of slaves themselves. He highlighted the fact that Benjamin Banneker was involved, very much so, in the layout of the city of Washington.

He was part of a commission. Benjamin Banneker was a black man. He was part of a commission that determined how Washington would be laid out. With the architect, L'Enfant, L'Enfant, he was there. Some parts of the plans were lost at one point, and Banneker restructured the plans from his memory, and played a major role in carrying out the grand design that we all see in Washington here in terms of the way the Capitol was laid out and the White House is placed in a certain place, and the Mall and the streets and all, that was part of the original grand design for Washington. There was a black man, Benjamin Banneker, involved. Nobody bothers to note that.

So Carter G. Woodson was the kind of person, a historian, who felt that those little facts that are left out become important; the fact that Crispus Atticus was the first man to die in the Boston massacre, and the fact that he was black was not properly noted until people like Carter G. Woodson brought it to our attention. The role of blacks in various inventions and various other developments was completely left out until Carter G. Woodson brought it to our attention.

I think Randall Robinson wants to go much further. His book is new and has just come out. He is raising the study of black history as part of American history to a different level. He sat in the Rotunda of the Capitol and looked at all of the friezes that are carved around the Rotunda today.

He begins his book, his introduction, by discussing the fact that in that frieze and in that set of depictions that

are carved, we find no black people. He notes that fact as he ponders how the stones got to the Hill here, how the stones were lifted up. We had no cranes and no machinery.

He notes the fact that to build the Capitol there was a request that was sent out for 100 slaves, 100 slaves to begin the work of the Capitol. That is how it started, those 100 slaves. Their masters were paid $5 a month for the work of those 100 slaves. That is a fact that we will not find anywhere in any of the books that the Architect of the Capitol has and the Capitol historian. They do not have those facts. We have to go hunt for them somewhere else.

So the study of black history as part of overall American history becomes very important, either when we look at the details one by one, the accomplishments, heroes people overlook, or when we look at the broader issues of labor, economics: Who built this country, whose sweat, whose labor built the country. When we look at the facts there, there is an important lesson to be learned. There are some unpaid debts. That is why Randall Robinson has chosen to call his book ''The Debt.''

Before we get to those kinds of concepts, and I often have young people ask me, why do not you and Members of the Black Caucus place greater emphasis on fighting for reparations? Why do you not throw down the gauntlet and demand that there be reparations for the descendents of slaves?

The reparations idea is now very much accepted in Europe, and maybe the Japanese will accept it soon. They are holding back. They will not even apologize for the way they ravaged China, let alone concede that some reparations are owed. But in Europe they have accepted it.

The Germans, the German industries, have now agreed that during the war we had Jews and other folks who were committed, forced to do slave labor in our factories, so the private sector has come together under the tutelage of the government and decided they are going to give $5 billion to the living persons who can be identified as having been part of that slave labor. I think they ought to do something for the descendents of those people, too. I think the reparations also have to be spread to the people who died in the concentration camps.

The government of Switzerland, along with the private banking system in Switzerland, has decided that they will establish a fund of more than $2 billion to admit that they swindled the Jews who were fleeing Hitler and came to Switzerland, and they wanted to hide their money. They swindled the descendents of those people by refusing to recognize that they had the money, and that they knew how to identify who it belonged to.

All these years they have refused to do that, for more than 50 years. Now they are ready to give $2 billion in reparations, $2 billion to compensate the people who can be identified for what has been denied them.

So the whole concept of something is owed, not by the Swiss bankers who are there now, because those who actually took the money and hid it are probably dead, but the banking system, the banking system feels it owes it; not by the corporate heads who were running the German companies at the time that they had the slave labor and people were forced to do slave labor in their factories, but the companies themselves have descendents, and the wealth they accumulated is part of the wealth that was accumulated during the time of the forced slave labor.

Therefore, they are willing to contribute; reluctantly, but they are willing, coerced by the government a bit, but they are willing to contribute $5 billion in reparations. If reparations is acceptable in Europe, it ought to be acceptable in the United States, also. We ought to take a hard look at the concept.

We have had one example in this Nation where we recognize the need for reparations. We did not exactly call it that, I think it was called compensation, or some other word, of the Japanese who were imprisoned during World War II.

We voted, I voted, since I have been here, on a bill which provided compensation for those who were still alive who were people involved in that horrible situation where they were swept up from their homes on the West Coast and thrown into concentration camps. I think $20,000, if I remember correctly, per person was allowed. Many of these people are quite old and feeble and many have died, but we actually appropriated around $20,000 per person for the Japanese who were interned during World War II. So the concept of reparations is certainly not totally foreign to this Congress or to the United States culture.

I am not going to dwell on that, however. I say to the young people who are insisting we should focus on reparations and have a showdown on reparations, I am as indignant and concerned as they are, but the practical thing to do is to try to get as close to some policies in the United States government that will have the same impact and the same overall effect. Therefore, opportunity should be emphasized.

In this budget that we are going to prepare as a Congressional Black Caucus alternative, I want to emphasize maximum opportunity as a way of dealing with the descendants of slaves who are in various ways disadvantaged and left behind mainstream Americans because they did not have the chance to accumulate wealth in the past.

Let their children have maximum educational opportunity, but going beyond their children, I say, let all poor children in America. Income should not be a barrier to attaining the best possible education. Every child born in America should understand that one way or another, he is going to have the opportunity to go to college, or go as far as he wants to go in attaining the education which will allow him to set himself free economically.

Education is at the top of the list for the Congressional Black Caucus because reparations, the reparations opportunity can be delivered most effectively and most rapidly through education.

There are many other items that we have on our list. We have housing, health, economic development, livable communities, foreign aid, welfare and low-income assistance, juvenile justice, and law enforcement. All of those items are part of a budget that is going to seek to rectify shortcomings of the past, and also to highlight the fact that in the present budget these same items, same concerns, have not been dealt with effectively.

We endorse a large part of the budget that has been submitted by President Clinton. We endorse a large part of it, but we also would like to highlight a lot of omissions, a lot of deficiencies. We would also like to say that we do not think that that budget goes far enough in providing maximum opportunity, and we want to deal with that in the Congressional Black Caucus budget.

I want to pause at this point and yield to my colleague, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), for her to make any observations she wishes to make with respect to black history.

This is Black History Month, and as I said at the beginning, I think everything we are doing can be sort of woven together. The knowledge of black history in the past throws a light on what we have to do at present, and gives us some vision for where we have to go in the future. The details of black history are as important as the broad concepts that we need to guide us as we learn the lessons of black history.

All of it is very important, and I think that we should have more than one month to deal with it. But we like to look at the month of February as just a time to highlight and to raise up the visibility of the relevance of black history, and that the rest of the year people would understand how it also has to be interwoven with our current concerns, as well as those current concerns being taken care of against a background and backdrop of past history.

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding to me.

I believe that this is a time that sets the tone for Members coming to the floor of the House, no matter what month it is, to talk about the history of all of the people of the United States of America, so many have contributed in outstanding ways to our Nation.

Frankly, I agree with the gentleman. I thank him for his opening remarks

and the discussions that he will continue to have on reparations and the CBC alternative budget.

But he is so right, that Carter G. Woodson started the African-American or Black History Month as one week in February.

□ 1845

We now have the entire month of February, and if I might quote my 14-year-old son Jason Lee, we should not be regulated even by the month, for African American history is a history of a people and the history of America.

So I would hope that as we take to the floor of the House this month, my colleagues will join me in additional days that we will spend talking about African American history, and I would hope that we would begin to explain to the American people how intimately woven this history is with American history.

Might I take a moment of personal privilege then to cite some historical factors, but as well to comment briefly on the term African American, because I believe I have heard some sense of concern. I know when the term first emerged I believe that Reverend Jesse Jackson was engaged in that discussion. As many people are aware, African Americans have been called many things. The more appropriate or I should say appropriate ones that I might want to use on the floor of the House would be colored, negro, black, and more recently African American.

Might I say that that seems to me to be the more accurate expression for this population, and the only reason that I say that is that even if one came to this country by way of Latin America, by way of Central America, by way of the Caribbean, and they are a Negro or Negroid, it is most likely that their origins were on the continent of Africa. So that African American comes from that origin, and I do not believe we have any current debates going on that, but that is why most of us will more frequently use the term African American.

In any event, what I would like to emphasize in my remarks this evening is that it is, in fact, a history of all of the people.

I would like to just start my discussion by citing a text, the Slave Narratives of Texas, edited by Ron Tyler and Lawrence R. Murphy. I will not read the huge volume of narratives that are here. I would just commend it to our viewing audience, or at least those who may be interested in this topic. I would like to cite comments from Martin Jackson, which is under chapter 2, Memories of Massa.

''A lot of old slaves close the door before they tell the truth about their days of slavery. When the door is opened, they tell how kind their masters were and how rosy it all was. One cannot blame them for this because they had plenty of early discipline, making them cautious about saying anything uncomplimentary about their masters. I myself was in a little different position than most slaves, and as a consequence have no grudges or resentment. However, I can say the life of the average slave was not rosy. They were dealt out plenty of cruel suffering.''

In this commentary, Slave Narratives, one will find glowing testimony by former slaves of how good the massa, or master, was; and then they find as well the violence and the viciousness of slavery being recounted.

I think Martin Jackson says it well, and that is there was great fear and so that some of the memories were geared by the discipline that was given out or meted out to Africans and those who came and became slaves.

I say that because it is important, as we recall African American history, that we should not be afraid to say that it is American history, and we should not be afraid to recount it over and over again, not out of hatred or hatefulness but out of the need to educate and to allow this country to move forward and to build upon the richness of its diversity and to solve some of the very problems that we confront today.

Might I also draw your attention to Rosa Parks, her book, Quiet Strength. She again focuses on fear and focuses on the motivation that allowed her to sit down on that bus in Montgomery, Alabama, opening the door to a whole entire movement and a whole sense of courage on behalf of then colored people or Negro people in America. She said, ''We blacks are not as fearful or divided as people may think. I cannot let myself be so afraid that I am unable to move around freely and express myself. If I do, then I am undoing the gains we have made in the civil rights movement. Love, not fear, must be our guide.''

So she negates what has gripped many of those in our community, a sense of fear. It was fear that kept us in a segregated society, fear that no one any earlier than Rosa Parks, when I say any earlier I know there was activism and opposition to a segregated America before Rosa Parks but in a more forthright or very conspicuous manner, the one act that she did sort of set the tone of opening up the civil rights movement. She is commenting that we cannot be restrained from injustices or fighting injustices because of fear, and I think that is particularly important as we talk about African American history.

African American history is recounting the contributions of great Americans, such as Booker T. Washington. We hear that quite frequently, commenting on W.E.B. DuBois, the debate between Booker T. Washington and W.E.B. DuBois, whether we hear that quite frequently they were at odds, whether they were in disagreement, their lives sort of overlapped each other to a certain extent.

If we look closely, we will find that both of them had a vision or a tracking of where they wanted the people of color in this Nation to go. They wanted them to use their talents. Booker T. Washington in particular wanted them to be able to utilize the skills that they had learned out of slavery, the artisan skills of carpentry and painting and building and agriculture, because he wanted them quickly to be able to be contributing members of the society. W.E.B. DuBois realized that a race of people had to be many things. They had to be philosophers. They had to be inventors. They had to be physicians. They had to be scientists. And he wanted to make sure that if there were those willing to take the challenge, African Americans, as he went to Harvard, he wanted to make sure that America's racism and segregation and hatred would not keep such people down.

I think it is important that as we reflect on the history of a people, as I reflect on my history, as I reflect on the history as it relates to America, that we study now more in depth, not in a cursory fashion, what did Booker T. Washington mean to America, what did W.E.B. DuBois mean to America? What did Marcus Garvey mean to America? To many of us who were in school, these individuals really were not taught in our own history classes. In fact, that was very much unheard of, to have books as I am citing. In Roland S. Martin's article in the Houston Defender, their tribute to African American history month, he noted for years a complaint of not being able to find enough information about black history has rung loud and clear from black parents, educators and community activists.

School history books were and still are devoid of the accomplishments and contributions of African Americans. Save a glancing mention of slavery or Martin Luther King, Jr., black folks are basically absent from history books. His comment or his purpose of this article is to suggest that now with the Internet, information technology, the superhighway, we are not relegated to that, and he is encouraging all of us in this history to get our ''dot com'' together, to get on the Internet and search out the wonderful history of African Americans.

I think it is well to note that as many of us grew up, we did not have the opportunity to be taught the history of African Americans. So the challenge is that as we are in this century, that we begin to study African American history not again as relegated to just a race of people but that it is truly African American history or American history.

I am going to cite two more things, I would say to the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS), and I am not sure if he is ready and I would be happy to yield to him, but I want to bring to everyone's attention several points, especially those that the gentleman has made, about our budget.

I believe that the history of African Americans should also be the history of

everyday people; the everyday people in our communities, whether it be our pastors in the religious community, religion being so much a vital part of our own history; whether it be people who have overcome obstacles, because again I think we fool ourselves if we continue to ask a race of people who lived 400 years in slavery not to talk about both collectively but as American society how slavery impacted us, even in this now 21st century. It impacts the legislative agenda of so many of us, of which we would hope that we would have a bipartisan support on issues like affirmative action, on issues like the Voters Rights Act, on issues like racial profiling, on issues like equitable funding for historically black colleges.

I want to bring to our attention a young man by the name of Jerick Crow. I had the opportunity of meeting him. He wrote a personal note to me in this book that was written about him, ''Thank you for your help with issues dealing with violence and youth.''

Jerick was an African American youth, quite handsome I might admit. His picture is in the book as a third grader, and I would like to bring our attention that in the book there are hard lessons, because Jerick now is in a wheelchair. He is one of those African American young men statistics who was in a gang that wound up in a violent result, not losing his life but certainly losing his ability to be mobile.

He talks about his life. He talks about the fact that his father died; and so he was one of those statistics, not of his own doing, a child without a father. He talks about that he did have dreams and aspirations, but all of a sudden something came over him. He stopped studying. He stopped doing his homework. He had failing grades, and then all of a sudden he did something that many of our young African American men, young men, young boys do and are still doing, and that is joining gangs. I bring that to our attention in a discussion of African American history because I think we are remiss if we do not take the collective history of our people and why ills fall upon them.

He has turned his life around, but part of the tragedy of the gangs in our community and the violence in our community again is because there were not enough legislative initiatives or collective community understanding of how our history impacted how we functioned as a race of people, how being isolated without a father, how not having the support systems that really sometimes came out of segregation, how not addressing the question, no matter how some of us may feel it is serious and others may look at it humorously, the issue of reparations.

When I say that there was never any compensation to African Americans because of slavery, in fact, when we discuss it now, and I am almost positive that if anyone is listening in my hometown, I would say to the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS), we can be assured that 950 Radio, one of the conservative talk shows that come on every morning in Houston, that unfortunately most of the listeners and callers in, including the host of that particular radio show, a good friend of mine, we have had an opportunity to talk over the years, continues to bash those of us who would raise issues that are controversial; controversial as they relate to race, the need for affirmative action, again the need for addressing the question of racial profiling, the need for addressing the divisiveness of flying a Confederate flag over a Federal building. I think part of it is because America has not accepted in a collective and collaborative fashion that African American history is a history of America. If we would do that, we would go so much further in solving these problems.

Let me cite one other feature and note. This is not to put Los Angeles in a negative light, but I do want to cite racial and ethnic tensions in American communities, poverty, equality and discrimination. This was a report of the United States Commission on Civil Rights. In fact, today we were in a Committee on the Judiciary meeting and it was dealing with the budget, and there was a great deal of discussion, unfortunately not bipartisan discussion, of criticism of the United States Commission on Civil Rights, and many of us were trying to make the point do we not want the Committee on the Judiciary to stand on the side of enforcing civil rights? Do we not want to have any budget that may be passed by this House in a bipartisan way increase funding for civil rights?

□ 1900

Let me just briefly say that this report coming out of May 1999, which is one of the reasons why we may not get the kind of funding that we should get because people are offended by the truth, it says, racial and ethnic bias, the revelation of former LAPD Detective Mark Furman's racist comments during the O.J. Simpson trial brought to the floor the existence of racial tension within the LAPD.

While many officers thought Detective Furman's attitude was an aberration, others maintained that such attitudes were widespread. Many perceived that racial and ethnic tension within the department is increasing.

Mr. Speaker, in August 1995, six black civilian detention officers and a black police sergeant filed suit alleging that the city, the police department, the police commission are condoning overt racism and failing to deal with the complaints of discrimination.

Why am I saying all of this? Mr. Speaker, as I was saying in 1995, a lawsuit was filed by members in the LAPD and civilians to indicate that the officials were condoning overt racism.

As I was saying, this is a part of African American history. It is a part of American history. It is a part of how we relate to each other today. We are always reminded that if we do not know our history, we are doomed to repeat what was history. We are doomed to repeat it, or we are doomed to go through it in the future; that is why the commemoration of African American history is so very important, because we have to reach for it.

We have to find it. We have to get people to seek it out. I believe it is more of our colleagues, more Americans informing themselves about real African American history, the glorious success stories that we have, the whole litany of outstanding African Americans which we all applaud, but also get down into the nitty and gritty of slavery, reading slave narratives, getting a full understanding of that very dark time in our history; the Civil War and what that meant, Reconstruction, when there was a great jubilee that we as African Americans were free and that we would be welcomed as equals in American society, and then the ugly head of Jim Crow rose up in the 1900s.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we must speak about African American history throughout the year, because we will never get to the point of passing the hate crimes legislation, of getting racial profiling to the floor, which I hope that we will see a positive result tomorrow in the Committee on the Judiciary, but then to the floor, to the Senate and signed by the President. We will never understand what affirmative action is about in Texas and in Florida, where they are trying to overrule it or override it.

We will never understand the importance of a Congressional Black Caucus budget. And we will continue to have conservative talk shows who malign African American elected officials, because they speak a different language of generosity than they might think is appropriate, unless we come together and study our history in an appropriate manner.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the fact that we now can find our history on the Internet. I would like to commend Dr. Louis ''Skip'' Gates, my colleague who probably soon will be called the new father of African American history, professor at Harvard, who has now put the African American encyclopedia on the Internet.

I think we can have a better understanding if we learn each other's history, if African American history becomes the kind of history that is living; that is accepted; that is widespread; and that all people understand it, so that we can make this country better.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, the remarks of the gentlewoman from Texas, (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), of course, were pertinent in every way in terms of the three items that I have put forth here tonight.

The gentlewoman has mentioned the juvenile justice and law enforcement problems that we have had for a long, long time in America, whether the law and the government became the arm of

injustice and inequality in so many ways, and the gentlewoman recommended that in the Congressional Black Caucus' Alternative Budget we put in items and we address it in terms of making certain that there are funds there to deal with the problem of continuing injustices, profiling and abuses of the law. I commend the gentlewoman for that.

Mr. Speaker, I also would like to highlight the fact that the gentlewoman said Dr. Gates, Skip Gates, who is now I think the Encarta Africana, is on disk, and our encyclopedia is on the Internet.

He might be called the modern father of African American history taking after Carter G. Woodson.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, he is a martyr. Mr. Speaker, I do not take anything from Carter G. Woodson at all. I did put on there martyr or future, may be the future, that is all.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, Skip Gates, we may in the future be proposing legislation around him. Today on the floor, I want to commend the people, the Members of the House, more than two thirds of the Members of the House voted for this bill, which calls for the Carter D. Woodson National Historic Site Study Act of 1999. It was introduced last year, and we passed it today.

Mr. Speaker, let me just indicate what it proposes to deal with. Congress finds the following: Dr. Carter G. Woodson, cognizant of the widespread ignorance and scanty information concerning the history of African Americans, founded on September 9, 1915, the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History, since renamed the Association for the Study of African American Life and History.

The association was founded in particular to counter racist propaganda alleging black inferiority and the pervasive influence of Jim Crow prevalent at that time.

The mission of the association was and continues to be educating the American public of the contributions of black Americans in the formation of a Nation's history and culture.

Dr. Woodson dedicated nearly his entire adult life to every aspect of the association's operations in furtherance of its mission.

Among the notable accomplishments of the association under Dr. Woodson's leadership, Negro History Week was instituted in 1926 to be celebrated annually during the second week of February. Negro History Week has since evolved into Black History Month.

The headquarters and center of operations of the association was Dr. Woodson's residence located at 1539 9th Street, Northwest, here in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Speaker, this bill proposes that not later than 18 months after the date on which the funds are made available for the purposes of this act, the Secretary, after consultation with the mayor of the District of Columbia, shall submit to the Committee on Resources of the United States House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the United States Senate a resource study of the Dr. Carter Woodson home and headquarters of the Association for the Study of African American Life and History.

The study shall identify suitability and feasibility of designating the Carter G. Woodson home as a unit of the national park system. It shall also include cost estimates for any necessary acquisition, development, operation and maintenance and identification of alternatives for the management, administration and protection of a Carter G. Woodson home.

This would be, in our opinion, a vital, small first step in recognizing the fact that this Capitol ought to contain many more resources related to African American history.

Mr. Speaker, we are able to get two thirds of the Members of Congress to vote for this, and it moves us forward. We hope, and we will continue to fight to get passage of JOHN CONYERS' bill on reparations. He calls for the commission to study reparation proposals for African Americans.

That bill has been here for many, many years and not been able to get passed, but this bill proposes to, quote, acknowledge the fundamental injustice, cruelty, brutality, and inhumanity of slavery in the United States under the 13 American colonies between 1619 and 1865, and to establish a commission to examine the institution of slavery, subsequently de jure and de facto racial and economic discrimination against African Americans and the impact of these forces on living African Americans, to make recommendations to the Congress on appropriate remedies and for other purposes.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is vital. We are only calling for a commission to study proposals for reparations. It relates as much to African American history as any item we could put forth.

I am going to close with a discussion of The Debt, the book by Randall Robinson which picks up the theme of reparations. I am going to show how that relates to our Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget. Before I do that, I would like to yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK).

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) for yielding to me.

As I stand here each day in the hallowed halls of this Congress, I cannot but be reminded of the broad shoulders upon which I stand. I do not think that every Member of Congress understands how far we have come, the 39 African American members of the Congress.

They just accept us as being knowledgeable colleagues. They accept us as being friends and many of us as neighbors. I do not think many of them realize the struggle that got us here and the struggle that still continues in this country for equality of opportunity for African Americans.

Mr. Speaker, it is our duty every day of the year to remind people about this experience and where we are going from here and what we must do.

Mr. Speaker, I think it was Martin Luther King who said that we do not have time, it has to happen now, we cannot keep putting it off by saying let us push this back on the back burner, but let us talk about it now.

Mr. Speaker, I think about men like former Congressman Robert Elliott, who served in Congress from 1842 to 1884. He was one of the 22 African Americans to serve in Congress during the Reconstruction.

Mr. Elliott's last term in the Congress was highlighted by his eloquent support of a civil rights bill designed to secure equality for and prohibit discrimination against African Americans in public places.

Mr. Speaker, think of it, it is ironic that we are still fighting that battle. As long ago as Mr. Elliott stood in Congress and fought it, the African Americans here today are still fighting to be sure that there is equality of education and equality of opportunity, and there is equal justice for African Americans.

It is ironic, and it is a charge that we must continue to keep. It is also a challenge of this Congress to be sure and keep that forever in front of them.

In his January 1874 speech before Congress, Congressman Elliott said, and he sounded to me very much like my colleague the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS), I keep talking about the resounding ring of these words and how they happen to be repeated. ''I regret that at this day, it is necessary I should rise in the presence of an American Congress to advocate a bill which simply asserts equal rights and equal public privileges for all classes of American citizens.''

And my colleague from New York (Mr. OWENS) just talked about reparations. The gentleman just talked about equality of opportunity or a budget that really focuses upon the needs of all of American citizens. According to the former Congressman Elliott he said, ''I regret, sir, that the dark hue of my skin may lend a color to the imputation that I am controlled by motives personal to myself in the advocacy of this great measure of national justice.''

Mr. Speaker, I compare that again to the gentleman's presentation, how he talked before the 300 years of slavery and how it has been a negative impact on people of color.

And my former Congressman goes on, Elliott, to say, ''Sir, the motive that impels me is restricted by no such narrow boundary but is as broad as your Constitution. I advocate it, because it is right. The bill, however, not only appeals to your sense of justice, but it demands a response from your gratitude.

''In the events that lead to the achievement of American independence, the Negro was not an inactive or

unconcerned spectator. He bore his part bravely upon many battlefields, although uncheered by that certain hope of political elevation which victory would secure to the white man.''

Mr. Speaker, Elliott went on to detail the participation of black Americans in America's wars for independence at the Battle of New Orleans and the other historic battles and the commendations that black soldiers have received.

□ 1915

I could go on and on in some way sort of laying out to my colleagues the history that makes it such a cogent thing for us tonight, not only tonight but this entire month and throughout the year, to secure equality for and prohibit discrimination against African Americans.

I am also reminded of several Members of Congress, the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) greatly included in this great victory of this great journey, this great exodus that we are on every time we stand on this floor to try to bring equality to all.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to say to the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) to just recall that Frederick Douglass was one of our greatest scholars and one of the ones who, during his time, was called the unofficial president of American Negroes. And this was in the years before and immediately following the Civil War.

No one represented the hearts and minds of African American people more than Frederick Douglass. He died in 1895. He was an abolitionist who believed that he and other African Americans could contribute most by being politically active in the anti-slavery movement. Douglass wrote and spoke often about freedom.

On September 24, 1883, Douglass spoke of a commonality, and I underline ''commonality,'' between the races in their allegiance to and aspirations for the Nation and called on America to make its practice accord with its Constitution its righteous laws.

In closing, Douglass said, ''If liberty, with us, is yet but a name, our citizenship is but a sham, and our suffrages thus far only a cruel mockery, we may yet congratulate ourselves upon the fact that the laws and institutions the country are sound, just and liberal. There is hope for people when their laws are righteous.''

And that is what the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) has done. I have been here in the Congress almost 8 years, and he constantly reminds us of the history that we must never forget. I think he is the only one that makes this a daily affair, this affair of African Americans and the history which preceded us, and making us to be sure not to forget that this does not happen again, that we continue on this route, that we will always be en route to freedom and justice for all.

I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS), for his scholarship and his foresight for being sure that black history becomes more than a month but remains throughout the year.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK) for her kind remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD).

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) for his constant reminder of how important education is to all children but especially African American children and the need to bring quality education to the regions of the Congressional Black Caucus members in providing a strong and quality education that includes computers in every classroom and students to have a computer at every desk. We thank him so much, and he continues to shed that light each night as he does on this floor.

I would like to also congratulate my two female colleagues who came before me to speak about this important month that we celebrate, commonly known as Black History Month. Some of us call it African American History Month. But irrespective of the title, it is to bring celebration to those who have come before us who have served with distinction and honor not only in this House but throughout this country in making America what it is today.

Mr. Speaker, as the co-chair of the Congressional Caucus on Women's Issues, I rise today to pay homage to the many African American women whose invaluable efforts have made it possible for me to stand here before my colleagues today. These women have struggled and fought against all odds to ensure that America would be a country where resources and opportunities are available to men, women, and children of all ages, races, and religions. It is with immense pride that I stand here today and honor some very important African American women who have served here in Congress.

One such woman was Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm, who became the first African American woman ever elected to the U.S. Congress from New York in 1969 and in 1972 became the first African American female to run for President of the United States.

Congresswoman Chisholm was a strong advocate for women's rights, universal access to day-care, the environmental protection, and job training. What a legacy she left.

Continuing her legacy pioneered by her was Congresswoman Barbara Jordan, who was elected from the great State of Texas in 1973 and impressed the world with her outstanding oratorical ability as well as her integrity, leadership, and dignity during the Watergate hearings.

She rose to national distinction when she became the first African American woman to deliver the keynote address at the Democratic national convention in 1976. Her legacy as a champion of the people is evident in many of her outstanding speeches. Her words ring true even today, as we remember her saying, ''What the people want is simple. They want an America as good as its promise.'' What an outstanding woman she was.

A preeminent example of a woman's ability to juggle family and a career was our great Congresswoman from the State of California, Congresswoman Yvonne Braithwaite Burke, who was elected in 1973 from that great State of California. She distinguished herself not only through her leadership, having made sure that the women who serve in the salons have health benefits, but she became the first woman of Congress to give birth to a child while in office. Her commitment to public service, however, did not end when she left Congress, as today she serves as one of the most influential members of the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors.

The epitome of loyalty to family and civic values was set as Congresswoman Cardis Collins, who was elected in 1973 to complete the term of her husband, Representative George Collins, following his death in a plane crash. She remained in the House for 23 years, holding the title of the longest of any African American woman to have served in the House of Representatives. She was a valiant leader as a ranking member in holding the line on the Committee on Government Operations.

Congresswoman Katie Beatrice Green Hall was elected from the State of Indiana in 1982 and earned a place in history as the sponsor of the Martin Luther King, Jr., Holiday legislation that was signed into law by then President Ronald Reagan. She was a strong advocate of education, too, being a former teacher.

And then, Mr. Speaker, history was made after 90-plus years of not having an African American in the Senate until Senator Carol Moseley-Braun became the first African American woman ever elected to serve in the U.S. Senate to represent the great State of Illinois in 1983. She served with distinction.

We can recall that Senator Carol Moseley-Braun sponsored the National Underground Railroad Network to Freedom Act. The Act is designed to identify and preserve significant sites in more than 29 States. She was recently appointed as the ambassador to New Zealand and Samoa.

Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate this month of African American History and find ourselves navigating through the joys and challenges of this new millennium that is about to embark, let us gain strength in knowing that the road is a little smoother, the battles a little easier, and the burdens a little lighter because we stand on the shoulders of these great women, women such as those I have mentioned and those who are coming behind us and the countless others who will come after us. Let us always remember that they endured

the public responsibility of office and the private responsibility of womanhood.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) for her comments.

I would like to close with quotes from the book by Randall Robinson, The Debt.

> No race, no ethnic or religious group, has suffered so much over so long a span as blacks have, and do still, at the hands of those who benefited, with the connivance of the United States Government, from slavery and the century of legalized American racial hostility that followed it. It is a miracle that the victims-weary dark souls long shorn of a venerable and ancient identity have survived at all, stymied as they are by the blocked roads to economic equality.
>
> At long last, let America contemplate the scope of its enduring human-rights wrong against the whole of a people. Let the vision of blacks not become so blighted from a sunless eternity that we fail to see the staggering breadth of America's crimes against us.

Solutions to our racial problems are possible, but only if our society can be brought to face up to the massive crime of slavery and all that it has brought. Step by step, in every way possible, the members of the Congressional Black Caucus are seeking to force the issue of having America face up to the need to compensate, the need to have special policies and programs which understand and recognize this long history of deprivation that was perpetrated against the people.

The Congressional Black Caucus budget is relevant, very much relevant, to all that black history lessons teaches. We will overcome.

□

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2366, SMALL BUSINESS LIABILITY REFORM ACT OF 2000

Mr. DREIER (during the Special Order of Mr. OWENS), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–498) on the resolution (H. Res. 423) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2366) to provide small businesses certain protections from litigation excesses and to limit the product liability of nonmanufacturer product sellers, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□

ILLEGAL NARCOTICS IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KINGSTON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I come before the House again on a Tuesday night to talk about the subject of illegal narcotics and how it affects our Nation.

Today we conducted an almost 6-hour hearing on the administration's proposal to expend more than a billion dollars in taxpayer funds in an effort to bring the situation in Colombia under control; and tonight I would like to speak part of my special order pointed toward that hearing and some commentary on that hearing.

I would also like to review some of the things that have taken place in the last week both in my State of Florida with a Florida drug summit and also here in Washington with an international drug summit, which I was one of the cohosts, along with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), the Speaker of the House, and with the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), chairman of the Committee on International Relations, and also with the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), full chairman of the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

As my colleagues may know, I chair the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources of the Committee on Government Reform. And, of course, the responsibility for national drug policy in trying to make some sense out of what we have been doing in our anti-narcotics effort really rests with that subcommittee.

So today we had a hearing, last week a summit at the national level, and a continuation of efforts at the local level.

Let me just mention, if I may, the international drug summit, which was held for 2 days last week here in the Nation's capital. If you look at the war on drugs, and the international problems relating to narcotics, you see that you cannot win an effort by yourself. The United States cannot stand alone and combat illegal narcotics trafficking, illegal narcotics production, illegal narcotics interdiction and enforcement and eradication.

It is really a simple thing to determine to look at the pattern of production of hard narcotics, illegal narcotics, to look at the path of illegal narcotics, and then the problems that we all have when they reach their source, the various countries.

□ 1930

Quickly you realize that the United States, even the powerful United States Congress, cannot legislate or dictate solutions to this international problem. But the problem is not that complicated, and I wanted to show something that was brought before our international drug summit last week. In that summit, we brought together probably the largest gathering of parliament members from various congresses and parliaments around the world to Washington. We had law enforcement leaders, including individuals from Scotland Yard, Interpol, Europol, DEA, other major drug enforcement agencies.

In addition, we had some of the leaders in treatment. Dr. Leshner, the head of NIDA, National Institute on Drug Abuse, came, along with others who were involved in successful treatment and prevention programs. General McCaffrey addressed the group. The Speaker of the House, DENNIS HASTERT who is intimately knowledgeable about this whole problem, chaired the subcommittee responsibility antinarcotics efforts in the House before he became Speaker, and a whole array of others who were involved in antinarcotics efforts.

This was not my idea; it was something that I agreed to cohost along with the others I have mentioned, and it was a follow-up to real efforts that were undertaken by one of the United Kingdom members of the European parliament, and that was Sir Jack Stewart-Clark who initiated the first international meeting some 3 years ago.

The second international meeting was held last year just outside of Vienna. I had an opportunity to attend, with the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and others, and participate behind closed doors in a meeting to discuss an international narcotics strategy. So we agreed to cohost with the United Nations Office of Drug Control Policy and its director, a wonderful gentleman, very talented, Pino Arlacchi, who again heads that office in the U.N.

This third summit, bringing together everybody who deals with this problem and look at how we could cooperatively tackle this and get a global approach and solution. We can look at the globe, and this happens to be a cocaine trafficking route, we see the problems created by cocaine. Now, cocaine, one does not have to be a rocket scientist or study the problem of cocaine trafficking very long, because there are only three countries that produce coca and cocaine. They are Peru, Bolivia, and Colombia.

One hundred percent of the world's supply of cocaine comes from that area, but it trafficks throughout the world. So all of the nations have an interest in that particular drug trafficking. Cocaine now has really surged in production the last year or two, and particularly in Colombia where the United States let down its guard some years ago. And as a result of an effort really that was instituted by the Speaker of the House, Mr. HASTERT, and his predecessor, Mr. Zeliff, myself, and others who, when we assumed responsibility for the House of Representatives leading the majority, the new majority in 1995, went down to those source countries to look at firsthand what had taken place.

Most of our antinarcotics programs from 1993 to 1995 were slashed by the Clinton administration. They were cut out in many instances or, in most cases, halved. We went into the jungles and saw that in fact the resources were not there to stop the production of coca. We worked with two countries in particular, Peru and Bolivia, and their leaders, in Bolivia Hugo Banzer and a dynamic Vice President Jorge Guerra and others from that country who were willing to step forward and take a

stand against cocaine trafficking and coca production.

There has been a dramatic decrease, some 55 percent decrease in some 3 years in Bolivia in coca production. We went on to Peru and met with President Fujimori and have worked with him over the past couple of years. President Fujimori inherited a country that was fraught with turmoil, with Marxist and terrorist operations throughout the country that destabilized Peru just some 9 or 10 years ago. It was an intolerable situation.

He brought that country under control. Meeting with us and working through programs he established in Peru, he has been able to cut coca production by 60 percent. Now, this is the good news. I do not want to say the United States or Mr. HASTERT, myself, and others should take credit for that but it was not done all by the United States. It was also supported by the international community through the United Nations Office of Drug Control Policy and also under the leadership of Pino Arlacchi.

I might just as an aside tell the Members about Pino Arlacchi. Pino Arlacchi is the Italian prosecutor who helped take down the Mafia and organized crime in Italy. He came on board and almost single-handedly led the effort to destroy the entrenched mob in Italy and did an outstanding job. He made Italy a country that is really free of the organized crime and corruption and did it single-handedly and then was chosen to lead the U.N. Office of Drug Control Policy.

I might also say that as a conservative Republican, it is sort of an odd fellow combination, myself and the head of the U.N. Office of Drug Control Policy. Although I have been a critic of the U.N. and some of the bureaucracy it has built up and some of its ineffectiveness, I do realize that we need international cooperative efforts, and I think that drug control and a global drug strategy working together is very important. Also it is important to know that the United Nations effort, while it does work with the United States and Peru and also in Bolivia, there are countries that we have no relations with that are major producers.

In fact, if we could look at heroin production, 75 percent of the heroin in the world is produced in Afghanistan. The United States has no relations really and at best very strained relations with Afghanistan. But yet 75 percent of the entire world production of heroin comes from Afghanistan. It is in our interest to see that that activity is curtailed.

So through the United Nations and through a program that Pino Arlacchi has championed and successfully put together, even talking with the Taliban and other groups in Afghanistan, again with which we have no communications, he is doing an effective effort, and the few dollars, the limited dollars, I believe it is around the $50 million mark over the last couple of years, that we have put into that effort and the few dollars he spends are very effectively spent.

They are spent in the Golden Triangle, some in Cambodia and Burma and Laos and other areas in which we do not have influence. He has had a successful program for the most part in stopping illegal narcotics, particularly heroin, where we cannot stop it, and working with us in South America to complement our efforts.

We see that successful effort. It does work. This is not rocket science. It works. We have stopped it. He has found, and gave a great presentation to our gathering, that alternative crops and crop substitution programs do work. But they must be combined with tough enforcement.

I think Bolivia had tried programs with just the carrot, and he has said in his remarks to us that the carrot alone does not work. You must have the carrot and the stick to enforce that. Both Peru and Bolivia are successful examples. Colombia is a disaster.

We know 75 percent of the heroin that is produced in the world comes from Afghanistan. One of the things that came out of this besides 2 days of discussion is really an effort to see if we could put a belt around Afghanistan, and also introduce and support programs that would stop production in Afghanistan of heroin, and then around the belt countries. There was substantial progress made in that regard.

Also, again rather than talking but acting on the issue of coca production and cocaine. The vice president of Bolivia has offered to host the fourth international summit gathering sometime next year, in 2001, and hopefully at that time we can celebrate the demise in 2001 of coca production in Bolivia, which once accounted for nearly 50 percent of the production.

Peru was the biggest producer, and now down by some 65 percent. The bad news is the United States curtailed some of the surveillance operations and information sharing to President Fujimori and we have seen a slight increase in coca production. The good news, I guess, is that coca is not coming into the United States; but the bad news is that it is going into Europe where it can get a higher price.

These programs are very cost effective, the crop eradication and substitution. In one year, we put in some $60 million in South America in the three countries that produce 70 percent of the heroin, 70 percent now of the cocaine, we put a few dollars, $60 million out of a $17.8 billion project and expenditure that the Congress undertook last year and will even be exceeded this year, more than $18 billion this year for the various drug programs that we support.

So a few million dollars can provide an alternative to these countries. It has proven to be, in fact, very successful. Next year, we hope to meet in Bolivia, celebrate that country's eradication of coca and hopefully the beginning and continuation of a successful crop substitution program which makes a better life for their people and certainly one for the people of the United States when we do not have cocaine and crack on our streets and our young people dying from drug abuse.

The international summit was successful, and I think again, everyone who came away is convinced that it can only be through a cooperative effort that we make progress. Now, one of the areas that has not been as successful is Colombia. Colombia is the focus of the national news tonight. It was the focus of a hearing that we spent 6 hours on in our Criminal Justice, Drug Policy subcommittee.

Almost all of the heroin that is consumed in the United States is produced in Colombia. DEA through its signature analysis program, which analyzes really almost the DNA in the heroin, DEA can tell you through this analysis that the particular heroin that is seized in the United States comes from Colombia, practically from the field it comes from. So 75 percent of the heroin coming into the United States comes from Colombia. Now, I talked about our strategy, and we have a strategy beyond the administration, because the administration's strategy is not going to work by itself.

□ 1945

You push this down in one area, it is like Jello, it pops up in another. That is why the Afghan's international global strategy is so important. Again, just a few dollars of our contributions in this effort will do an incredible amount to stop that supply.

The same thing can happen in Colombia, although the situation there has spiraled out of control. In addition to heroin production, Colombia in 5 or 6 years is now the major coca-producing country in the world. Some of the production has shifted from Peru and Bolivia to Colombia.

We know that what we did in Peru and Bolivia will work in Colombia; there is no question about that. The problem is, every effort that the new majority has tried, and I tried to make these efforts in a bipartisan fashion the last 4 or 5 years since we took over, every effort has been thwarted by the administration to get resources to Colombia. So where you do not have ammunition, where you do not have supplies, where you do not have a riverine strategy in place, where you do not have information-sharing that allows a shootdown of drug traffickers, when all of these things are taken out or blocked by the administration, which they have repeatedly done, you have a very difficult situation.

Then you see Mexico on this chart. Mexico, it is not a big producer of illegal narcotics. It does produce a great deal of marijuana and about 14 percent of the heroin, and that is up; but that is because we have this open border. But most of the heroin that is produced

and enters the United States is produced in Colombia. So that is where we need to concentrate some of our resources. It will not even reach Mexico to get into the United States.

In addition to these two charts, I wanted to trace the history of how we got ourselves in this $1 billion-plus Colombia mess.

This did not happen by accident. As I said, the administration and a Democrat-controlled Congress from 1993 to 1995 cut the interdiction, the source programs, the eradication programs, cut the Coast Guard and began taking the military out of the war on drugs. Basically, the war on drugs was closed down in 1993 by the Clinton administration, slashing the drug czar's office from 100-some staff to 20-some staff.

You cannot fight a war unless all these things are in place. The media is unbelievable in this. They say the war on drugs is a failure, there has not been a war on drugs since January of 1993. What we have tried to do in 1995 and 1996 is restart the war on drugs, target it to where the drugs are coming from.

Now, just let me read from 1994, my colleague STEVE HORN in a hearing, his comments. He said, ''As you recall, as of May 1, 1994, the Department of Defense decided unilaterally to stop sharing realtime intelligence regarding aerial traffic in drugs with Colombia and Peru. Now, as I understand it, that decision, which has not been completely resolved, has thrown diplomatic relations with the host countries into chaos.''

Now, here is sort of the genesis of how we get ourselves into that $1 billion fix. Back then the administration made a decision to stop information sharing. Now, how can anyone fight a war on drugs without information to conduct combat? The United States was the source of that intelligence, with overflights, with forward operating intelligence, with all the information needed to go after drug traffickers.

So the first thing we did, STEVE HORN complained about it back in August 2, 1994, and he was not the only one. Even the Democrats complained about it in the House of Representatives. In fact, this is a Washington Post story a couple days later, August 1994. ''Chairmen of two House subcommittees blasted the Clinton Administration,'' not Republicans, mind you, ''for its continuing refusal to resume sharing intelligence data with Colombia and Peru that would enable the Andean nations to shoot down aircraft carrying narcotics into the United States.''

So here is the beginning of a multi-billion dollar spiral out of control, the drug czar called it a ''flipping nightmare,'' to use his term, before the press. This is the genesis of it; and you see that, again, that both Republicans and Democrats, their leaders, were absolutely appalled by what was taking place. That is how you turn a minor producer, and you have to remember, Colombia produced almost no coca, there was almost no coca grown in Colombia, almost 100 percent was grown in Peru and Bolivia at the beginning of this administration, almost no heroin. In fact, today I said the only poppies that were grown could barely fill a flower arrangement, grown in Colombia in 1993. Now this Nation is the leader in growing and producing both coca, poppy, heroin and cocaine.

Here is the genesis of this. Now, it would not be bad if this was the only misstep, but the missteps just continued and continued. The next thing the administration did was adopt a policy to decertify Colombia as being eligible to receive United States assistance.

Now, I helped develop a law back when I worked in the Senate that allows for decertification of countries that are not cooperating in either stopping the production or trafficking of illegal narcotics. It is a good law. It ties aid and financial assistance and other benefits to their cooperation. It is one of the few handles we have.

As you will notice, we are getting closer to certification, which is required by law March 1st. Mexico extradited someone the other day, and these countries start behaving and cooperating in the anti-narcotics effort when it is time for certification.

But you could not believe that an administration could possibly mess up a law the way the Clinton administration messed up the certification law. We allowed under the law to decertify a country and not let them get benefits for trade and assistance and foreign aid, but we put in the law a little provision that said the President could grant a national-interest waiver in our interest, the United States' national interest, because we knew when we wrote the law we wanted to be able to get aid to a country that was having a problem to deal with the problem, to make efforts to eradicate the problem, drugs at their source, to stop trafficking, et cetera, and get them the resources they needed to conduct that activity.

You could not believe that they could mess this up, but they did; and the President decertified Colombia without a national-interest waiver. Not for Colombia, but national-interest waiver for the United States.

Repeatedly we asked for, of course, hearings during the Clinton administration when they controlled the House of Representatives. I had 132 Members sign a letter requesting hearings over 2 years when they controlled the House, the Senate and the White House. One hearing was held, and it was a very brief hearing. Since we took over, we have had at least 20 hearings on the narcotics issue in trying to get this effort that was started back so successfully under Reagan and Bush restarted in 1995–1996.

The next thing we knew as a Congress, and anyone who looked at the situation, is that it was worsening in Colombia. This is back in 1995–1996 as a result of the 1994 policies that were ill-advised in decertifying Colombia.

The next thing that we asked for was to get to the police in Colombia equipment that could go to high altitude and go after narcotics traffickers and also do eradication of the beginning of the poppy fields that were growing there that we saw that were reported, at the beginning of the coca production that we saw that was started there.

I cannot tell you how many letters, how many communications, how many requests were made of this administration. It was countless, asking the Secretary of State, asking the President, asking the Secretary of Defense, everyone in the administration, to get resources to Colombia because the situation was worsening.

Now, this is an interesting headline. It says ''Delay of copters hobbles Colombia in stopping drugs.''

I do not know if you can see this. I would like to blow this up and just put it on the screen here so every colleague could read this. This is February 12, 1998, just after 1997. This is an unbelievable sequence of events. Again, first dismantling the entire command structure of our war on drugs; gutting the drug czar's office; next, doing away with the shootdown policy; next, doing away with the information-sharing policy; and then, next, decertifying the country without granting a national U.S.-interest waiver to allow the equipment to get there. We knew the equipment needed to get there, we knew what was happening, we knew that only copters and equipment in the anti-narcotics effort could eliminate that.

But this is how you turn a minor problem into destabilizing a whole region, failed policies of an administration. This is not partisan, this is fact, and it is very well documented. It should be documented for history, and also for what we are doing, that these kinds of mistakes are not made in the future. And you cannot win this by yourself; it is going to take a cooperative effort; and you are not going to be sending United States troops in. That would never happen. But you can provide a little bit of assistance to countries that are trying to stop narco-terrorism within their borders.

So here you see in 1997–1998, asking for the resources denied by the administration, not only denied, but blocked by the administration, and that helps you get into a multi-billion dollar pickle that we are now in.

Then we have been asking not only could we appropriate a few dollars, and under the leadership of Mr. HASTERT, now Speaker of the House, who had this responsibility, he framed together in 1998 a bill for a supplemental in the war on drugs to restart the source-country programs, restart eradication, alternative crop programs, to restart interdiction of drugs, trying to get information and sources down there.

We not only wanted to put a few more dollars in that that could effectively cure the problem that was erupting and we saw back from 1994, but we

thought it would be wise to also take surplus United States equipment and get it to Colombia, so we asked the President to do that.

Now, until a few weeks ago, equipment requested in 1997 still had not been delivered, surplus equipment, delivered there. This stuff sits rusting in fields or warehouses or in lots, and there is no reason why it cannot get to Colombia.

Then almost a slap in the face. Last year when we began asking why is the equipment not requested, and even that the President said he would send as surplus in 1997–1998, getting there? This is another headline that just shows that ''the gang that couldn't shoot straight'' was in charge. ''Colombia turns down dilapidated U.S. trucks.''

We sent dilapidated trucks, I think they were trucks used primarily in the tundra or the cold climate, down to Colombia. So when we do finally get some equipment there, it is equipment that is not usable in the war on narcotics. It is a pretty sad story. It would almost be humorous if it did not have consequences.

Now, I know people think that this is probably something that the Republicans made in a partisan fashion, but in fact this chart was produced by the Monitoring of the Future Study by the University of Michigan. Let us just look at it for a minute, because it shows from 1980 the problem with cocaine and drug use at that time, it was predominantly cocaine that we were having the big problem with. This chart shows a long-term trend in lifetime prevalence of drug use.

This shows the Reagan campaign, the Just Say No, the Andean strategy, the Vice President's task force. This was reducing drug use among our youth, among our population, in very good fashion. It was put together, all of these initiatives, the certification law, and it worked.

□ 2000

It was working. This is nothing that we made up, it is not a partisan poster. Then we had President Bush, and he continued the same policies through to the end of his term. We saw continued dramatic declines in prevalence of drug use, period. This formula works. A balanced formula of eradication, crop alternative at the source, interdiction as the drugs are coming up, give the information, surveillance, get them as the drugs leave their source country, and then involving the military or whoever to protect our borders as it gets closer to the borders; the Coast Guard, which also was dramatically cut.

In 1992 and 1993, we see the beginning of the end of the war on drugs. Again, this is fact. It is just fact, pure and simple. The media probably would never print this chart. One would never see this on the evening news.

Tonight I saw the evening news and they showed a little bit about how Peru and Bolivia went down in production. Of course, they did not say who did that or what policies instituted that change. They do not give us the rest of the story, as Paul Harvey says. One has to listen to myself and my colleagues tonight to hear that on the floor.

Drug use just climbed, climbed, climbed with the Clinton administration. One could almost trace the gutting of the Drug Czar's office. We have the documentation. The slash of the Drug Czar's office was from 112 to 27. Now, how could one fight the war on drugs when we slash the command staff. I will say the Republicans have given Barry McCaffrey I believe 150 positions, he is fully staffed, but it has taken us a good period of time to get us back into the war on drugs. Mr. Speaker, 112 to 27. They cut source country and interdiction funding by 50 percent. We can almost see the actions here.

Mr. Speaker, in 1993, appoint Jocelyn Elders Surgeon General who said to our children in the next generation, ''just say maybe'' instead of ''just say no.'' There are consequences from those actions.

The next consequence is the information-sharing, the commentary from TORRICELLI, the Democrats who mention here, do not stop that. Look at how we see the increase there. In 1996 and 1997, blocking the aid to Colombia. Finally we see the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), first Mr. Zeliff and then our Speaker of the House taking over this responsibility and again, turning that ship around.

We are just starting to see a slight downturn in these figures. That is with a $1 billion national education program. The President wanted to pay for all of those ads. I introduced legislation that said that they must donate them. We ended up with a compromise. The compromise does give us a $2 billion effort, $1 billion in public money, $1 billion in donated money. The success of that I do not know, and I cannot tell my colleagues today. We did preliminary hearings on the expenditures of one-third of $1 billion, and quite frankly, I am not pleased with everything I have seen. It is somewhat of an effort.

But I will tell my colleagues one thing. When we go after production in the source country, we begin to stem some of the, not supply but glut; and that is what has happened with cocaine. Now we need to do the same thing with heroin and continue with the cocaine and hopefully, we will learn by the mistakes that were made in the past.

Mr. Speaker, this is the history. It is pretty dramatic.

The Republicans, I might say, what have they done? Well, we have restored the source country programs equivalent right now to 1992 dollars the cost-effective stop-drugs-at-their-source. If we know 100 percent of the cocaine is produced in coca in those three countries and it really cannot be produced in too many other areas, that makes a lot of sense to go after that.

We know what we have done works because we have seen it work in Peru and Bolivia. I will say in Peru, President Fujimori was able to create stability in that Nation and then put these programs in place. The same thing President Pastrana in Colombia is going to do. That is why we are going to have to support that effort. I do not like that effort, I do not like spending taxpayer money there. But in comparison, a few billion dollars there; think of what this administration has squandered in deployments in forays around the world.

In Somalia, which President Bush started as a humanitarian mission he escalated into the loss of, I believe, some 30 American lives; a $3 billion enterprise, a failure in Nation-building and putting our people in there. The Haiti experiment, which is an absolute disaster, it is a national and international disgrace that he would impose sanctions on the poorest of the nations in the entire hemisphere, spend billions of dollars to put more corrupt people in place, and now Haiti is one of the major drug trafficking areas in the entire Caribbean, not to mention that much of the billions of dollars went to institution-building that failed. Then, to send our troops to Bosnia, to send our troops to Kosovo. Great international humanitarian missions, probably $10 billion apiece. But there were very few civilian Americans killed in any of those incursions.

Mr. Speaker, in 1997, 15,973 Americans died because of direct drug-related deaths. Mr. McCaffrey, our director of the Office of Drug Control Policy, said today that if we take the total figure in the last year, it is about 52,000. Speaker HASTERT, who spoke to our international drug summit for dinner the other evening when we convened that meeting and he spoke, he said that if we had 15,000 troops in any conflict anywhere who were killed in one year, that people would demand action. Unfortunately, these are silent deaths. Unfortunately, these are young people in our community.

What is interesting, it has not stopped. It used to be just the urban centers, the ghetto. These were sort of the community rejects and they were injecting heroin or doing crack or cocaine, and it was not really covered; nobody really cared. They just sort of looked the other way. They were drug addicts; they were bad. Then it spread to our suburban communities and now it has awakened part of America.

The most recent statistics are, and should be, alarming to every Member of Congress and every American. It has not only spread from the urban setting and the core of our cities to the suburbs, but the latest statistics just released in the past few weeks this year indicate that our rural areas are now plagued by the worst narcotics epidemic they have ever seen. So we have managed in 7 years to see the problem

of narcotics spread to every element of our society. Those 15,700 from 1997, and I am sure were in the 16 thousands in the past year, are all sort of nameless, but they are someone's child; they are someone's loved one, and they are human beings who it is our responsibility to protect.

Now, if we cannot expend this money and get the funds to fight this war on drugs, a few dollars towards the international effort in Southeast Asia where we know those drugs are produced and do it cooperatively with the United Nations where we do not have relations with those countries, a few dollars in South America, the alternative is really the most expensive solution which the administration has gone for. That is treatment of the wounded in battle.

Now, one would think that hearing tonight, and I saw the national news, that Republicans did not spend more money on treatment, the entire strategy of this administration has been to put the money on treatment. Could we imagine dismantling the command center in a war, stopping the information in war, not going after the targets in a war, not providing resources to fight a war, cutting back any of the aid and ammunition in a war, and just treating the wounded in a battle.

That is exactly the philosophy, it is exactly the strategy, and it has been a failed strategy in communities like Baltimore. Baltimore had a liberal mayor up until just recently who said, just do it; we will have needle exchange; we will have all of these liberal programs. Baltimore went from almost no heroin addicts or drug addicts and a large population, the population was approaching 1 million, it is now down to about 600,000. One in 10 people, a city council member has recently been quoted in Baltimore saying 1 in 8 individual citizens of Baltimore, Maryland is a drug addict. Now, that is the liberal approach. The liberal mayor with his liberal policies just left.

If we look at other cities, but let us go back to Baltimore for a second. Most major cities that have adopted zero tolerance like New York and Los Angeles, even Richmond, who have adopted tough prosecution, tough enforcement policies, zero tolerance, have dramatic reductions in deaths. The statistics we have seen from Baltimore were 312 in one year, I think in 1997, and 312 in 1998. I do not have 1999 figures, but I guarantee they have not gone down. The rest of the Nation is where we have zero tolerance. So we have 60,000, one in eight. Imagine the United States of America adopting this liberal policy that Baltimore did. One in eight Americans as a drug addict. Could we imagine the societal costs, the cost to families, the cost to the economy of the Nation. It would be astronomical.

Now, that is one model we can look at.

The New York model, zero tolerance, tough prosecution. I went up during recent months to visit a program that Mayor Giuliani put into place, DTAP, a prosecution program, tough prosecution program that tied in with an effective treatment program, one of the most effective I have seen anywhere in the Nation. Here is a mayor, an elected executive who inherited one of the most crime-ridden towns in America where most people would not walk on the streets with over 2,200 deaths when he took office, the year he took office, and through a zero tolerance, through a tough prosecution program, 600 deaths in New York City. This is a successful program. This is an area where they have successful treatment.

I sat with addicts, and one of the addicts was 38 years old and had spent half of his lifetime in prison. Had no hope before the program instituted by the mayor and the prosecutors in that area. No hope.

Another individual, I talked to his wife, had died of a heroin overdose. He was a heroin addict, and the story went on and on. No successful programs. No tough enforcement. This does work.

Richmond, people talk about gun violence, and I was glad that the President came just behind us and talked about gun violence. Now, I believe very strongly in Second Amendment rights, and I heard the President talk about tough prosecution. We have asked for tough enforcement of gun laws. We have countless gun laws. Washington, D.C. has the toughest gun laws. Guns are banned in Washington, D.C. Today, this community buried a young couple the day after Valentine's Day who were massacred, slaughtered on the streets, I think they were 17 year-old sweethearts in this community, a community with every restriction one could possibly have.

□ 2015

But we know that tough enforcement works. We know that Project Exile, which they adopted in Richmond, which was plagued by record numbers of deaths, but tough prosecution of existing gun laws worked, and we cut the murders dramatically in Richmond, where people could not walk in their neighborhood, in the street. We know the Giuliani method is successful, and that tough prosecution does work.

Our hearing today, in addition to the drug czar, had as a witness an individual who has done an outstanding job, General Wilhelm, who is in charge of the Southern Command. He has done a great job, in spite of an administration that is not interested in having the military work in any way on the war on drugs, and has had to be drug, really, into this new restarted national strategy. General Wilhelm has done an outstanding job in piecing together our Southern Command.

Our Southern Command has been in charge of the surveillance information. Our military does not go after, in a law enforcement manner, drug traffickers. What they do is provide surveillance intelligence information, and that is passed on to our allies, who are really the best suited to go after drug traffickers in their own communities and states and nations, and drugs, at their source most cost-effectively.

Again, this administration could not have bungled things more. We were basically removed from Panama, and we knew we had to be out of Panama. We were unsuccessful, the administration was, in negotiating, keeping our drug surveillance operations at Howard Air Force Base, so last May all flights stopped out of there.

One of the problems we have had is we have had an absolute wide open corridor for narcotics traffickers to come in through this drug-producing region. Again, the most cost-effective way, stop drugs at their source, where they are grown, eradicate them; next, interdict them as they come out.

The glut we are seeing is because Howard Air Force Base was closed down May 1. We turned over those assets to the Panamanians. We have had to relocate in Ecuador, and it will cost us probably $100 million before we are through. We finally signed a permanent agreement, I think a 10-year lease on that airport there. Right now the airfield is in such bad shape that the equipment cannot take off and land that we need. Aruba is another location we have had to look at moving those assets to.

In the meantime, today we are probably only flying 35, 40 percent of the strategic missions to detect and monitor drug trafficking. In a report which I requested from GAO, and we held a hearing just a week or two ago, it was ''Assets DOD Contributes to Reducing Illegal Drug Supplies Have Declined.'' This is a real indictment of the administration in dramatically decreasing the flights. From 1992 to 1995, the drug surveillance flights were reduced, according to this report, by 68 percent. The maritime efforts, anti-narcotics efforts, were reduced some 62 percent.

What is even scarier is, according to General Wilhelm, in this report, and he did testify today, the Southern Command Commander, they can only detect 60 percent of the key routes in the drug trafficking area about 15 percent of the time.

Mr. Speaker, if Members want to be even more concerned, the over-the-horizon radar that was supposed to be in place next month to supplant some of this lost capability is further delayed for installations.

The good news is some of the drug-tethered balloons, air balloons that we have in surveillance around our coasts, I understand we have at least a commitment from the Air Force and from the Assistant Secretary of Defense where they will stay in place, although they were going to remove them.

Again, it does not take much to figure out a good strategy in the war on drugs. We stop it at the source, eradicate it. Even President Nixon eradicated heroin. They have had various programs. They were reviewed at the International Drug Control Summit

last week, and some were very successful, and China and Turkey and other countries. They have been able to eradicate them. We are not on a mission that will not succeed, but we must get the resources there. We must get the equipment there. We must aid our allies, who are willing to be partners in this effort, especially in Colombia, where we have a great leader in President Pastrana, who is trying to get his Nation back together.

I submit, and it was confirmed by witnesses at our hearing today, the only reason the rebels are now in Sweden and in Europe and talking about serious peace settlement in Colombia is because the threat of the resources finally reaching there. It is sad that even until a few weeks ago, the three Black Hawk helicopters that we had requested, and again, Members saw the documents here back some 4 years, 5 years ago, that finally arrived the end of last year, and it is unbelievable, they arrived without proper armor.

Today we were told that the armor that was sent does not fit on all of the helicopters, so some of these are sent in nonstrategic but support missions. Some are up and flying, but not in the proper fashion that Congress had intended.

In addition, the ammunition and mini-guns and other resources to get to the national police, who are anti-narcotics officers in Colombia, still have not all arrived. It is unbelievable, but I believe confirmed that half the ammunition was inadvertently delivered during the Christmas holidays to the loading dock at our State Department; again, the gang that cannot seem to shoot straight in getting this drug situation under control.

Again, it is not rocket science. Almost all of it is coming from Colombia. Seventy-five percent of the heroin coming into the United States, over 75 percent of the cocaine is now sourced there. Some of it does transit through Mexico, but if we stop it at its source cost-effectively, we do not have to have 10,000 Border Patrol people there.

Even today I see they are becoming threatened with bounties put on their heads by these reckless drug traffickers.

Again, we can win this. We can win it cost-effectively. We have to learn by our mistakes. It must be an international effort, a little bit of dollars, with the help of our friends, the European communities willing to put in more resources, because they also are becoming more victimized, just like the United States; with a little help to Colombia and with a little help from both sides of the aisle, not making the mistakes, joining in and saying, we are going to get those resources there, we are not going to wait.

If this was Kosovo and we could not get the helicopters to Kosovo, it would be a disaster. If we could not have gotten the ammunition and the resources to our troops, and these are not our troops we are trying to supply, in the Gulf War, we would have had a disaster there.

So we can start a real war against narcotics. We have thousands of lives at stake. Out there tonight in our districts are young people who are overdosing. Three or four times those who are killed in Columbine will die tomorrow as a result of drug overdoses in our community, and hundreds more, as the drug czar said today, will die from the scourge each day across our Nation.

So we have a great responsibility to get our act together, make certain this administration fulfills the will of Congress, and that we get resources to those who can help us bring this situation under control.

□

FALSE STATEMENTS CONCERNING THE F/A–18E/F SUPER HORNET

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

THE PROBLEM OF INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS TRAFFICKING

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my friend, the gentleman from Florida, for the presentation that he just gave. I would add a couple of things to it; first of all, that in Kosovo the KLA Albanians have been described by the CIA and FBI as some of the most ruthless and dangerous cocaine and heroin dealers in the world. In Europe they are the major threat, and we are starting to see the function of that now. They operate out of Kosovo. They have a clear hand.

Secondly, in Afghanistan, another area in which the terrorists are selling drugs to support the mujaheddin, the Hamas, and recently in Israel, that Israel is having trouble with right now in Lebanon. So I would thank the gentleman for his presentation. The lives of our children and our grandchildren are at stake, and the information that he brings I have read not only in several articles, but have been briefed by our classified sources.

Mr. Speaker, I want to talk on something a little different tonight. On February 7, a member of the other body delivered on the Senate floor what has become an annual tirade of false and misleading statements concerning the Navy's number one weapons system procurement, the F–18E/F Hornet. He concluded at best that the aircraft is not better than the current airplane, and probably is worse, and it is enormously more expensive than continuing with the present FA–18C and D models.

Mr. Speaker, I have two models here. The first is the F–18 C/D. The second is the F–18 E/F. What I will show in this next hour is the extreme advantage of the latter over the C/D model, and why it is necessary that the Navy has its number one aircraft for the future.

Secondly, the gentleman from the other body has never served in the military who was talking about these two aircraft. He has a zero rating from all defense groups and agencies. He stated his own opinion as fact, and I would say that the gentleman in the other body is extremely factually challenged. The gentleman has never served in the armed service. The only credential that he has is that he is liberal.

I say this based on my knowledge and experience in carrier aviation, and on intelligence briefs presented to me recently by the Department of Defense and by the Central Intelligence Agency. It concerns, first, the current, and more importantly, the projected military threat that will face our defense forces over the next decade. We need to take seriously a look at not only what the current threat is that we could face, our men and women in all services, and secondly, it concerns the weapons we are planning to acquire to defeat that threat.

When we look at the threat, we look at the future threat 10 years, 20 years, even 30 years from now, it should be determined on what direction we go with the planning and the aircraft and equipment that we buy presently, and the training of the men and women in our Armed Forces.

I would say that many of the Members have received this intelligence briefing. I would encourage the gentleman from the other body to do so. The classified briefings can bring insight into what those actual threats are and the direction that we need to go.

□ 2030

I would ask, Mr. Speaker, what brings DUKE CUNNINGHAM, a Republican from California, why should I be such another expert, other than the gentleman in the other body?

First of all, I served 20 years in the United States Navy. I was a Top Gun student. I was a Top Gun instructor. I was commanding officer of the adversary squadron. I was on the Defense Authorization Committee, and I am now on the Defense Committee on Appropriations and sat in on many of the Intel briefings. I would tell the gentleman that I have flown the F–14. I have flown the Air Force F–15. I have flown the F–16, the F–18C/D and the F–18E/F that we are talking about. I have flown in the Middle East, and I flew in Israel in 1973 and 1974. I have flown against enemy aircraft in combat, and I have shot down many of those aircraft. I have also flown against them in peacetime to judge their capabilities, and I helped develop the tactics against those particular aircraft.

The gentleman in the other body has none of these capabilities or none of this knowledge.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BILIRAKIS). The Chair would advise the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) that he should refrain from characterizing the position of an

individual Senator, even if not mentioning the Senator by name; and the gentleman should also refrain from urging an individual Senator to take a particular position.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would particularly recommend that the gentleman in the other body get the briefings on potential threats posed by forces by Iran, Iraq and Libya, in North Korea and China. Specifically, Mr. Speaker, I would recommend that the Speaker look at the Russian SU–37 with the AA–10, the AA–11 and AA–12 missile, because in today's fleet, if our pilots in the F–14, the F–15, the F–16 or current F–18 meet this SU–27, with the Russian missiles and their jammer and their radar, our pilots will die 95 percent of the time.

That is not spin, Mr. Speaker. That is fact.

I would recommend these briefings on the capabilities of carrier battle groups to meet and defeat these particular threats and the tactics involved in them, which I deal with on a daily basis. The capabilities of carrier aviation today center on two tactical aircraft, both of which I have flown, the F–14 and the F–18 Hornet. The Navy has upgraded them throughout the years. As they buy an airplane, new equipment, new electronics, new stealth capabilities, are placed on those aircraft.

The F–14 airframe was designed in the 1960s, and the F–18 in the 1970s. We have added many things to those aircraft, trying to keep them with the capability to meet those threats that I have previously talked about.

When the F–14 was designed, the Navy desperately needed a high speed interceptor. Right after the Vietnam War, Mr. Speaker, there were many that thought that our only threat was going to be Backfire bombers coming in from the former Soviet Union. We trained many of our pilots as interceptor pilots, although the Navy Fighter Weapons School, which we know as Top Gun, continued to learn how to fight the F–14 and F–18 in what we commonly call a dog fight.

Counterfleets of projected cruise missiles were also a threat coming in not only at the carriers but our battleships and our troops embarked, and our aircraft were designed to meet that particular threat. That performance dominated the design at the expense of reliability, maintainability, survivability, and versatility.

The F–14 today is very expensive to maintain, and each cost per flight hour is an extreme mode.

In early mid-1970, Congress, in its wisdom, directed both the Navy and the Air Force to develop their next generation of tactical aircraft. The F–18, and for the Air Force the F–16; and if we want to look I do not have a model, Mr. Speaker, of the F–16 but if we want to look at the Russian-built MiG 29, it is very similar. As a matter of fact, the Soviets stole the plans of our F–18 and our F–16 and devised this particular airplane called the MiG 29.

They also stole the plans for our older F–111 and created a MiG that is very poor performing. They stole the wrong plans, because in my opinion the F–111 could not shoot down the Goodyear Blimp, but they stole the plans and thought it would be a good airplane because it had variable swept wing like the F–14.

All of these aircraft have served our Nation well and they have been equally successful by our forces, by both our men and women in Desert Storm and other areas. But they are limited.

The aging fleet of the F–14 Tomcats, many of which are over 20 years old, Mr. Speaker, are difficult and expensive to maintain because they were designed before modern survivability. We call it VSEVO.

Mr. Speaker, we know it as stealth capability, and those techniques have been developed over the years since the F–14 and the F–18 models were developed. Like the F–14, the early models of the F–18 were growing long in the tooth; and even the most recently built F–18C/D model are no longer able to keep up with the evolving threat, i.e., the SU–27, which is a Russian variant, the SU–35 and SU–37, which are projected Russian threats in the next few years, along with their AA–10, AA–11, and AA–12 missiles, which are superior to our best missiles in a dog fight.

The limitations of the F/A–18C/D Hornet and the ability to handle that threat is a serious threat today, Mr. Speaker. They performed well in Desert Storm and Allied Force and Desert Fox. All I can say is we are very, very fortunate, Mr. Speaker, that the SU–27, with the Russian add-ons were not available in Kosovo, because our long-range stand-off weapons, our aircraft would not have known, both in the intercepted and the dog fight, that they were coming, and our pilots would have suffered at the hands of those pilots.

That brings me to my major premise, Mr. Speaker, the necessity of acquiring a larger, longer range, more survivable, and more capable F–18E/F Super Hornet. Many people fought off the B–2 and its production. The B–2 was one of our most successful aircraft in Kosovo. It had no losses. It launched out of the United States on missions, and if we look at the target damage in Kosovo impacted most of the target damage itself.

The F–22 is a future airplane by the Air Force. It will be able to meet the threat of the SU–35 and SU–37 in the future, but at the same time we are debating in Congress the additional cost of that particular airplane. If anything, we need to double the numbers, reduce the unit cost and proceed with the test and evaluation so we can take a look at introducing that particular airplane capability against the future threat of Russian and Chinese airplanes.

Let me give another example, Mr. Speaker. I went to Patuxent River, Maryland, and as a test pilot I am able to fly aircraft. A few weeks ago, General O'Ryan was flying the F–16. I was able to be in the F–15 and doing the test results on the new F–22. We did high angle attack work, which means a very slow high angle, high claim rate speed, and also the VSEVO test, which is the performance and acceleration test of different aircraft.

In this particular airplane, the F–18E/F where I flew at Patuxent River, Maryland, let me give you the difference in capability. In Vietnam, I was shot down on my 300th mission in combat, after engaging some 22 MiGs on the 10th of May 1972 and shooting down three of those MiGs. On other occasions, I had to ingress a target at very low level, 50 feet to 100 feet. I would pitch the plane that I was flying, at that time was an F–4 Phantom, and I would go over the ground looking at my map and hitting certain positions on that map within seconds.

At a given time, I would pop the airplane up, roll to take a look at that target and quite often it took a long time to find that particular target, Mr. Speaker. At that time, I was very vulnerable to those gunners while I am looking for that target climbing.

With this particular airplane, when I flew at low level, some 600 knots at 50 to 100 feet above the ground, it handles very capably and that is another reason that the airplane is good because one can take a young Jonathan Livingston Seagull that has never set foot in a jet before and they feel very, very comfortable with the handling qualities of this aircraft.

I flew it in at 600 knots, popped up; and before I got there, miles away from the target, I was able to lock that target up with two different systems, which I cannot discuss because it is classified. I not only locked up the bridge with two systems, I knew exactly where it was so when I pulled up, all I had to do is roll, put the airplane on the target, drop the ordnance and then break out, which limited the amount of vulnerability that I was vulnerable to enemy aircraft fire and/or other aircraft.

So that in itself, Mr. Speaker, is a big advantage over the F–18C/D, or even the F–14.

Early F–18s, the A, the B, the C and then later the D models, have been strengthened over the years to withstand stress of recovering back aboard a carrier, with more and larger weapons. We have added sensors to these older F–18s, countermeasures, advance systems, black boxes, electronics; and the Hornets have become even more densely packed and heavy.

What does this mean, Mr. Speaker? It basically means that this older model of the F–18, because we have added so much weight, there is no more capacity to add weight to this airplane and, secondly, that when we add the weight on there, we cannot grow anymore. All the new systems to combat these aircraft that I previously mentioned, SU–27, SU–35, SU–37, all their missiles, all of their capabilities, I have no more

room to put it in this airplane. It is full. The F–18E/F has room to grow over the next 20 years, which is a big advantage.

I would ask the Speaker to put himself in the Sea of Japan, or put his son or his daughter in an aircraft, coming aboard in the Sea of Japan in the dead of winter, a pitching deck, bad weather, and you can only land on that carrier one time because the increased weight of this aircraft as it has grown throughout the years, you are limited in the amount of fuel that can be brought back aboard. If you do not land that airplane on the flight deck, you have to go back up through the bad weather, you have to find a tanker and be able to tank. If you drop the weapons that you are carrying, you could drop half a million dollar or million dollar weapons off of that airplane so you can back aboard the carrier, and that is a waste in itself and cost millions of dollars, especially if you are early on in a war when it has not started but yet you carry ordnance just in case the battle begins.

The worst part of this, Mr. Speaker, is that our young men and young women, if they miss that carrier deck in those kind of conditions, in the Sea of Japan or areas where the weather is bad and cold, if they have to eject, the pilots wear today a survival suit, but they have less than 10 minute survivability time; and chances are our helicopters and our search-and-rescue efforts will not find them before they die.

□ 2045

The aircraft that we are talking about that the gentleman in the other body talks so badly about that says it was not better, I can bring four of these heavy duty weapons back aboard and I can carry enough fuel for 15 passes at that carrier deck in case there are problems with the deck, if there are problems with the weather or even the tailhook itself on this particular airplane. So it means survivability to those men and women in those circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, when I was in Vietnam, we had problems bringing Rockeye, which is a bomblet, back aboard the carrier and quite often we did not have time to stick around on the target to develop that particular weapon because we ran low on fuel. F–18E/F extends the range of the current F–18 by drastic amounts, not only giving the pilot time on target but survivability in an area which could be very hostile to enemy threats.

Another advantage of the new F–18E/F because the defense budget has been so low and because many of the deployments to Somalia, to Haiti, to Iraq four times, to Bosnia, to Kosovo, to bombing aspirin factories have cut off the defense budget; and we have not had the advantage of the particular airplane to allow it the capabilities that we need in this particular airplane.

What this aircraft offers is it can itself, if we take off these weapons off this pylon, the airplane is built as an air-to-air tanker. It can give us an additional thousand pounds of fuel, which will allow us to go over a thousand miles, where the F–18/CD has as little as 370 miles of range.

So the gentleman in the other body that spoke about the capabilities of this older CD being worse than the current F–18E/F that we have coming up is just not the case. I would tell the gentleman that he is incorrect, and I would tell him to get not only, I do not know if I can do that, if I can advise him to take briefs, Mr. Speaker, but if he does not, he should. I do not know if I can advise him or not under the rules. But if he is overly concerned that the Super Hornet will cost 13 percent more than the older airplane, I would ask him to think about the capability of this aircraft not only in cold weather in saving our pilots, the ability of this airplane to be a tanker so that this one will not run out of fuel, but the Hornet in studies has been shown that this airplane will die in combat four to one to this airplane. Why?

First of all, you have the endurance and the range to go to the target not direct but in a route that avoids enemy threats. Secondly, if you are engaged by enemy threats, you have the fuel to get back to the carrier, where, with this airplane, just to use an afterburner will cause you to run out of fuel or could cause you to run out of fuel. This additional 13 percent in cost will save four aircraft to one in combat with different studies. And I think that is very critical.

Mr. Speaker, I took this airplane up at Pax River and also flew it. Because the aircraft itself, when it was being initially tested, had a condition that they call wing drop. When you take this aircraft, generally at speeds in which you are trying to close in very close to the enemy, and we will not shoot another F–18, let us at least use a Russian airplane, if we are trying to close in on another airplane close aboard, what was happening, something that they did not look at in a test bed was a condition called wing drop.

If you would pull under certain PSF, different G-loadings, different altitudes, then what happened is the air flow over the wing of this aircraft would cause one wing to depart other and then the wing would drop, which is a tactical disadvantage and could even cost you that fight.

Engineers went in. I flew the airplane at 40,000 feet; and I then flew it at 35,000 feet, and I then flew it at 30,000 feet trying to duplicate the wing drop after the engineers had fixed it. We could not duplicate it.

But during this time, the point that I would make, my chase pilot flew at 25,000 feet just saving their fuel while I did all of these other tests using in and out of afterburner, under high-G loading not only in military power but maximum power, burning fuel at a very high rate, this aircraft was sitting at 25,000 feet at maximum endurance just saving its fuel. Even with all of that, I ended up with 3,000 pounds more fuel, Mr. Speaker.

What does that mean? It means that our pilots, if they are engaged, will have a much higher capability not only of survivability but the ability to engage the enemy.

On May 10, 1972, I was engaged by 22 MiG–17s, 19s and 21s over North Vietnam, Mr. Speaker. I cannot tell you about the ensuing dogfight. I was fortunate enough to shoot down three of those 22 MiGs. But, in that, you use a tremendous amount of fuel; and if you have got 100 or 200 or 300 miles to return to your carrier or to your airfield, the Air Force, then you have a good chance of losing that aircraft.

The F–18/C model has done well in the past, but yet its stealth capabilities that we have added today to that particular airplane were not developed until later on. The new aircraft, the F–18E/F, gives us a much higher chance of survivability in the intercept. The Russian radars are very large. They had jammers that are very difficult to actually see where this particular airplane is, Mr. Speaker.

What the F–18 does is that his missiles, the bad guy's missile, is better than our missile today, not in the future but today. We cannot only see where he is not, we cannot see where he is. And what happens is that he fires a missile at me if I do not have stealth capability and our pilots die. Now, that is a pretty serious thing, Mr. Speaker, whether you are sitting in that cockpit or you have a family member that is sitting in that cockpit.

What this stealth capability in this new F–18E/F does is that enemy, with his powerful radar, cannot see our aircraft, or, at least, by the time he sees it, it gives us time to lock up his airplane and to fire our AMRAM or other type missiles, which gives us the capability to shoot him down and to have him come back in a ball of fire instead of us.

Now, that might be not significant to many people, Mr. Speaker, but it is for the men and women that we ask to fight our battles.

I would say to the gentleman in the other body, when he says that the older F–18C/D is better than this airplane, he is wrong. When he says it has longer range than the newer airplane, he is absolutely wrong. When he says it has better stealth capability, he is wrong. And when he says it is an airplane that we should not buy, Mr. Speaker, in my humble opinion, the gentleman is wrong.

We need to look very carefully at the future, Mr. Speaker, and to see what technologies we have to put into those aircraft. I have a real concern. If the gentleman in the other body wants to take a look at a system that could have problems in the future, this country, the United States of America, has never built, Mr. Speaker, an airplane that is inferior to what the enemy

threat is. We are not going to put our men and women up in the air with an airplane that we think that they cannot survive in. We just have not done that in this country.

Even during World War II, when the Japanese Zero was superior to many of our aircraft, industry came about and developed superior aircraft, like a P–51, like a P–38, like other aircraft that turned the tide of that war. And we cannot do that today. But I would tell my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, that I have a real concern with an upcoming aircraft, not the F–18E/F, but with an aircraft called the Joint Strike Fighter.

The Joint Strike Fighter, the U.S. Air Force is going to replace its F–16, which is an attack aircraft. The U.S. Marine Corps is going to use it as a vertical takeoff, what we call a jump jet, to replace the ailing Harrier.

The United States Navy is selected to take a low-end or a low-cost variant of that Joint Strike Fighter. And we must take a look before we buy or develop that aircraft first, is its design going to allow our pilots in all the services to win in combat? Can they meet that future air-to-air threat and air-to-ground threat? Can they fight those future threats?

I do not want a fair fight, Mr. Speaker. There is no such thing as a fair fight when you are a fighter pilot, and there are no points for second place because second place means you are captured or you are dead. And I do not want to build an airplane that I cannot defeat an enemy or that my children or your children cannot defeat that enemy.

I hope the Joint Strike Fighter program succeeds. Battle group commanders will surely welcome it in year 2012 to begin sharing on its flight deck with the F–18E/F. But I will continue to argue to the best of my ability from now until that speculated time that we need to be equipping our airwings with the F–18E/F and ensure that the other systems that we put our pilots in can meet that threat.

This year, in Congress, we debated the F–22. The F–22 will meet the threat of the SU–35 and the SU–37, which is the future aircraft. Right now, in my opinion, it is one of the few airplanes that will meet that threat. Unfortunately, the airplane today is $187 million a copy. The research and development is over $20 billion dollars. And the cost of the electronics, hopefully, will not go up.

If we do anything, Mr. Speaker, we should double the buy of the F–22. Because what they did is, with Lockheed and the Air Force, they cut the buy of the F–22 in half. When you take all this research and development money and you put it on a lesser number of airplanes, each of those airplanes, when you pile those additional costs, it is more than if you had a whole bunch of them. So, in the future, I think we need to double the buy of the F–22, not only for the cost but the fact that when you get into an engagement, it is like a food fight, you may have some airplanes over here and some other here and some behind you that are in the threat, and if you only have two air superiority fighters, you may not be able to cover everybody that is in trouble. And it is another issue that is coming up before this Congress. I hope we can resolve this, as well.

It is not just because of the superior ability to bring expensive smart weapons back to the ship or because spectacular improvements in survivability. It has a wealth of additional enhancements, the F–18E/F.

I will confine myself to three, Mr. Speaker. First of all, the increased range. Secondly, the airborne tanking capability. And C, I mentioned briefly, the capability for growth. The combat radius of the Super Hornet carrying 4,000-pound weapons, that is a lot of bombs on an airplane; and the drag, like when you stick your hand out of a car, that is called drag, but the drag on those aircraft is tremendous.

That airplane can go 500 nautical miles, compared to only 370 miles of this aircraft. Every battle group commander since the F–18 deployment in 1983 has recommended this extra range.

The GAO reported highly critical initially of the F–18 at the time and it emphasized the limited range of the F–18C/D. I criticized it myself. And they asked us to continue buying the A–7, which was a much older airplane with less capability, and I disagreed with that.

At least one of these same GAO analysts that was responsible for the recommendation now states that the extra range of the Super Hornet is unnecessary and that the previously unsatisfactory range of the original Hornet is adequate.

□ 2100

Mr. Speaker, this absurd and contradictory analysis is all the more unsettling when combined with the fact that in the days of the original Hornet, the Navy had A–6 tankers to enhance the range of our aircraft for in-flight refueling. These vulnerable aircraft have since been retired, leaving the aging S–3, which has very limited tanking capability, as the only tanker for the fleet today.

Fortunately, the F–18E/F unlike the F–18C/D was designed to carry fuel tanks. You see all of these stations underneath can be loaded with fuel tanks. What is the advantage of that? It can fly at speeds and altitudes most suitable for the combat mission unlike slower, less maneuverable ones. Let me give an example.

In Vietnam, we used to go up and try to tank behind a C–130. It was so slow that I used as much burner getting the two or 3,000 pounds of fuel out of that airplane than I got. I burned more fuel than I actually received, but at least I was heading toward the target. This aircraft can act as a tanker and tank at the same speed as the other F–18s and be just as maneuverable. This gives the battle group commander the capability to launch one or two Super Hornets, each carrying two smart missiles, accompanied by an additional Super Hornet configured as a tanker, and after a single refueling outbound leg, the missile-armed aircraft will strike the enemy targets a thousand miles away and return, a thousand miles and return. Remember, this airplane was 370 miles only. So again the gentleman in the other body was wrong and misinformed.

The big part of this airplane is the maintainability. I have spoken about the F–14 and its capability. If you have an aircraft that is a tanker and also can act as a fighter, it gives you another fighter airborne. Plus you do not have to have all the other maintenance people to maintain a totally different airplane, to have different parts on the carrier because this aircraft is the same as the airplane you are going out to fight with as a tanker. The parts are common, they are easier to keep, and that way you also keep more aircraft up on that carrier deck making your readiness much, much higher.

With two-thirds of each launch serving as strike aircraft and the third serving first as the tankers and then as combat air patrol between the battle group and the enemy, tremendous new capabilities and flexibility and alternatives accrue to the battle group commander.

My final attribute of the F–18E/F is its capability for growth. The reason the F–18 A, B, C and D models have remained effective is that we have built up those systems since the early 1980s and they have been upgraded every 2 years, incorporating new radars, mission computers, forward-looking infrared sensors, and weapons employment capabilities as I noted earlier. This capacity for further modernization has been exhausted, and there is no more room. Not only is the current F–18C/D already too heavy to incorporate any additional systems, without considerable redesign there is no space to locate such systems or black boxes, as we refer to them in the military.

Likewise, there is no additional electrical power or cooling capacity to accommodate the new equipment. So in short, Mr. Speaker, the old aircraft cannot keep up not only with the threat but the modernization necessary for our men and women to win in combat and to complete their mission. The F–18E/F has, like its predecessor the F–18A/B did in the day, the access of electrical power, cooling capacity, and cubic space to accommodate 20 years of growth and therefore will be able to incorporate new sensors, countermeasures and weapons still on the drawing board. One of the advantages is that the high technology of the new F–22, the Joint Strike Fighter as it develops, will be able to use those same weapons systems, those same radars in this aircraft and exchange them because there is plenty of room for

growth, up to 20 years, which should be just about the service life of the F–18E/F before we go to the Joint Strike Fighter and whatever comes next.

I began these remarks with the opinion that they are the most important of my career. I believe this because I feel that the F–18 is essential to the preparedness and success of carrier aviation and naval air power projection for the next 20 years, Mr. Speaker. As events in both the Arabian Gulf and in the Adriatic Sea have borne out recently, our land-based tactical assets are not always welcome on otherwise friendly real estate. Quite often, we will have to engage it with a battle group or a carrier air battle group. That, combined with the Air Force, the Marine Corps and the Navy, in joint exercises and joint combat, our troops should be able to withstand those enemy threats.

But I do not think there is anyone on either side of the aisle or the gentleman in the other body that would have our men and women engage an enemy in a system where they knew that they could not win and they would either die or be shot down. The engineer and manufacturing development phase is complete. The operational evaluation is complete. The airplane is ready. It is ready to put to the fleet.

Back in 1992, the Navy presented its $4.8 billion estimate for this phase in FY 1990 dollars. The Navy and the contractors have come in below those costs. Boeing, McDonnell Douglas, Northrup Gramine, Raytheon, General Electric aircraft engines have brought the program in well below the cost estimates, and it is a superior aircraft, Mr. Speaker. Congress also specified that the F–18 production costs not exceed that of most F–18C/Ds by more than 25 percent. This aircraft came in at 13 percent the cost.

Frankly, I have been a little skeptical of some years ago to whether the F–18E/F could live up to its billing and I was wrong. It has. I was skeptical that the radars would not meet the threat but it has. For the preceding 2 years an annoying, relatively minor anomaly has shown up in certain combinations of speed and altitude, and I addressed that. It is called wing drop. That has been completed and finished by our engineers, not only not at the expense of our stealth capability nor our range as you would think that you have to hang something else on the airplane. At the end of an exhaustive process, the fixes were finished, the wind tunnel tests are done; and we are ready to buy this airplane for the United States Navy and the United States Marine Corps if they so choose.

I would be comfortable in this airplane, Mr. Speaker, fighting against the threats that we have today. And the threats that we have tomorrow we will have to upgrade this aircraft as well. The Navy's most successful initial sea trials on board the U.S.S. *Stennis* CVN–74 in January 1977, the dual F–18E/F is virtually identical to the front and rear cockpits and can be flown in training with our student pilots. This airplane is one of the easiest aircraft I have ever flown to bring aboard or take off on an aircraft carrier, making it user friendly for our young pilots as they enter the fleet. That is important as well, Mr. Speaker.

Eight production Super Hornets have been delivered to Fleet Readiness Squadron 122 at Naval Air Station Lemoore, California, where the cadre of instructor pilots is unanimous in its approval of how well the Super Hornet performs day and night and under most grueling conditions. It can be conducted aboard a ship within a test range of shore or in simulated combat fights.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for the RECORD a Commander Operational Test and Evaluation Force, COMOPTEVFOR, released the results of the OPEVAL, specifically that the aircraft was found to be operationally suitable and operationally effective. The highest grade attainable in a test of this type or ever from an aircraft from the United States. They also recommended the aircraft for fleet introduction.

I would say to the gentleman in the other body once again, he is wrong. Boeing Super Hornet awarded the NAA Collier Trophy, Washington, D.C., the National Aeronautic Association announced today, Mr. Speaker, that the Boeing F/A–18E/F Super Hornet has been selected to receive the NAA Collier Trophy recognizing the top aeronautical achievement in the United States for FY 1999. That in succinct order, Mr. Speaker, is why that I say the gentleman in the other body, if he wants to man up in one of the older airplanes, I will man up in the new one, and he will die in a fireball all tensed up.

2–11–00—BOEING'S SUPER HORNET AWARDED NAA'S COLLIER TROPHY

WASHINGTON, DC.—The National Aeronautic Association announced today that the Boeing F/A–18E/F Super Hornet has been selected to receive the NAA Collier Trophy recognizing the top aeronautical achievement in the United States for 1999.

The Boeing Company, the Hornet Industry Team, and the United States Navy were recognized for, ''designing, manufacturing, testing, and introducing into service the F/A–18E/F multi-mission strike fighter aircraft, the most capable and survivable carrier-based combat aircraft.''

In announcing the selection of the winner, NAA President Don Koranda commented, ''The selection of the Super Hornet as the 1999 Collier winner is an excellent example of the technical achievement and teamwork of America's aerospace industry.''

The NAA's Robert J. Collier Trophy, established in 1911, is awarded annually, ''For the greatest achievement in aeronautics and astronautics in America, with respect to improving the performance, efficiency, and safety of air or space vehicles, the value of which has been thoroughly demonstrated by actual use during the preceding year.'' The trophy, on permanent display at the Smithsonian's National Air and Space Museum in Washington, DC, is considered the greatest and most prized of aeronautical honors in America.

The Boeing F/A–18E/F Super Hornet is a flexible, multi-mission aircraft capable of performing a variety of tactical missions including air superiority, fighter escort, close air support, day/night precision strike, and all-weather attack. It was designed to replace three Navy aircraft, the A–6 Intruder, the F–14 Tomcat, and the earlier model Hornets. In addition, the aircraft will significantly increase an aircraft carrier battle group's capability to independently carry out sustained perations in support of national interests.

The F/A–18E/F has greatly increased performance, efficiency, and safety over the Hornet and has also reduced the maintenance requirements with 42 percent fewer parts than its predecessor. The aircraft has 25 percent greater payload, three times the ''bring-back'' to the aircraft carrier, five times more survivability, a 40 percent increase in range, and 17.3 cubic feet of growth volume for future systems.

In 1999, the Super Hornet completed the most thorough and challenging operational evaluation in the history of naval aviation. Its test program was a unique partnership between the Hornet Industry Team and the Navy that used a fully integrated team to conduct developmental flight and ground testing concurrently from a single location. During its ''Test and Evaluation'' phase, the F/A–18E/F has flown 6,876 mishap-free hours, including 2,917 hours in 1999. As it entered service in November, 1999, the Super Hornet exceeded all Navy and Department of Defense operational requirements. In addition, Congress approved a multi-year procurement demonstrating confidence in the program.

Additional evidence of the success of the program is illustrated by a number of technical ''firsts.'' The Super Hornet has an unlimited angle of attack that provides exceptional maneuverability in combat, fly-by-wire controls and Full Authority Digital Electronic Engine Control (FADEC), and a flight control system that automatically compensates for damage or failure. Its documented performance makes the Super Hornet the most versatile, capable, and survivable strike fighter aircraft in the world.

Formal presentation of the trophy will take place at the annual Robert J. Collier Presentation Banquet, which will be held on Wednesday, May 3, at the Crystal Gateway Marriott Hotel in Arlington, VA. For further information, please visit NAA's web site at www.naa-usa.org, send an e-mail to awards@naa-usa.org, or call 703–527–0226.

The National Aeronautic Association is the National Aero Club of the United States and the nation's oldest aviation organization, founded in 1905. Its primary mission is the advancement of the art, sport, and science of aviation and space flight. NAA is also the United States representative to the Federation Aeronautique Internationale, the 88-country organization that oversees all aviation and space records established worldwide. NAA consists of more than 100 member organizations. NAA oversees many of aviation's most prestigious awards and trophies and is a member funded, not-for-profit association.

The Commander Operational Test and Evaluation Force (COMOPTEVFOR) released the results of OPEVAL, specifically that the aircraft was found to be Operationally Suitable and Operationally Effective (the highest grade attainable from the test). They also recommended the aircraft for fleet introduction.

Press release follows:

''SUPER HORNET'' OPERATIONAL EVALUATION RESULTS ANNOUNCED

The Navy announced today the results of the F/A–18E/F Super Hornet operational

evaluation (OPEVAL). The OPEVAL report awarded the best possible grade to the Super Hornet, calling it ''operationally effective and operationally suitable.'' In addition, the report recommended the aircraft's introduction into the fleet.

Chief of Naval Operations, Adm. Jay Johnson, stated ''The F/A–18E/F Super Hornet is the cornerstone of the future of naval aviation. The superb performance demonstrated throughout its comprehensive operational evaluation was just what we expected and confirms why we can't wait to get it to the fleet!''

Air Test and Evaluation Squadron Nine (VX–9) at China Lake, Calif., flew 1,233 hours in over 850 sorties and expended more than 400,000 pounds of ordnance in the Super Hornet during nearly six months of flights. The 23-member aircrew tested the aircraft in a complex variety of tactical missions representing the operational arena.

The Navy's Program Executive Officer for Tactical Aircraft Programs, Rear Adm. Jeffrey A. Cook commented, ''This is the best news the Navy's carrier forces have received in a long time. It will ensure that throughout the next twenty years the fleet will be capable of countering the evolving threat. My congratulations to the Navy's Operational Test and Evaluation Command, the men and women of VX–9, and the entire naval aviation systems team.'' The purpose of the OPEVAL was to test the aircraft in a realistic fleet setting to determine its operational effectiveness as a weapon system, and its suitability to be maintained and operated by the Navy. No new deficiencies were found and the report validated the aircraft's superior capabilities.

''I'm really excited about the results,'' said Capt. James B. Godwin III, F/A–18 program manager, ''and we got the best grade possible from OPEVAL—operationally effective and operationally suitable. This report confirmed that the Super Hornet is a very mature product. We have been recommended for full fleet introduction.''

The OPEVAL report specifically cited the aircraft's key enhancing features—growth, bringback, survivability, range and payload—as qualities relative to current fleet operational capabilities. The successful completion of OPEVAL continues the Super Hornet along the road to a milestone III decision, and then approval to start full-rate production and multi-year procurement.

□

CRITICAL TIME IN NORTHERN IRELAND PEACE PROCESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to take a special order at a very critical time in the peace process in Northern Ireland. I have asked a number of my colleagues to join me tonight, but at this late hour, I am not sure that they will. But in the event that they do, I would like to yield them time, because so many of us have for so long worked so hard to help support this fairly difficult and ''fairly difficult'' would be an understatement, this extremely difficult process.

The news today is that the British Government has reimposed its sovereignty over Northern Ireland. After about a 2-year process of working and compromise and difficult negotiation, an agreement was reached and the Northern Ireland government took control of its own destiny in December of this past year.

Now, because of a crisis that has been precipitated over the issue of disarmament, the British Government has reimposed its will and has re-extended its authority over Northern Ireland. There is a question, Mr. Speaker, over the constitutionality and the legality of that action, but nonetheless it is fait accompli and home rule has been taken back away and Britain is now again in control of Northern Ireland governmentally.

That is a tragedy. After all these days and months and weeks of hard work and prayer and negotiation, we are back almost to where we started from. Reg Empey who was a unionist leader under David Trimble who is the Unionist Party leader, said today that the entire agreement now must be renegotiated, not just the issue of decommissioning or disarming but the Patten Commission which determines the reforms in the police, and the police is a major issue in terms of civil rights and justice in Northern Ireland, they say that will have to be renegotiated.

The cross border agreements between the Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland would have to be renegotiated. The Parades Commission, which oversees the licensing, the authorization of these parades that occur between and among the two traditions in Northern Ireland, that will have to be renegotiated.

This makes it next to impossible to get the genie back in the bottle. David Trimble, the first deputy or prime minister of this new government, was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize for his actions in this. He has taken many chances to make this process go forward. Against great opposition within his own party and at certain times maybe today he leads a minority of the Ulster Unionist Party in support of the Good Friday Agreement. Nonetheless, his decision to tender his resignation prior to the completion of the Good Friday Agreement has precipitated this crisis.

□ 2115

It was a reaction to his own internal party strife, there is no question, but in order to make this work, it requires that all the leaders lead from the front, and it is pretty obvious that the rank and file of the party are in control right now.

Seamus Mallon of the SDLP party, who is the second in the government in a multi-party government, has said it was a mistake for Great Britain to take power back, to put the duly-elected government on the shelf. I agree with him. But, again, it is fait accompli. It has happened. So Mr. Mallon would like all the parties, the British, the Irish Republic, the political leaders of Northern Ireland, and I think the leadership of this country, to reengage quickly and resolve this and close the gap as quickly as possible.

Gerry Adams, the leader of Sinn Fein, said at the beginning that he questioned the legality of Great Britain's action, and also the logic and common sense of this action. We have entered into a void, and no one knows how to come back out. There is no legal framework, there is no guidepath, there are no maps to getting us out of this quandary we are in in Northern Ireland.

David Irvine, the leader of the Progressive Unionists, said this is far more dangerous than anyone knows. Those words, Mr. Speaker, are chilling when you consider the 30 years we have just come through in Northern Ireland.

This has great meaning to the American public. Millions and millions and millions of Americans claim their heritage beginning in Ireland. This has been watched with great interest and great support among the American public at large, among the Members of Congress of both parties, by our President, who has shown great leadership, and by Senator George Mitchell, who has provided the glue to make this stay together.

So now we are at a point where all the parties, all the players, have pretty much laid their cards out on the table. The IRA, the Irish Republican Army, they had declared a cease-fire 5 years ago; 5 years ago. There has been no breaking of that cease-fire, there has been no sectarian violence perpetrated by the Irish Republican Army. They have not responded to Protestant attacks on Catholics, Loyalist attacks on Republican Nationalist citizens in Northern Ireland, and there have been many. There have been many murders, and we have read about them, but they have not responded. They have shown great discipline.

They agreed to participate in the International Commission on Decommissioning. They made public statements that the war is over, that they support the political institutions, that there is nothing to fear from the IRA in this peace process. They have shown support, they have shown discipline, they have supported peace, they have engaged in it, and they have engaged in negotiation.

The latest statement by the IRA, albeit too late to prevent this from happening, made a very clear statement, understood clearly by the British government, the Irish Republican government, the political parties in the north and in this country, that they were committed to a process with clarity and definition and time lines.

Unfortunately, they have had a penchant throughout this process of saying just enough a little bit too late, and, in this case, it gave the nihilists, the anti's within the Unionist Party, a reason to close the deal and break off the deal.

It is terribly unfortunate. Mr. Mandelson, the Secretary of State for the Blair government in Northern Ireland, has done a good job. He just

lacked persistence. He moved too quickly to accommodate the Unionist demands, and, like any kid knows, it is a lot easier to take a bicycle apart than it is to put it back together again. It looks like he made a mistake, and it gets harder and harder to get the wheels and the chain back on the bicycle.

Tony Blair, the Prime Minister of Great Britain, has been a true leader. Today, this evening, tomorrow, he has got to show that leadership, and he has got to show courage, and he has got to be forceful, because the British government is the patron of the Unionist Party. The Unionist Party wants allegiance with Great Britain, Great Britain has to be the lead government in getting the Unionists back to the table.

The Unionists, for their part, precipitated this crisis, not the IRA. Yes, they did make the jump in forming the Executive, 18 months too late, and only then just for a few weeks, but they did make the jump. Unfortunately, they did it with preconditions. Again, going outside of the initial Good Friday Agreement that 90 percent of the people on the island of Ireland supported, 90 percent.

They pressured their leader, David Trimble, into setting an artificial deadline. And I just wonder if Jeffrey Donaldson must be proud of the disruption that he has wrought? Ken McGinnis and John Taylor, two Unionists who have worked with Mr. Trimble all the way through, need to be bold, and they need to stand up and they need to take leadership in support of Mr. Trimble and getting the Unionists back on track.

This government can be put together again, but time is our enemy. The Irish government of the Republic of Ireland, led by Bertie Ahern, their view is that the British should have waited. There is no constitutional precedent for taking power back once it has been devolved, as they did in Scotland and Wales. Again, there is no map, there is no plan, there is no legal precedent for this. Bertie Ahern has been brilliant, but it is time to be strong. If this situation is not fixed soon, a vacuum is created, and throughout Ireland's history whenever a vacuum existed, violence fills the void.

As my teachers in school used to say, an idle time is the devil's workshop. Ahern must insist that the British move quickly to close the gap. The partnership between the Republic of Ireland and the government of Great Britain has been essential. The two leaders, Blair and Ahern, have guided this process along with our President and the political leaders in the north to this point. They have to reimpose their will and take control of the situation.

The United States' role, I am joined today by Congressman Peter King, who has been the true leader in the Congress on Irish issues throughout his career, as he has been in so many other areas, and Carolyn McCarthy, also of New York, has, while only in Congress for a brief time, become conversant with these issues, knowledgeable, forceful, and has become a real player.

We have all spent dozens of hours meeting with the political leaders in Northern Ireland. We have visited there. I have been there personally five times in the last 3 or 4 years, to try to just let them know that the world is watching, that it is important what they are doing, that the people of America care deeply, and we can see over the horizon the bright future that they will experience if they can just hold this together.

President Clinton has invested himself deeply in this. He knows the issues, he knows the players, and herein I think lies his greatest legacy.

Mr. President, you must do something to help at this critical situation. I would not make a suggestion, other than that you need to think about it, you need to think about how far we have come, how much we have invested, and what can happen if this falls apart.

Tonight I spoke with Rita O'Hare, the spokesman for Sinn Fein in Washington. She was actually in Dublin. There was grave concern in her voice, perhaps even fear, fear that we could lose what hard work and a little good luck and many prayers have gained.

There is a great deal at stake, but it is still repairable, but I fear that it is not repairable for long. The way forward is still the Good Friday Agreement that everyone signed on to.

The IRA has made a real commitment to disarmament. It must be coupled and symmetrical with a reduction in forces and arms on the part of the British, the Northern Ireland Police, the Protestant paramilitaries. Everyone, all sides, must get rid of their guns. Only then will we have real peace in Northern Ireland.

But to hang the whole process on the issue of disarmament or decommissioning is bogus. There are far more issues at stake here, not the least of which is removing the causes, the root causes, of violence: Prejudice, injustice, bigotry, triumphalism. All of these things in time must be eliminated.

Perhaps George Mitchell would be willing to once more try. He must cringe when he hears that, but he is the only one that has been able to put this back together at each and every juncture and each and every crisis.

I do not know what the answer is. Hopefully my colleagues here in the House will be able to shed some light on it.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Mineola, Long Island, New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY).

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. I thank my dear colleague from New York (Mr. WALSH), and I thank the gentleman from Long Island, New York (Mr. KING) also.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to be very brief on this. I will not even try to say that I am as knowledgeable as the two gentlemen here. But I have been to Ireland. I was there a year ago August when we were trying to put together the peace process.

The one thing I know, when I came back from Ireland, I know what the people of Northern Ireland wanted, and that was peace. Anywhere we went you could tell all they wanted was peace.

All of us watched over the weekend, hearing of news of what was going on. Many of us, our hearts sunk, because one moment it did not look like it was going to be put together, and the next moment things were going well. This afternoon we got word that things were not going well, that the IRA had walked away.

I want to clarify that point, because I am afraid tomorrow the newspapers and the media are going to blame the IRA for everything that has gone on. I do not believe that is really what has happened.

The IRA walked away from the bargaining table, but not from the peace process. The IRA and Sinn Fein are not walking away from peace, and I think all of us have to remember that. They want to continue the peace process.

The IRA and Sinn Fein are committed to the Good Friday Agreement. The IRA and Sinn Fein went to the Unionist Party and the British government to keep their commitments in the Good Friday Agreement as well. By suspending the newly formed Belfast administration, Northern Secretary of State Peter Mandelson is pulling out the rug from under the peace process. I know both sides will probably argue that, but those of us that have been following it felt that he should have stood his ground and continued to work things out.

The Belfast administration did not have a chance to succeed because it was held hostage by one man and his threat to resign. That is wrong. That is wrong for the people of Ireland, that is wrong for the people of Northern Ireland.

The road to peace is paved by compromise, not by the demands of one country or one man. Sinn Fein and the IRA are willing to adhere to their agreement, but the British Government is changing the rules. I agree with my colleague that this is a time when Tony Blair really has to take a stance and prove to everyone that he wants to see peace in Ireland.

Let us remember that the IRA and Sinn Fein have kept the peace process going.

□ 2130

Sinn Fein and the IRA, they have kept their guns silent.

I can speak from personal experience, knowing what it is like to lose a loved one, my husband, to gun violence. As a mother I can speak as someone who has seen a child maimed, so I know what the women of Ireland are feeling

tonight. We must persevere. We must have President Clinton continue to work, and I agree this could be his legacy, his greatest legacy. The American people must stand together and have their voices heard. Again, here in Congress, we must continue to work to make sure that this works for all of us. We of Irish American descent over the last several years have discovered what it is to be Irish. It is a proud race. We are proud that we all belong to it. We will continue to do our job to make sure that there will be peace in Northern Ireland. God willing, it will happen sooner than later.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I yield time to my good friend and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING).

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I am proud to rise this evening to discuss the Irish peace process and the crisis that threatens it this evening and, unfortunately, probably into the next several weeks.

At the outset, I want to commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) for his leadership, both in calling this Special Order this evening and also the leadership he has shown as chairman of the Friends of Ireland Committee and for the work he has done, for instance, in leading the congressional delegation which accompanied President Clinton to Ireland and Northern Ireland in 1995 and again in 1998.

I also have to commend my colleague in the neighboring district of Long Island (Mrs. MCCARTHY) for the enthusiasm and the interest she has shown in this issue. She also was with the President and Congressman WALSH and myself in Ireland, in Northern Ireland on the President's trip in 1998. She attends meeting after meeting; she meets with all of the parties from all sides. She meets with victims; she meets with the police; she meets with representatives of the British Government, the Irish government, and all of the significant political parties in Ireland and Northern Ireland.

Of course, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), who is the Co-chairman for the Ad Hoc Committee for Irish Affairs who represents the district that I was born and grew up in. Unfortunately, I did not have enough money to be able to live in his district. I had to move out to Long Island. Joe represents that district today, and he does a great job, both in representing his constituents and also in applying himself so much to this issue of peace in Ireland, an issue which he addressed when he was a member of the New York State Assembly and which he has continued to address in an even more dramatic way during the 2 years he has been a Member of the United States Congress.

So all of us are here this evening, Mr. Speaker, to address the underlying crisis which threatens the very survival of the Irish peace process. First of all, I want to say that I associate myself with all of the remarks of Congressman WALSH and Congresswoman MCCARTHY, and I am sure whatever remarks that Congressman CROWLEY makes I would also attach myself to those. I do know that the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL) is going to attempt to make it here this evening, but if not, he wanted to put it on the record that he stands with us in the call that we are making this evening.

Mr. Speaker, it is essential, I believe, that the facts be laid out as to exactly what has precipitated this current crisis. The gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) has gone over many of them in his presentation, and I would like to reiterate a number of them now. Because unfortunately, I believe that both here in the United States, particularly in the American media and also in the British media and, to some extent, even the Irish media, the facts have been misrepresented and a totally false image has been created.

Number one, the fact is that the breakdown in the Irish peace process is solely the responsibility of David Trimble and the LC Unionist party. Sinn Fein and Jerry Adams have complied with each and every provision of the Good Friday Agreement and each and every understanding that was arrived at with Senator Mitchell last fall.

This crisis came about because David Trimble said that the IRA would have to begin decommissioning by February 1. The Good Friday Agreement called for decommissioning by May 22 of this year. Even that date of May 22 was premised on governmental institutions in northern Irish and north-south institutions between the north of Ireland and the Republic of Ireland being in place sometime in August or September of 1998. In other words, there was supposed to be a 20-month lead up to the conclusion of decommissioning.

The purpose of that was to let the people on the ground, to let the people in the Catholic and the Nationalist and the Republican community see that the political process was working. As that process was working, weapons would be decommissioned and it would have been completed by May of this year.

It was David Trimble who refused to allow the government to be created in the north of Ireland. It was David Trimble who delayed and delayed and delayed through every obstacle in the way and caused a 16-month delay.

So it was not until November; actually, December 2nd of last year that the government was finally put in place in Northern Ireland and that an executive was set up which included two members of Sinn Fein, Martin McGuinness and Barbara deBrun, who would sit as members of that executive.

That creation of the government was preceded by months of negotiations with Senator Mitchell. The result of those negotiations was that David Trimble agreed to allow the government to be created and, in return for that, the IRA, the Irish Republican Army, agreed to send one of their members to take part in the meetings of the International Commission on Decommissioning. That was the sum and substance of the agreement that was worked out with Senator Mitchell.

When David Trimble then went public, he announced that yes, he was allowing the creation of the government, but then he imposed an arbitrary deadline of February 1 which had not been agreed to by anyone.

I think it is important to put on the record, because, unfortunately, not everything is being made public these days. But the reality is that on December 6 of last year, Peter Mandelson, the British Secretary of State for Northern Ireland came to Washington and, at a lunch with a number of Members of Congress, stated that the first he heard of the February 1 so-called agreement was when David Trimble announced it; that it was never agreed to. He, quite frankly, did not know what was going to happen when February 1 came along.

The first thing he did was ask Gerry Adams for help and advice, and he said he would work with the British government and try to find a way to resolve this. But never, ever was it a condition. Yet, as February 1 approached, suddenly all of the pressure was but on Sinn Fein, it was put on the Irish Republican Army, it was specifically put on Gerry Adams. I find it really disgraceful that so many American newspapers, and I am talking about The New York Times, The Washington Post, the New York Daily News, the New York Post, the Boston Globe, News Day in my own county, all of them wrote totally one-sided editorials saying that there had been an agreement breached by Sinn Fein and the IRA because it was not going to be decommissioning by February 1 when, in fact, no such agreement ever existed.

The entire premise of all of these editorials was a lie. There was never any agreement at all to have any decommissioning by February 1 of this year, but based on this lie, based on this misrepresentation, everything was set in motion. As a result of that, this crisis developed. Even though there was no obligation on the IRA, there was no obligation on Sinn Fein, Gerry Adams was meeting around the clock with the British Government, with the Irish government, attempting to meet with David Trimble, on the phone with people here in the United States, talking to the White House, talking to the National Security Council.

And he was doing that to try to find an agreement which he was under no legal or moral obligation to find, but he did it anyway because of his commitment to the peace process. He did it, and he did come forward with a number of concessions by the IRA, the most recent being last Friday concessions they had no obligation to make. Yet, in spite of that, the British Government, under the direction of Secretary of State Mandelson, last Friday

suspended the agreement, suspended the Good Friday Agreement and they took all the powers back to London, away from Belfast.

I think what is lost in all of this is, and Congressman WALSH mentioned this in his speech, this was illegal. There was no legal justification for one government, the British government to eviscerate an internationally arrived at agreement. This was a formal agreement which was arrived at by Great Britain, by the government of Ireland, and by all of the signators to the agreement, including Gerry Adams and Sinn Fein, and it was an agreement that was ratified by 90 percent of the people in the Republic of Ireland and over 70 percent of the people in the north of Ireland. Yet, even though not one provision of that agreement was violated, the British have now reimposed direct rule in Northern Ireland, and there is no legal basis for that.

Now, the argument can be made, and I can understand it to some extent, that the British found that if they did not do this, the peace process would collapse. Well, what they have done is they have in effect; not in effect, but in reality, they have violated the law for what they feel is the greater good of preserving the peace process. Well, if that is their motive, then there is even more of an incentive on them to make sure this peace process works.

They have to let David Trimble know that he cannot be the final arbiter of what is acceptable. Already he is saying he wants the British government to renegotiate what is going to happen with the Northern Ireland police force, the royal constabulary. He wants to renegotiate any number of items that are in the Good Friday Agreement. He has no right to renegotiate anything. This was an agreement that was formally ratified and approved by referendum and signed by the two governments, and he has absolutely no right to be doing this; yet, he is giving the clear impression that he is a veto power over the process.

If that is the case, how can anyone expect the Republican community, the IRA, Sinn Fein, or his rank and file Catholics living in places like Derry and West Belfast, how can we expect them to have faith in the system if David Trimble can undo it whenever he wants to; if he can rewrite an agreement whenever it suits him. What is the incentive to go into the agreement. What is the incentive to enter into a peace process if David Trimble can just pull the rug out whenever he wants to. That is why it is so essential that the British government make it clear that David Trimble is not going to be allowed to continue to ride roughshod over a lawful process and he is not going to be able to literally rip up agreements when he chooses to do so.

Also, if there is going to be an ultimate agreement reached in this whole decommissioning issue, it is essential that it be resolved once and for all, and that it involve all the guns in Northern Ireland. Again, Congressman WALSH has mentioned this. There is the guns of the British army; there is the military installations of the British army, many of which were increased after the IRA cease-fire went into effect. There is also, and many people do not realize this, 150,000 Unionist guns in Northern Ireland, so-called legal guns. These are guns which the British government and the Northern Ireland authorities have allowed the unions to have, 150,000 legal guns.

They also have what are called 35,000 personal security guns which are given to people in public life or people who feel that they are being threatened. None of those guns are given to members, for instance, of Sinn Fein. Almost all of those guns go to Unionists and Loyalists and yet, I believe the facts will bear me out on this, that no political party in the western world has had more fatalities and more casualties because of political violence than Sinn Fein.

Sinn Fein's officials have been attacked, they have been shot, murdered, wounded, and maimed; and yet nothing is done at all to protect them, and all we hear about are the guns of the IRA. Also, there are the guns of the loyalist paramilitaries, the Ulster Volunteer Force, the Ulster Defense Association, and any number of others, we can go on and list them all.

So all of this has to be addressed. The entire issue of guns in northern Ireland has to be addressed. Yes, the IRA did walk away from the negotiations today. However, as Congressman McCarthy said, they did not walk away from the peace process, and that is important to remember.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot say what I would do if I were in their place, but I can certainly understand the logic in what they did. Because back in November they made a solid agreement with Senator Mitchell that they would send a representative to the decommissioning commission to meet, discuss decommissioning in return for David Trimble allowing the government to be set up in Northern Ireland. Now that that government has been suspended, the IRA feels why should it keep its end of the agreement if David Trimble is not keeping his. But significantly, it has been made clear to all of us who have looked into this that the IRA has no intention of breaking the cease-fire; the cease-fire is intact and it is going to remain intact. So they are still part of the peace process even though they are not at the table of the decommissioning body.

How much longer can this be risked? How much longer is Tony Blair going to allow these games to be played where one person can undermine and unravel the peace process that has taken years to be put together? The key player in that quite frankly has been President Clinton. He has done a tremendous job in keeping the parties together. Certainly over the last several weeks, I know the President was personally involved in this. He and members of the National Security Council were in contact with all of the parties and were responsible for keeping the process going as long as they did. I am, however, critical of the statement the White House put out where it seemed to put the onus on the IRA for not coming in sooner with their proposal. The fact is, as we said before, they have under no obligation to submit any proposal at all, and it appears as if the proposal they did submit was known to Peter Mandelson in advance, and yet he still took no action to stop the suspension of the government, which leads to the belief he was going to suspend the government anyway just as a way to protect David Trimble.

So in the days and weeks ahead as we head towards St. Patrick's Day, which will be approximately five weeks I guess from today, or probably four weeks from this week, it is so important that all of us, and all Americans, not just Irish Americans but all Americans who care about peace and justice in Ireland, will stand together, stand as one. Yes, we are more than willing to work with David Trimble, work with the British government, work with any of the parties who are honestly committed to the peace process.

□ 2145

But we cannot allow ourselves to be used as accessories to a game where David Trimble rewrites the rules, rewrites agreements, and reneges on agreements that he has entered into.

If that is what is done, there is not going to be peace in Ireland, and it is a situation that none of us even want to contemplate what could happen if this unravels, because this is the best chance for peace for all the people in Ireland probably in the entire history of Ireland, and certainly in the last 30 years or 75 years. There has never been an opportunity such as the one that is there today.

It is there. It is the good Friday agreement. It is the basis which allows all of the parties to move forward while all of the parties at the same time make concessions. It is the agreement which provides the basis where everyone's legitimate rights are protected, and everyone should receive peace and security, so long as the agreement is fully implemented. That is what has to be done. That is the role the U.S. can play.

Senator Mitchell has done a great job in the past. The gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) is trying to bring about a divorce in the Mitchell family by asking George Mitchell to go back again. He has made the ultimate sacrifice twice in putting in so much time and effort. If he is willing to do it again, God bless him. But we as Americans, as Members of this Congress, as people who care about the peace process in Ireland, we have to do what we have to do.

We have to work with the President, we have to work with all the parties to

bring about that peace which is so close and yet so far, but in doing this, we cannot allow ourselves to be scared off or turned away by the American media, which unfortunately in the last several weeks, and I think it has really been disgraceful the way they have so misrepresented and misreported what the reality is in Northern Ireland, and unfortunately has provided a climate and backdrop which has allowed both the British government and David Trimble to do what they have done.

I know that when we look at the British media, when we look at the television and radio shows in Northern Ireland, especially, all of these editorials are cited as proof that the American people are standing behind David Trimble, when exactly the opposite is true. Those of us who know what is going on realize that the onus for all of this is on David Trimble, and we are not going to allow him to get away with it. We are going to stay committed to this process until peace does come to Ireland.

I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH) again for his efforts, both tonight and throughout the history of this process.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING) for that summation. It is right on the money, as always, and I certainly associate myself with the gentleman's remarks.

I yield to another good friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), another newcomer to the House but someone who has been in the leadership as a private citizen and also as a member of the State legislature fighting for peace and justice in the United States and in Northern Ireland.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my good friend, the gentleman from upstate New York (Mr. WALSH) for organizing this special order this evening. He has been a stalwart ally and friend of the peace process in Northern Ireland, and I congratulate him for calling this special order.

I also want to congratulate and thank my good friend and colleague the gentlewoman from Long Island, New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY). She may be relatively new to Congress, although I am newer than she is at this point in time, but she, too, has proven herself to be a true and good friend to the people of Ireland.

I want to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL). Although the gentleman from Massachusetts is not here, I understand the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING) has mentioned he is going to try to be here before the end of the special order, and the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), chairman of the Committee on International Relations, another co-chair of the Ad Hoc Committee on Irish Affairs.

Lastly, I just want to thank my good friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING), for all his work throughout his years of service here in the House of Representatives, and prior to that his service in local government back in Long Island. The question I am most often asked by some of the gentleman's friends back in Woodside and Sunnyside, they want to know what type of curtains he has out there in Seaford.

Mr. Speaker, the political process in Northern Ireland has had a major setback recently, when the British government suspended the Northern Ireland Power-Sharing Executive. Such a drastic measure certainly does not instill parties on the Republican and National side in Northern Ireland with a great deal of confidence.

I realize there has been much criticism in the press lately, as the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING), has mentioned, wrongfully so, about the IRA and decommissioning. But I, too, want to set the record straight.

Back in May of 1998, the parties in Northern Ireland got together to support the historic Good Friday agreement, which set up a political structure inclusive of all the people of Northern Ireland. This agreement was accepted by not only the people of Northern Ireland, but the people of Ireland and Britain as well.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a point. I would like to point out that nowhere in the Good Friday agreement does it say that if the IRA or any other group has not decommissioned by the end of January 2000, the Ulster Unionist Party, the UUP, can threaten to pull out of the agreement and that the British can suspend the power-sharing executive.

We have this agreement, and the people of Northern Ireland waited for the Power-Sharing Executive to convene. Unfortunately, the UUP leader, Mr. David Trimble, refused to let it go forward.

Here we see the process of what I like to call the de facto veto. While Mr. Trimble and the UUP do not have a veto spelled out in the Good Friday agreement, they have one because every time progress begins to occur on setting up the democratic institutions needed for peace, Mr. Trimble finds some new crisis to stop it.

So in 1999, Northern Ireland found itself in a new crisis when Mr. Trimble would not allow the executive to meet, and former Senator George Mitchell was called in to review the process, particularly the aspects of decommissioning.

Bear in mind here that the Good Friday agreement does not even say that the IRA must begin decommissioning for the Power-Sharing Executive to begin. In fact, it only says that parties to the agreement, which includes Sinn Fein, not the IRA, Sinn Fein and not the IRA, will work to get paramilitary and other groups to begin the process of decommissioning.

Mr. Speaker, Senator Mitchell went to Northern Ireland and worked very hard, very hard with the pro-agreement parties, like the SDLP, the UUP, and Sinn Fein. He worked out a new accommodation. The IRA sent an interlocutor to the Independent International Commission on Decommissioning, the IICD, set up under the Good Friday agreement, and the UUP let the Power-Sharing Executive form and hold meetings.

So 18 months, a full 1½ years after the Good Friday agreement was signed, we finally see real movement and the establishment of democratic institutions in the north of Ireland. I might point out, the IRA has agreed to in about 5 months what it previously intended to do in 2 years. That is no small commitment on the part of the IRA when they have been misled in the past.

What happens a mere 11 weeks after the Power-Sharing Executive begins? Mr. Trimble decides needs to exercise his de facto veto power again, and says that he will resign unless more progress is made on decommissioning. This is even before the IICD issued its report.

Suddenly, Peter Mandelson, the Secretary for Northern Ireland, fearing the collapse of the process, rushes legislation through the House of Commons effectively reimposing direct British rule and suspending the democratic institution set up under the Good Friday agreement.

This bears repeating, Mr. Speaker. The Power-Sharing Executive was set up and running for only 11 weeks, 11 weeks, Mr. Speaker. In that time the UUP wanted the IRA to turn over its weapons in simply 11 weeks, even though the IRA ceasefire has held the entire time, and they invested a tremendous amount of time and energy into this peace process.

Mr. Trimble, casting all of this aside, exercised his de facto veto yet again, and the process comes crumbling down.

Mr. Speaker, let me be clear, I support decommissioning wholeheartedly. I would like to see all parties in Northern Ireland turn in their weapons, renounce violence, and solve their differences through the political process and the democratic institutions designed under the Good Friday agreement. If we ask the IRA, they would tell us they want the exact same thing, only the IRA wants to see some progress made on the democratic institutions first.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell the Members, suspending the democratic institutions after just 11 weeks does not instill confidence. Here is where, despite all of this, the IRA shows how truly committed to the peace process they are. They put forward a new proposal on decommissioning. They are willing to go even further than the Mitchell review. The new proposal is accepted by the IICD and touted as a major step, a major step forward on decommissioning. It is also accepted by the Irish government, but not by Mr. Trimble. He once again exercises his de facto veto and says the IRA has not gone far enough.

Well, that is when the IRA had finally had enough. They withdrew today their interlocutor from the IICD, and said that until the suspension of the Power-Sharing Executive is lifted they would suspend their activities on decommissioning.

Mr. Speaker, I feel the need to be very clear here once again. The IRA is still holding to the ceasefire and still wants to see the implementation of the Good Friday agreement. They just want the democratic institutions created under the agreement to remain in effect, not an unreasonable request. I do not think it is unreasonable.

Let me just say that I am deeply disappointed by Mr. Trimble's decision to reject the new proposition on IRA decommissioning. I agree with the IICD that it would have been a major step forward. Clearly, the IRA has been an active participant in the peace process, and important progress has been made. Unfortunately, David Trimble and Peter Mandelson have dismissed these significant developments.

For far too long the people of Northern Ireland have been waiting for the democratic institutions created under the Good Friday agreement to become an effective force for peace and stability. Mr. Speaker, the time for inside politics is over.

The Ulster Unionist Party and the British government must let the Independent International Commission on Decommissioning complete its work. We have come too far and too many lives are at stake. We must not allow one man, one man to destroy a process agreed to by the people of Northern Ireland, Southern Ireland, and Great Britain.

I have a personal stake in this peace process. My mother was born in County Armargh in Northern Ireland, and I have many family, friends, and loved ones who will either enjoy or suffer in their lives, depending on what happens during this process. Only a return to the political framework agreed to under the historic Good Friday agreement will resolve the current crisis and move it forward to continue on to the creation of a new Ireland.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) for his participation in this special order tonight, and for contributing his thoughts and ideas.

His summation of the situation is very, very clear and accurate. There is the need to stick to the agreement, the initial agreement that got us this far.

I would like to also thank my colleagues, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) for participating.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude with a brief story about a personal experience that I had. My family and I adopted a Project Children child from Northern Ireland back in 1990, a young man I believe about 12 years old at the time. He had never been outside of Northern Ireland.

He came to Syracuse, New York, by a plane, flew over, the first time he had ever been in a plane, and lived with us for 6 weeks. He had some trouble adapting to American food and music. He was a terrific soccer player, though, and we stuck him on our summer team as a ringer and he played great soccer. He loved to fish, he loved to be around the water. He just loved the peace and solitude of upstate New York.

He went back. I did not see him for 5 years. I went over when President Clinton went to Northern Ireland. On that historic day when they went to City Hall to dress the Christmas tree, I went to Michael Lyons' home and met with his mom and his sisters, and had a wonderful visit.

His mother told me that for the first time in his young life, and he was then 17 years old, for the first time in 17 years of his life, other than the 6 weeks he spent in upstate New York, he had never known peace before. This was the first time he could walk to school or go to the store or visit a friend and not have to worry about a bomb going off, a car driving by and riddling his friends and fellow citizens with automatic weapons, fire breaking out throughout the neighborhood, murals on the walls with masked men and rifles.

□ 2200

That was his whole life for 17 years. She said he can now walk down the street without being tugged and pulled at by those who want to draw him into this fight. He does not have to make that choice anymore; you are either with us or you are against us. He does not have to make the choice of going to war or going to school.

For the first time in 17 years, it is a remarkable event for any country. There are very few places in the world where war has gone on for 30 years, but nonetheless that was his life.

Today, 5 years later, there is still peace but it is tenuous.

I remember when I first engaged myself in this peace process I said to Jerry Adams, I said to David Trimble, when they were first coming, what do you expect to get from this peace process?

He said, peace; a straightforward answer.

I said to Jerry Adams, when I met him at a different time, I said, what do you expect to get from this peace process?

He said, peace, with justice.

Therein lies the problem. Two people who inhabit the same city, believe in the same God, speak the same language, have the same hobbies and habits and interests, one group has justice, one group has no justice. In order for there to be peace, there has to be justice. In order for there to be justice, everyone has to agree on the way forward. The only agreement thus far that everyone has agreed to is the Good Friday Agreement, and just like us, in our country, when crisis comes, impeachment, war, we do not set the Constitution on the side while we work it out. We honor it, we respect it, we live by it, we write our laws by it and we govern by it.

The only way for this process to go forward is to have everyone come back and sit down and say, yes, this is the only way we can go, this is the only thing we all agree to, and, therefore, in order to get to that bright future over the horizon, let us again swear to support this agreement.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. WALSH, the distinguished Chairman of the Friends of Ireland for tonight's Special Order.

The Irish peace process is in crisis and we need to make sure that both governments and peace loving people around the globe know what happened and why we are here.

It is disappointing and a step backwards in the search for lasting peace and justice in the north of Ireland that the British Government has suspended the vital power sharing institutions that had been the best chance to produce overall change in the north. Even after positive steps were being made to resolve the arms issue, the unionist veto by the Ulster Unionist Party (UUP) was again exercised to force suspension under the threat of resignation by the UUP's First Minister, David Trimble.

Terms of the Good Friday Accord set out the time frames and means to bring about lasting change, including removal of the guns from Irish politics. Those who have unilaterally changed its terms and exercised a veto over its operation and terms once again must explain their intransigence to the Irish people, both north and south, who support the Good Friday Accord in overwhelming terms.

We need to get the institutions back up and running in order to create the climate and framework for arms decommissioning as envisioned by the terms of the Good Friday Accord.

□

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. LOWEY (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and February 16 on account of illness.

Mrs. CAPPS (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of a death in the family.

Mr. BAIRD (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of an unavoidable family matter.

□

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BALDACCI) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.
Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. LARSON, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. BALDACCI, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. CROWLEY, for 5 minutes, today.
Ms. SLAUGHTER, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. PASCRELL, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HANSEN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FOLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RILEY, for 5 minutes, February 16.

□

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1052. An act to implement further the Act (Public Law 94–241) approving the Covenant to Establish a Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in Political Union with the United States of America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

□

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 16, 2000, at 10 a.m.

□

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6197. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Gypsy Moth Generally Infested Areas [Docket No. 99–042–2] received February 8, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6198. A letter from the Architect of the Capitol, transmitting the report of expenditures of appropriations during the period April 1, 1999 through September 30, 1999, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 162b; to the Committee on Appropriations.

6199. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, Department of Defense, transmitting the 2000 Department of Defense Annual Report to the President and the Congress, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 113 (c) and (e); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6200. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Procurement, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Mentor-Protege Program Improvements [DFARS Case 99–D307] received February 8, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6201. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Procurement, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; People's Republic of China [DFARS Case 98–D305] received February 8, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6202. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Procurement, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Delegation of Class Deviation Authority [DFARS Case 99–D027] received February 8, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6203. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—Home Equity Conversion Mortgage Insurance; Right of First Refusal Permitted for Condominium Associations [Docket No. FR–4267–F–02] (RIN: 2502–AG93) received February 8, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

6204. A letter from the Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education, transmitting a report on Strengthening Institutions Programs and Developing Hispanic-Serving Institutions Program; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6205. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the department's final rule—New Drug Applications; Drug Master Files [Docket No. 94N–0449] (RIN: 0910–AA78) received January 20, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce.

6206. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—National Priorities List for Uncontrolled Hazardous Waste Sites [FRL–6532–7] received February 4, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

6207. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Regional Transmission Organizations [Docket No. RM99–2–000; Order No. 2000] received January 27, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

6208. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

6209. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting the reports containing the 30 September 1999 status of loans and guarantees issued under the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on International Relations.

6210. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Inspector General for the period from April 1 through September 30, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6211. A letter from the Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Semiannual Management Report to Congress: April 1, 1999 to September 30, 1999 and the Inspector General's Semiannual Report for the same period, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 4062(c); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6212. A letter from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting List of all reports issued or released by the GAO in December 1999, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 719(h); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6213. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the 2000 Annual Performance Plan; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6214. A letter from the Chairman, Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting the Merit Systems Protection Board reprt titled, ''Restoring Merit to Federal Hiring: Why Two Special Hiring Programs Should be Ended.''; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6215. A letter from the Director, National Counterintelligence Center, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act from October 1, 1998 to September 30, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6216. A letter from the Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Determination of Endangered Status for the Plant Thlaspi californicum (Kneeland Prairie Penny-Cress) from Coastal Northern California (RIN: 1018–AE55) received February 8, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6217. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Marine Mammals; Incidental Take During Specified Activities (RIN: 1018–AF87) received February 4, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6218. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting the report on State Sex Offender Public Information Programs and the Feasibility of Establishing a National Sex Offender Hotline January 2000; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6219. A letter from the Director, Bureau of Transportation Statistics, transmitting Transportation Statistics Annual Report 1999, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 111(f); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6220. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the United States Government Annual Report for the Fiscal Year ended from September 30, 1999, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 331(b)(1)(a); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6221. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Last-in, First-out inventories, Department Store Indexes—December 1999 [Rev. Rul. 2000–10] received February 8, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6222. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—New Technologies in Retirement Plans (RIN: 1545–AW78) [TD 8873] received February 8, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6223. A letter from the Chairman, International Trade Commission, transmitting a report on the results of its monitoring of developments with respect to the domestic industry since quantitative limitations on imports of wheat gluten were imposed on June 1, 1998; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6224. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting notification that the Department of Health and Human Services is allotting emergency funds; jointly to the Committees on Commerce and Education and the Workforce.

6225. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Election Commission, transmitting the FY2001 Budget Request; jointly to the Committees on House Administration, Appropriations, and Government Reform.

6226. A letter from the Commissioner, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Social Security Administration's Accountability Report for Fiscal Year 1999, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 904; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means, Government Reform, and the Judiciary.

□

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. LINDER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 423. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2366) to provide small businesses certain protections from litigation excesses and to limit the product liability of nonmanufacturer product sellers (Rept. 106–498). Referred to the House Calendar.

□

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ABERCROMBIE (for himself, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. LARSON, Mr. REYES, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. TURNER, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. ORTIZ, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. UNDERWOOD, and Mr. SISISKY):

H.R. 3655. A bill to make certain improvements to the military health care system; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, Commerce, and Government Reform, 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. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 3656. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to reauthorize the Office of Ombudsman of the Environmental Protection Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mrs. BONO (for herself and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 3657. A bill to provide for the conveyance of a small parcel of public domain land in the San Bernardino National Forest in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 3658. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to designate the Logan Triangle in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, as a brownfield site for purposes of the brownfields economic redevelopment initiative of the Environmental Protection Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 3659. A bill to provide for a study and for demonstration projects regarding cases of hepatitis C among firefighters, paramedies, and emergency medical technicians who are employees or volunteers of units of local government; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. CANADY of Florida (for himself, Mr. SHERWOOD, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. HYDE, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. JOHN, Mr. COBURN, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. PITTS, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. GOSS, Mr. NEY, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. WICKER, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. DELAY, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. TANNER, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. STUMP, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. TALENT, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. HILL of Montana, Mr. KING, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. POMBO, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. WELLER, Mr. BUYER, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. BALLENGER, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. GOODE, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. CAMP, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. TANCREDO, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. VITTER, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. CRANE, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. ADERHOLT):

H.R. 3660. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to ban partial-birth abortions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANSEN (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. HAYES, Mr. HEFLEY, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. MCINNIS, Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. RADANOVICH, and Mr. CANNON):

H.R. 3661. A bill to help ensure general aviation aircraft access to Federal land and to the airspace over that land; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, and Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. MCGOVERN (for himself, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. OLVER, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. DELAHUNT, and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H.R. 3662. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to report to Congress on the readiness of the heating oil and propane industries; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. OSE (for himself and Mr. CONDIT):

H.R. 3663. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income payments made under Department of Defense programs for the repayment of student loans of members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 3664. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the deferral of removal and detention of certain aliens awaiting trial on Federal or State criminal charges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STARK:

H.R. 3665. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to deny tax benefits for research conducted by pharmaceutical companies where United States consumers pay higher prices for the products of that research than consumers in certain other countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WISE:

H.R. 3666. A bill to amend titles II and XVI of the Social Security Act to provide that where a failure by the Commissioner of Social Security to investigate or monitor a representative payee results in misuse of benefits by the representative payee, the Commissioner shall make payment of the misused benefits to the beneficiary or alternate representative payee; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DELAHUNT (for himself and Mr. GEJDENSON):

H.R. 3667. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to modify the provisions governing naturalization of children born outside of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. LOFGREN:

H. Con. Res. 250. Concurrent resolution expressing support for a National Kindness and Justice Week; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. RADANOVICH:

H. Con. Res. 251. Concurrent resolution commending the Republic of Croatia for the conduct of its parliamentary and presidental elections; to the Committee on International Relations.

□

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mrs. MORELLA introduced a bill (H.R. 3668) for the relief of Virginia Ifenyinwa Anikwata; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

□

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 5: Mr. DEMINT, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. SHERWOOD, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. BUYER, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. TANNER, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. BASS, and Mr. HOUGHTON.

H.R. 38: Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 113: Mr. FOLEY.

H.R. 148: Mr. STUPAK, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. OWENS, Mr. MICA, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. TOWNS, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 207: Mr. WELDON of Florida.

H.R. 355: Mr. FOLEY and Mr. OSE.

H.R. 443: Mr. BONIOR.

H.R. 531: Mr. MORAN of Kansas and Mr. SABO.

H.R. 538: Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 583: Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 664: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 742: Mr. MCHUGH.

H.R. 826: Mr. CLEMENT.

H.R. 923: Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 1040: Mr. TOOMEY.

H.R. 1041: Mr. THORNBERRY.

H.R. 1071: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island and Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 1102: Mrs. FOWLER.

H.R. 1111: Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, and Mr. BOEHLERT.

H.R. 1115: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

H.R. 1194: Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, and Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 1217: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. LAHOOD, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mrs. WILSON, Mr. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. TOOMEY.

H.R. 1244: Mr. GOODLING.

H.R. 1325: Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma and Mr. SOUDER.

H.R. 1354: Mr. COBURN and Mr. LAMPSON.

H.R. 1363: Mr. GOODLING.

H.R. 1399: Mr. BLAGOJEVICH and Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 1422: Mr. ENGEL and Mr. RODRIGUEZ.

H.R. 1486: Mr. FOLEY.

H.R. 1495: Mr. ENGEL and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 1532: Mrs. MORELLA.

H.R. 1592: Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 1617: Mr. NUSSLE.

H.R. 1621: Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. PICKETT, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 1650: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BLILEY, and Mr. BARCIA.

H.R. 1841: Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. WEINER, and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.

H.R. 1890: Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 1899: Mr. MOAKLEY.

H.R. 1941: Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky.

H.R. 2088: Mr. RILEY.

H.R. 2265: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 2289: Mr. SHAW.

H.R. 2298: Mrs. JONES of Ohio.

H.R. 2308: Mr. BROWN of Ohio and Mr. MASCARA.

H.R. 2362: Mr. COBURN and Mr. BONILLA.

H.R. 2397: Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. EVANS, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. KIND, Mr. TOWNS. Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. SABO, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. RIVERS, and Mrs. MORELLA.

H.R. 2498: Mr. GILMAN, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Mr. TAUZIN.

H.R. 2511: Mr. DICKEY.

H.R. 2564: Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 2595: Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 2631: Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. DOOLEY of California, and Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 2662: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 2697: Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 2780: Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H.R. 2900: Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MARTINEZ, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. MARKEY, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 2966: Mr. MOLLOHAN.

H.R. 2991: Mr. MCINTYRE and Mr. BOSWELL.

H.R. 3003: Mr. RAHALL, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. BALDACCI, and Mr. CANNON.

H.R. 3006: Mr. ROTHMAN.

H.R. 3034: Mr. WELDON of Florida.

H.R. 3091: Ms. DEGETTE and Mr. BAKER.

H.R. 3116: Mr. DREIER and Mr. RAMSTAD.

H.R. 3132: Mr. WU, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. FILNER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. LAMPSON Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. BERKLEY, and Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 3161: Mr. DAVIS of Virginia.

H.R. 3193: Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. KIND, Mr. COYNE, and Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 3235: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. GILMAN, and Mr. DEUTSCH.

H.R. 3252: Mr. ENGLISH.

H.R. 3278: Mr. HAYES, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. COBLE, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.

H.R. 3293: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. HAYES, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. TURNER, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FORBES, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. HALL of Ohio, and Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 3295: Mr. PHELPS.

H.R. 3301: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. WATKINS.

H.R. 3308: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 3377: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mr. WEINER.

H.R. 3408: Mr. THORNBERRY.

H.R. 3439: Mr. COOK, Mr. FORBES, Mr. HOEKSTRA, and Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.

H.R. 3494: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 3518: Mr. ROHRABACHER and Mr. THORNBERRY.

H.R. 3525: Mr. EHLERS, Mr. NEY, and Mr. SCHAFFER.

H.R. 3539: Mr. GOODE.

H.R. 3554: Mr. BLILEY, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. POMBO, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. VITTER, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. DELAY, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. PAUL, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. COBURN, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. TERRY, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. COX, Mr. KASICH, Mr. STUMP, Mr. SCHAFFER, Ms. DUNN, Mr. COOKSEY, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. HAYES, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

H.R. 3557: Mr. SCHAFFER.

H.R. 3573: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. HILL of Montana, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. SPENCE.

H.R. 3575: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. MEEKS of New York.

H.R. 3576: Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. LAFALCE, and Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 3578: Mr. WELLER.

H.R. 3594: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. UPTON, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, and Mr. LARGENT.

H.R. 3608: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. SAXTON, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. MASCARA, and Mr. WALSH.

H.R. 3616: Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. GILMAN, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. DICKS, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. REYES, Mr. THOMAS, and Mr. RODRIGUEZ.

H.R. 3626: Mr. OXLEY, Mr. SAXTON, and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.

H.R. 3639: Mr. TALENT, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. DANNER, Mr. MCNULTY, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. MOORE, Mr. REYES, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 3642: Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. BARR of Georgia, and Mr. LAFALCE.

H.J. Res. 86: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. COYNE.

H. Con. Res. 111: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Mr. GEJDENSON.

H. Con. Res. 115: Ms. DANNER, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, and Mr. GEJDENSON.

H. Con. Res. 220: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. KUCINICH.

H. Con. Res. 240: Mr. WATT of North Carolina.

H. Con. Res. 242: Mr. BACA, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. COBURN, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mr. PORTER.

H. Res. 16: Mr. UPTON.

H. Res. 237: Mrs. ROUKEMA.

H. Res. 298: Mr. COLLINS.

H. Res. 397: Mr. LAHOOD, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. ROHRABACHER.

□

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2086

OFFERED BY: MR. ANDREWS

AMENDMENT NO. 15: Page 8, line 22, insert ''and counterinitiatives'' after ''including privacy''.

Page 8, line 23, insert ''(including the consequences for healthcare)'' after ''social and economic consequences''.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1996

HON. RICK LAZIO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2000

Mr. LAZIO. Mr. Speaker, it has been four years since the Congress passed the Telecommunications Act of 1996 to open local markets to competition. While many of us hoped competition would not take this long, it is now beginning to take root. Since passage of the Act, over $30 billion has been invested by CLECs alone in new networks and there are more than 300 facilities based competitors now versus only 30 in 1995.

The ILECs have also invested tremendously since passage of the Act. Just last month, the FCC approved Bell Atlantic's application to offer long distance service in New York State. This was a landmark decision. I want to congratulate Bell Atlantic for doing what was necessary to open its local markets. The consumers of New York State are the winners. We are already seeing new choices in services and for the first time, competitive choices in local service. Mr. Speaker, the Act is working and it has worked first in New York State.

I want to congratulate many people for the work that they did to give consumers in New York State a choice in local service. First, I want to congratulate the New York Commission that tirelessly worked with all the concerned parties to make sure that the process and the outcome was fair. This process allowed all parties to work through the technical challenges of opening up the local network. Second, I want to congratulate Competitive Local Exchange Carriers that went into New York State a year ago and began offering local residential service on a statewide basis.

Mr. Speaker we are in the beginning of a technology revolution that is sweeping across this country. Since the 1996 Telecom Act, hundreds of new competitive telecommunications carriers have been formed and thousands of new Internet Service Providers are in existence today. The Telecommunications Act of 1996 is a great success and consumers are just now beginning to reap its benefits. I'm proud that New York has led the way, and I look forward to the day when the rest of this country's citizens enjoy the same freedom of choice.

HONORING AMY FINCH, OUTSTANDING YOUNG HUMANITARIAN

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2000

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate and honor a young Colorado student from my district who has achieved national recognition for exemplary volunteer service in her community. Amy Finch from Vail has just been named one of my state's top honorees in The 2000 Prudential Spirit of Community Awards program, an annual honor conferred on the most impressive student volunteers in each state, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico.

Amy, a senior at Battle Mountain High School, is an avid community volunteer who has helped raise money for victims of violence, knitted clothes and blankets for refugees, served as a buddy to elementary school children, served soup to the homeless, and volunteered with Special Olympics.

The program that brought this young role model to our attention—The Prudential Spirit of Community Awards—was created by The Prudential Insurance Company of America in partnership with the National Association of Secondary School Principals in 1995 to impress upon all youth volunteers that their contributions are critically important and highly valued and to inspire other young people to follow their example. In only five years, the program has become the nation's largest youth recognition effort based solely on community service, with nearly 75,000 youngsters participating since its inception.

Amy should be extremely proud to have been singled out from such a large group of dedicated volunteers. I heartily applaud Amy for her initiative in seeking to make her community a better place to live, and for the positive impact she has had on the lives of others. She has demonstrated a level of commitment and accomplishment that is truly extraordinary in today's world, and deserves our sincere admiration and respect.

It is with this, Mr. Speaker, that I offer this tribute in honor of Amy Finch. Her actions show that young Americans can—and do—play important roles in our communities, and that America's community spirit continues to hold tremendous promise for the future.

THE ILLEGAL ALIEN PROSECUTION ACT OF 2000

HON. MATT SALMON

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2000

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce the Illegal Alien Prosecution Act of 2000. The bill prohibits INS officials from deporting illegal immigrants accused of violent state crimes upon the request of local officials. Additionally, the bill would facilitate the apprehension and prosecution in the United States of criminal illegal aliens who attempt to re-enter the United States.

The United States has become a consequence-free zone for criminal aliens. Flawed deportation policy, less than perfect communication between the INS and county prosecutors, and misguided efforts on the part of local prosecutors and judges to secure adequate bonds have created a climate where criminal aliens can engage in lawless behavior without the fear of prosecution or incarceration.

The revolving door of illegal criminal aliens committing serious state crimes, being deported, then returning to the United States to commit even more serious crimes is the result of a loophole in the INS' voluntary deportation program. The program is intended to reduce administrative burden on the INS and the courts by expediting the deportation of aliens whose only offense is illegal entry into the United States. Unfortunately, illegal aliens charged with much more serious state crimes such as armed robbery, manslaughter, and drug trafficking are also being deported by this same process, often before they have even faced trial. After they have been returned to their native land these illegal aliens almost never face prosecution or incarceration.

The scope of this epidemic was detailed in a report by the East Valley Tribune which revealed that from October 31, 1998, to July 31, 1999, the INS deported 3,361 illegal immigrants who either made bail or were released before trial. To make matters worse, many of these alien criminals illegally return to the United States and only face prosecution if they commit additional, even more serious crimes.

The effect of this flawed policy has been devastating. In the last two years, two illegal immigrants have shot police officers in the Pacific Northwest after slipping through our immigration system. In one incident, an illegal alien with a vast criminal and deportation history killed an officer in Washington after being released from prison and deported to Mexico 5 months earlier. My home state of Arizona has experienced similar carnage. A deported defendant came back across the border illegally and is one of three men suspected of killing a Phoenix police officer.

And let's not forget the high profile case of Rafael Resendez-Ramiriez, the railroad serial killer. INS officers detained him as he attempted to cross the border illegally. But, within 24 hours, they quickly deported him back to Mexico even though the FBI suspected him of being involved in four murders.

As the previously mentioned incidents clearly illustrate, the INS must improve their communication with state authorities. In 1998, the Inspector General notified the INS that only 41 percent of deported illegal aliens were being processed by INS' new border patrol database system. In a letter to INS Commissioner Doris Meissner, he told her that ''this results in previously deported aliens (including aggravated felons) being released from INS custody when subsequently apprehended because INS is unaware of their immigration or criminal histories.''

Some progress has already been achieved in remedying this breakdown of our criminal justice system. As a result of several meetings that Senator KYL and I have held with local prosecutors, magistrates, and INS officials, actions have been taken in my State to address this situation. Our meetings also prompted Judge Reinstein, the Associate Presiding

Judge of Maricopa County, to issue a memo to his judges that directed them when determining bond to ''consider the factor whether the accused is an illegal alien and that they have a hold placed on them.'' He continued that ''if you don't give these factors consideration you are practically guaranteeing they will not appear in the future.''

Additionally, the INS and Maricopa County Attorney's office have agreed to change their procedures and communicate more regularly and efficiently so that, among other things, the county attorney's office will be armed with greater information when they fight for appropriate bail. More importantly, the new procedures should help ensure that no illegal immigrant (who commits a felony) is deported without the knowledge of all parties.

These significant advances should help reduce the number of illegal aliens charged with violent crimes from being deported without facing justice. I commend all of the state, local, and federal officials I met with for implementing important changes on their own accord. However, legislative language is still necessary to close the loophole in current law which allows INS to deport criminal illegal aliens before they face justice.

Under the Salmon bill, local or federal officials may request that INS not remove an individual accused of a state crime. And if the crime is a serious, violent felony as defined by 18 U.S.C. 3559, the Attorney General must detain the accused. For all other crimes, the Attorney General has the final say. The bill would only apply to individuals who have entered the United States illegally. This change in law will protect us all when, for whatever reason, an illegal alien accused of a serious state crime succeeds in posting bond. It is our safety net.

Of course, performing these new responsibilities likely will require additional resources for INS and the states. To that end, I will work to help secure the appropriate funding needed to carry out these duties. In the meantime, my legislation will provide the authority to act now.

It is an insult to victims and their families when an illegal alien accused of a violent crime in America is deported before he or she faces trial. The Illegal Alien Prosecution Act would close the loophole in current law which allows INS to remove illegal aliens accused of a serious state offense prior to trial. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor my bill.

TRIBUTE TO MACK WILLIE RHODES

HON. JAMES E. CLYBURN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2000

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute once again to a pillar in my hometown, Mr. Mack Willie Rhodes of Sumter, SC. It is with great pleasure that I rise today to congratulate Mr. Rhodes on his 102d birthday. An African-American great great-grandfather, Mr. Rhodes has been a champion in his community for many years. He is continually offering his assistance to neighbors, friends and family in many capacities. Mr. Rhodes is the oldest member of Melina Presbyterian Church, where he has worshipped since 1915. Mr. Rhodes is an Elder in his church and was a Sunday School Superintendent for many years. He also taught Sunday school at the Goodwill Presbyterian Church and has been a member of Masonic Lodge Golden Gate No. 73 since 1948.

Mr. Rhodes was born in Sardinia, SC, on February 25, 1898, to Robert and Olivia Williams Rhodes. Mr. Rhodes is the second oldest of 15 children. Family, good values, and good living are Mr. Rhodes' most cherished possessions.

At an early age Mr. Rhodes married Annie Elizabeth Hammett Rhodes (deceased). They had 14 children: Calvin Oliver Rhodes, John Tillman Rhodes, Adranna Olivia Cooper, Susanna H. Hannibal, Annie Elizabeth Muldrow, Hattie Jane Burgess, Mack Willie Rhodes, Sam J. Rhodes, Daisy B. Sims, Willie Rhodes, Albert Rhodes, Viola Rhodes Montgomery, MacArthur Rhodes, and Paul Rhodes. Mr. Rhodes later married Mrs. Carrie Smith Rhodes (deceased), who brought two children to their union: Maggie and Johnny Smith. He is affectionately known as ''Papa'' by his 7 children (9 deceased), 41 grandchildren (5 deceased), 48 great-grandchildren (2 deceased) and 10 great great-grandchildren.

Mr. Rhodes' favorite pastime is reading the Bible, newspapers and magazines. He also enjoys watching baseball, the news, and news related programs on television. He still takes time to visit the sick in his community to offer any assistance he may be able to provide. His favorite Bible scripture is the 23rd Chapter of Psalms. Mr. Rhodes also lives by a motto, ''Treat others as you would have them to treat you.''

Mr. Speaker, please join me in wishing Mr. Mack Willie Rhodes a prosperous and happy 102d birthday, and the best this year has to offer.

TRIBUTE TO SUSAN B. ANTHONY

HON. SUE WILKINS MYRICK

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2000

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, Susan B. Anthony is well recognized as a towering figure in the struggle for equal rights for women. Today, on her birthday, she will rightly be celebrated for her indispensable role in setting our nation on the course towards recognizing the full equality and dignity of women. All women and especially those of us who serve in this Congress are indebted to her pioneering work.

Susan B. Anthony's advocacy of women's rights included a concern for the rights of others as well. The same passion for justice that made her a fierce advocate for women also made her a fierce opponent of slavery. And inevitably, it led her to oppose abortion.

Today, abortion advocates equate their position with women's rights. But Susan B. Anthony knew better. She vigorously denounced abortion, calling it ''child murder.'' For her, abortion was not evidence of women's rights, but just the opposite: it is evidence of the lack of such rights. Anthony wrote that women ''in their inmost souls revolt from the dreadful deed'' of abortion, but are nonetheless driven to it precisely because women could be treated as property and less than equal. Thus, Anthony's opposition to abortion arose from her fight for equal rights for women, and she saw no cause to separate the two.

Without a doubt, if Susan B. Anthony were alive today, she would be fighting to reverse Roe vs. Wade. But more importantly, she would fight for true choice by supporting crisis pregnancy centers and other organizations that offer resources to help both the mother and the child. She would also be promoting advances in prenatal surgery and working to help families pay for these medical miracles. She would also work to eliminate barriers to adoption.

As we celebrate her birthday and the gains for all women that her legacy bestows, let us also honor her life's work by doing as she did and make pro-life inseparable from pro-woman.

HONORING DR. RICK HERRINGTON FOR 25 YEARS OF SERVICE

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2000

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to recognize the outstanding commitment and years of service given to Carbondale, Colorado by Dr. Rick Herrington.

Dr. Herrington arrived in Carbondale in 1975, just out of residency and recruited by a leader of concerned citizens, Betty DeBeque. He was so excited to be in this small Colorado town that he donned cross country skis and took a night tour of the town. The town reciprocated the feeling of joy and embraced its new doctor.

True to any small town, when the clinic opened under Dr. Herrington, more townspeople came in to ''check the doctor out'' than because of illness. Dr. Herrington's staff included himself and a handful of volunteers to keep the clinic running. After two years of running the clinic as the only doctor, his wife, Sherry, told him that he had to find a partner or a new wife. In 1978 Dr. Gary Knaus became Dr. Herrington's partner. Today, the clinic is still serving the community with as much dedication as it did when it opened in 1975. The community of Carbondale will forever be grateful to a young man from Nebraska who came to help out a small town.

It is with this, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to offer this tribute in honor of Dr. Rick Herrington, celebrating 25 years of service.

MARRIAGE TAX PENALTY RELIEF ACT OF 2000

SPEECH OF

HON. MATT SALMON

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 10, 2000

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most indefensible aspects of our current Tax Code is that 28 million working American couples—over 40 percent of married couples—pay more in taxes than they would if they were unmarried. Over 65,000 couples in my District suffer this penalty, which on average is $1,400.

Just as indefensible as the marriage penalty is the notion that Congress should overturn

the principle of fairness embedded in current law which dictates that different families with the same total income should be treated equally for tax purposes. The leading bill last Congress sought to fix the marriage penalty in a manner that would have inadvertently penalized families that chose to have one parent stay at home.

I made this point when I testified before the Ways and Means Committee in support of a marriage tax proposal Representative BOB RILEY and I developed, which doubled the standard deduction for married couples to twice that of singles. The legislation essentially also doubled the tax brackets of married couples to twice that of singles. One income families often have the toughest time making ends meet, particularly if they are raising children.

I am gratified that the marriage penalty bill the House will pass today embraces the approach developed in the tax bill I proposed with Mr. RILEY. The Marriage Tax Relief Act would eliminate or substantially reduce the penalty for virtually every couple currently burdened by the tax. Furthermore, marriage penalty relief would be targeted to primarily benefit low and middle-income families.

Critics complain that this legislation is too expensive or would provide so-called bonuses to families in which one spouse stays at home to raise children. Indeed, it would require Washington to give back billions of dollars to America's families. and yes, the bill as drafted would lighten the tax burden for certain families sustained by a single income. However, the preservation and security of the smallest, yet most important unit of government—the family—is too important to shortchange with more economical, but less effective proposals. Additionally, it simply isn't fair to require married couples who prefer parent-care over daycare to pay more in taxes.

For years, the Tax Code has been used to penalize the creation and maintenance of cohesive family units. This is foolish and unfair. The Marriage Tax Relief Act of 2000 will put an end to this discrimination and I urge the Senate to immediately pass this legislation and send it on to the President.

TRIBUTE TO HONDA OF SOUTH CAROLINA

HON. JAMES E. CLYBURN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2000

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of my colleagues the recent announcement by Honda of South Carolina Manufacturing, Inc. (HSC) located in the Sixth Congressional District, to expand its current all-terrain vehicle (ATV) plant in Timmonsville, South Carolina. On January 21, 2000, HSC broke ground on a new $20 million engine manufacturing operation. The new expansion will allow HSC to produce an engine currently made in Japan and will lead to the hiring of an additional 200 associates.

HSC began ATC production in July 1998. The expansion will increase Honda's total investment in HSC to more than $70 million. When the new engine operation reaches full capacity in 2001, HSC will have an annual production capacity of 150,000 ATV's and engines and will employ approximately 625 associates. Construction of the 50,000 square foot expansion for engine machining and casting will begin immediately and will be completed by late summer. Upon completion, the plant will total 330,000 square feet.

Honda's ATV sales in America grew more than 20% in 1999. In addition, 20% of the products manufactured at HSC are exported to overseas markets including Australia, New Zealand, and the United Kingdom.

Mr. Speaker, please join with me in saluting Honda of South Carolina Manufacturing, Inc. on their newest expansion. The Sixth Congressional District and the State of South Carolina are grateful for Honda's investment in our State and look forward to a long and prosperous business partnership.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SUE WILKINS MYRICK

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2000

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, due to necessary medical treatment, I was not present for the following votes. If I had been present, I would have voted as follows:

JANUARY 31, 2000

Rollcall vote 2, on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H. Con. Res. 244, Authorizing the Use of the Rotunda for Holocaust Memorial, I would have voted ''yea''.

Rollcall vote 3, on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 2130, the Hillory J. Farias and Samantha Reid Date-Rape Prevention Drug Act, I would have voted ''yea''.

FEBRUARY 1, 2000

Rollcall vote 4, on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 764, the Child Abuse Prevention and Enforcement Act, I would have voted ''yea''.

Rollcall vote 5, on passage of H.R. 1838, the Taiwan Security Enhancement Act, I would have voted ''yea''.

Rollcall vote 6, on the motion to instruct conferees for H.R. 2990 the Bipartisan Consensus Managed Care Improvement Act, I would have voted ''nay''.

FEBRUARY 2, 2000

Rollcall vote 7, on passage of H.R. 2005, the Workplace Goods Job Growth and Competitiveness Act, I would have voted ''yea''.

CHANGE IN CROATIA

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2000

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, in October of last year, I expressed concerns in this Chamber on the condition of democracy in Croatia. At that time, the leadership of Croatia was resisting the transition towards free elections, stalling the construction of democratic institutions, flaunting the rule of law, and squashing ethnic diversity. Those that held power were maintaining it in two significant ways. The first was through the manipulation of the political system to their advantage, including, in particular, efforts to control the media and the unwillingness to allow free and fair elections. Second, there was heavy reliance on nationalist passions for support. Zagreb's policies swayed the loyalties of Croats in neighboring Bosnia and made it difficult for the displaced Serb population to return to the country.

Since last October, things have changed drastically and for the better. In the Parliamentary election of January 3, the desire of the people for change was manifested as the party that had ruled since the fall of communism was defeated by an opposition coalition led by the new Prime Minister, Ivica Racan. Meanwhile, in a special presidential election on February 7 to succeed the late Franjo Tudjman, Stipe Mesic won on promises of reform, of a more democratic political system with diminished power for the presidency, of greater cooperation with The Hague in the prosecution of war criminals, of progress in the implementation of the Dayton Accords in Bosnia, and of the return of Croatia's displaced Serb population. These changes have been universally applauded, specifically by Secretary of State Madeleine Albright during her visit to Croatia on February 2. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I join the Secretary of State in commending the new policies of Croatia's leaders, and I compliment our able Ambassador to Croatia, William Montgomery, for his role in pressing for democratic change.

Mr. Speaker, it is good that Croatia's new leadership is talking about substantial reform. However, we must be sure that it is not just talk. We must be sure to encourage Croatia to move closer towards full freedom, true justice, and greater prosperity for all of her citizens, regardless of ethnicity. We must continue to press for the surrender to The Hague of those indicted for war crimes. As we do, we must be ready to support Croatia, even as we have been ready to criticize Croatia's shortcomings in the past. Recent violence in southeastern Europe underscores the need for true democracy in the region.

In closing, I congratulate Croatia's new leadership and its promise of progress. Now that reform is on the horizon, I am hopeful that Croatia will soon be an integrated partner in European affairs.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROD R. BLAGOJEVICH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2000

Mr. BLAGOJEVICH. Mr. Speaker, due to flight delays out of Chicago yesterday, I was unable to make the vote on rollcall vote No. 16 on H. Con. Res. 247 and vote No. 17 on H. Con. Res. 76. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes'' on both votes. I would ask that my votes be reflected in the RECORD.

TRIBUTE TO MICHAEL DEBONIS

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2000

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate a distinguished young man, Michael DeBonis, for attaining the rank of

Eagle Scout in the Boy Scouts of America. Michael is a member of Boy Scout Troop 69. He will receive this award at an Eagle Scout Court of Honor at 3:00 p.m. on Sunday, February 20, 2000 at the Hobart Scout Cabin, located in Hobart, Indiana.

Boy Scout Troop 69 was founded at St. Bridget Church in Hobart, Indiana. Since its founding in 1957, Boy Scout Troop 69 has become one of the most successful scout troops in Northwest Indiana. Since 1987, fifteen boys from this troop have achieved the prestigious rank of Eagle Scout. Only an elite group of Boy Scouts attain the Eagle Scout ranking, which is the highest of seven rankings in the Boy Scouts of America organization. In order to become an Eagle Scout, a Boy Scout must complete the following three tasks: earn 21 merit badges; complete a service project; and demonstrate strong leadership skills within the troop.

Scout Master Robert Bell must take credit for much of this success. He has been Scout Master of Troop 69 since 1987 and is directly responsible for the excellent program which has led to the development of such fine young men. Mr. Bell devotes significant time to scouting and has displayed qualities of personal understanding, dedication to youth and advocacy for their cause, which has made his troop and his entire community very proud. The following are the names of the Eagle Scouts who have come from Troop 69 since Bob Bell has been Scout Master: George E. Murchek, 1987; William Guinee, 1987; Robert W. Bell, 1988; David Strickley, 1988; Michael Murchek, 1989; Michael Stewart, 1990; Richard Duirda, 1991; Richard A. Sapper, III, 1992; Joel Detterline, 1993; Dennis King, 1995; Eric Stage, 1995; Chad Wolf, 1998; Jeremiah Jackson, 1999; Philip Sirota, 1999; and Michael DeBonis, 1999.

The most recent addition to this list, Michael DeBonis, began in scouting as a Tiger Cub in the first grade. He attended St. Bridget School in Hobart, and is currently attending Andrean High School in Merrillville, Indiana, where he will graduate this June. Michael has served in several positions of responsibility in scouting and was twice Senior Patrol Leader of his troop. Michael also won the Arrow of Life and was inducted into the Order of the Arrow.

Michael attained the rank of Eagle Scout in conjunction with his academic and athletic achievements at Andrean High School. He served as Captain of the Andrean High School Quiz Bowl Team, which won the Indiana State Championship in 1998, and was runner-up in 1999. Michael has also been named an All-Star on Andrean's various academic teams and has won numerous awards as a member of the Andrean Academic Superbowl Teams in Social Studies, Science and Interdisciplinary. Additionally, he plays Defensive Tackle on the Varsity Football Team at Andrean. Michael has achieved all of these accomplishments and yet has maintained an A average at Andrean and is a National Merit Scholarship Semi-Finalist.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my other distinguished colleagues to join me in congratulating Michael DeBonis for his commendable achievement. His parents, Tony and Shelia DeBonis, can be proud of their son because it takes a great deal of tenacity and devotion to achieve such an illustrious ranking. This young man has a promising future ahead of him, which will undoubtedly include improving the quality of life in Indiana's First Congressional District.

FIRST CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH, CELEBRATING 100 YEARS OF SERVICE

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2000

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to tell you about a small church that has celebrated 100 years of service to the community of Craig, Colorado.

The entire town of Craig was invited to help celebrate the 100th birthday of the First Congregational Church on January 2, 2000. It was a time to reflect on the past and plan for the future as Reverend Edwin Mendanhall delivered an inspirational message to the congregation. The church was founded by a group of 16 people in 1900. Within just a few months, the church had found a pastor and was chartered with 29 parishioners. Generous gifts from members of the church contributed to the purchase of a new bell in 1904 and it is still used today. A new facility was built and put to use in 1959.

The First Congregational Church is affiliated with the Rocky Mountain United Church of Christ Conference. As part of the centennial celebration the church will host the conference's annual meeting in June of 2000.

It is with this, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to offer this tribute in honor of the centennial celebration of the First Congregational Church and in recognition of its members.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SUE WILKINS MYRICK

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2000

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, due to necessary medical treatment, I was not present for the following votes. If I had been present, I would have voted as follows:

FEBRUARY 8, 2000

Rollcall vote 8, on the motion to suspend the rules and agree to the Senate amendment to H.R. 1451, the Abraham Lincoln Bicentennial Commission Act, I would have voted ''yea.''

Rollcall vote 9, on the motion to suspend the rules and pass S. 632, the Poison Control Center Enhancement and Awareness Act, I would have voted ''yea.''

Rollcall vote 10, on agreeing to the Resolution H. Res. 418, expressing the Condolences of the House on the Death of the Honorable Carl B. Albert, I would have voted ''yea.''

TRIBUTE TO EVELYN CLARKE

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2000

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize the important community contributions of Evelyn Clarke.

Evelyn was born and educated in Charleston, South Carolina. She has been active in Brooklyn community affairs for a number of years. Not one to rest on her laurels, Evelyn continued to work in Central Brooklyn even after she retired from 35 years of service with the Marriott Essex House Hotel. She began volunteering at the Berean Missionary Baptist Church's Senior Center where she has been credited with initiating a number of new senior programs. Evelyn has also worked with the Auxiliary at Kings County Hospital Center. She served as its President for four years.

The proud mother of one daughter, Dotrice and two grandsons, Ian and Christopher, and several nieces and nephews, Evelyn Clarke has made her mark as an advocate for seniors and a key supporter for one of Brooklyn's largest medical centers. Please join me in honoring Evelyn Clarke as one of Brooklyn's most committed activists.

FEDERAL COURT ASSIGNMENT OF CRIMINAL CASES

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2000

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member highly commends to his colleagues and submits for the RECORD this February 12, 2000, editorial from the Omaha World Herald regarding Federal court assignment of criminal cases concerning President Clinton's friends. Our colleague, Representative HOWARD COBLE (R-NC), recently discovered frequent use of a special rule allowing the chief judge to bypass the random assignment system for certain ''protracted'' cases; in this instance, fundraising cases involving friends of the President that have been assigned to judges appointed by the President. This situation certainly should be investigated. It's little wonder that increasingly Americans are wondering if one can get justice from the Justice Department.

JUDGING A JUDGE'S JUDGMENT

The Washington, D.C. panel of federal judges that oversees judicial conduct there has reopened what had looked like's closed controversy. The judges were right to do so. The situation involved the chief judge's prior practice—it might reasonably be characterized as a habit—of naming judges who were appointees of President Clinton to preside over criminal cases involving his friends.

That particular federal judicial district has a computer system to assign almost all criminal cases randomly. The idea of putting the system in place was to avoid both the appearance and the reality of favoritism. But there was a special rule, which was recently eliminated, allowing the chief judge to bypass the system for ''protracted'' cases.

Chief Judge Norma Holloway Johnson used the rule with what might politely be called enthusiasm. It was revealed in recent months that five Democratic campaign fundraising prosecutions and a tax-evasion case against Clinton confidant Webster Hubbell went to Clinton appointees. Now, appeals court Judge Stephen Williams has been ordered to look into the circumstances of these and other case assignments.

The decision to revive the inquiry was made after the revelation by Rep. Howard Coble, R-N.C., of additional non-random assignments in fund-raising cases, including one involving a former fund-raiser for Vice President Al Gore.

Coble, one of the most conservative members of a mostly conservative congressional delegation from a conservative state, is no friend of Clinton or Gore. He probably has an agenda behind his quest. But that shouldn't matter. The facts are the facts: Judge Johnson by-passed the system and has never said why, although she denies that there were political considerations.

It may all be on the up-and-up, but it smells funny. If Johnson in fact did nothing wrong, she deserves to have that publicized. Conversely, if some level of cronyism is involved, some sort of disciplinary action might be appropriate. Getting to the bottom of this is, plain and simple, a good idea.

TRIBUTE TO CHIEF MULLER

HON. BART STUPAK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2000

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to note for our House colleagues the loss of a fine community leader and dedicated public servant, Fred Muller of Acme, Mich., who died at his home on Dec. 21, 1999.

At the time of his death, Fred was chief of the Grand Traverse Rural Fire Department. He was also an arson investigator whose probes and seminars took him all over the nation, and he was an instructor at the National Fire Academy in Emmitsburg, Md. Most important to me, Fred Muller was my friend.

I am challenged, Mr. Speaker, to sum up this man's life in a few brief remarks. My anecdotes are only small windows on the career of a man who so loved firefighting from his youth that at age 13 he formed a junior volunteer fire brigade in his hometown of Brighton, Michigan. We can only glimpse the strength of his dedication to his community in such acts as coming out of retirement in 1985 after 24 years with General Motors to assume the post of rural fire chief in one of the most heavily populated counties in my district.

Our view of Fred Muller comes into better focus when we learn that he served eight years as a city council member and two years as mayor pro tempore of Brighton, and held various leadership positions, including president, of such professional organizations as the Northern Michigan Fire Chiefs, Michigan Fire Chiefs and International Association of Fire Chiefs.

Fred was a leader, and as his deputy chief Bill Sedlacek was quick to note in a news story on Fred's death, he led his volunteer force to a position of being rated among the top five in the nation.

In his public role, Fred's greatest test was a fire that broke out in late 1995 at a tire retreading facility in the small Michigan community of Grawn.

When the black clouds began climbing from the site and soot began turning snow around the site black, Fred ordered homes evacuated and a local school closed.

But the fire, which burrowed deep into a field of hundreds of thousands of tires, sometimes piled 50 feet high, soon signaled it would not be easily dealt with. There was no model for this conflagration. Temperatures at the core of the fire built up to almost 2,500 degrees. The fire burned under the surface, creating cavities that constantly threatened to swallow firefighting equipment. Conventional hoses merely built a shell of ice around the fire, which burned uninterrupted.

The fire became a siege, drawing manpower from around the state and bringing in technical experts from various state and federal agencies. Almost 125 firefighters were at work on New Year's Eve. Throughout the fire, Fred continued to monitor the hours that men worked, aware that fatigue and complacency were the greatest threats to the well-being of the army of firefighters. Whenever he gave community updates, Fred drew applause from audiences who knew he was dedicated to finding a way to defeat this fire through techniques that would serve as a guide for any future fire of this kind.

I had known Fred through his efforts to win funding for fire training, but now I had an opportunity to stand shoulder-to-shoulder with him in this great fight. I was able to assist by obtaining for Fred a pair of Air National Guard water cannons from a nearby base. With these cannons, his crews were able to blast apart the hot core of the fire, eventually reducing the blaze to smaller, cooler fires that could be doused by conventional means.

Mr. Speaker, we all owe a debt to this dedicated citizen, one of those men who care about people, give of themselves, and seem to live a life in preparation from some great moment when they can marshal and utilize all the skills they have acquired.

Not only my northern Michigan communities but the entire nation sustained a great loss with Fred Muller's untimely death. He will be missed.

CELEBRATING NATIONAL TRIO DAY

HON. JOHN ELIAS BALDACCI

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2000

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring my colleagues' attention to the upcoming celebration of National TRIO Day on February 26.

The TRIO programs are Upward Bound, Upward Bound Math/Science, Veterans Upward Bound, Talent Search, Student Support Services, Educational Opportunity Centers and the Ronald E. McNair Postbaccalaureate Achievement Program. These programs, established over the past 30 years, provide services to low-income and potential first generation college students and help them overcome class, social, cultural and physical barriers to higher education.

Currently 2,000 colleges, universities and community agencies throughout our nation sponsor TRIO programs. More than 780,000 middle school and high school students and adults benefit from their services. Most of these students come from families in which neither parent graduate from college. These students represent the highest aspirations and best hope for the American dream. By lifting these students out of poverty, the nation is lifted to new heights.

There are 15 TRIO programs hosted on nine college campuses in my State. Together, they serve nearly 6,000 aspiring students and adults annually. Almost 5,000 of these students are in my Congressional District. They are low income, first generation students and adults who are preparing to enter, or have entered, postsecondary education programs.

I have met with many of these students, and I know these programs work. For example, in recent years I have met Mark Crosby, a First Vice-President for Personnel for one of Maine's most successful and fastest-growing employers, MBNA America Bank. Mark was a student in the Upward Bound Program which he credits for his success in completing high school, college and graduate school. As he told me, ''I went to college. My brother, who did not go to Upward Bound, went to jail.'' I have also met with a young man, John Simko, whose participation in TRIO programs helped to get him into and through Bowdoin College. He later went on to become the Town Manager of a small town in Maine.

TRIO graduates can be found in every occupation: doctor, lawyer, astronaut, television reporter, actor, professional athlete, state senator and Member of Congress. In fact, some of our colleagues today are graduates of TRIO programs. The TRIO programs are a cost-effective investment in our nation's future. They help to ensure that no child will be left behind, his or her aspirations unrealized.

In closing, I would like to encourage my colleagues to visit the TRIO Programs in their districts and learn for themselves how valuable these programs are to our nation. I also want to say a warm hello to all of the Maine students currently participating in TRIO programs and to remind them to keep reaching for their dreams.

RECOGNIZING AND SUPPORTING EFFORTS TO ENHANCE PUBLIC AWARENESS OF SOCIAL PROBLEM OF CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT

SPEECH OF

HON. BOB CLEMENT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 2000

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise as a member of the Missing and Exploited Children's Caucus in strong support of H. Con. Res. 76. This common sense resolution expresses our support for a ''Day of Hope'' for abused and neglected children and urges us to remember these young victims of violence.

Child abuse and neglect are serious issues which we must address as a community. Over 3 million American children are reported as suspected victims of child abuse and neglect annually and more than 500,000 American children are unable to live safely with their families and are placed in foster homes. The cycle of child abuse and neglect all to often leads to crime and delinquency, drug and alcohol abuse, domestic violence and welfare dependency. We can and must do something to break this vicious cycle. I urge my colleagues to not only join me in supporting this resolution but also to actively work with our constituents to bring an end to child abuse and neglect.

HONORING LOUISE EVANS FARR, AN ADVOCATE FOR PEACE AND CIVIL RIGHTS

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2000

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to tell you of a great woman who gave selflessly of herself to her community. Louise Evans Farr passed away on January 14, 2000.

Louise was a lifelong advocate for peace, human dignity and civil rights. She graduated from Vassar College and Yale Law School. In the 1940s she was executive director of the Unity Council, a coalition of groups concerned with ending racial and ethnic discrimination in Denver, Colorado. She was also active in the peace and nuclear nonproliferation movements. Most recently she worked as a volunteer for Physicians for Social Responsibility and for the Union of Concerned Scientists.

Louise was the granddaughter of Frank S. Hoag Sr., former publisher of the Pueblo Star-Journal and Chieftain, and the cousin of, my good friend, Robert Rawlings, the present publisher of the paper. Her brother, Frank Evans, represented Pueblo and Southern Colorado in the United States Congress from 1964 to 1978.

It is with this, Mr. Speaker, that I offer this tribute in memory of Louise Evans Farr. She was a humanitarian who will be missed by all those who knew her.

SHREWSBURY SENIOR CENTER

HON. JAMES P. McGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2000

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, Today in Shrewsbury, Massachusetts, the dream of many is finally becoming a reality. It is my great pleasure to recognize the invaluable service that the Shrewsbury Council on Aging provides to the senior citizens of that community and congratulate them on the grand opening of the new Shrewsbury Senior Center.

From humble beginnings, the evolution of the center is truly amazing. Only a few short years ago the center was housed in the copy room of Shrewsbury Town Hall. From the there it moved to quarters in the North Shore School, and now to its new home at 98 Maple Avenue which will hold the grand opening February 17, 2000. I am so proud of everyone involved. They truly represent the best our nation has to offer.

The Shrewsbury Senior Center provides information on housing, health care proxies, volunteer opportunities, home care services, as well as hot meals and information on other issues. The Council on Aging also performs preliminary case work and makes referrals to appropriate agencies.

In a time when many forget our older neighbors, men and woman who quite literally saved the world, the Senior Center will forever ensure that this 'greatest generation' will always hold a prominent place in the community. From line dancing and bridge to yoga, knitting, painting, and shopping trips, this very special place will permit seniors to enjoy themselves in the company of friends.

As a Member of Congress, I often have the occasion to visit with seniors across my district. It is always a great joy for me to visit Shrewsbury. I look forward to visiting with them in their new home and congratulate them on this new beginning.

RECOGNIZING AND SUPPORTING EFFORTS TO ENHANCE PUBLIC AWARENESS OF SOCIAL PROBLEM OF CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT

SPEECH OF

HON. EVA M. CLAYTON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 2000

Mrs. CLAYTON. Madam Speaker, in this land of diversity, one belief is nearly common to us all: Children are our greatest resource.

Children represent our hope for the future. They are our special treasures and deserve every protection we can provide them. Statistics show that every 10 seconds a child is abused and more than 3 children a day die as a result of abuse. Given statistics like these, it is critical that we, as a bipartisann body, continue our efforts and use all of our abilities and resources to ensure that our children, our national treasures, are protected and have the greatest opportunities to grow up happy, healthy, well-educated and strong. We must re-double our efforts to help break the cycle of abuse and violence that affects so many children.

Recently, The National Center for Missing and Exploited Children reported that the number of missing children reports filed in 1999 dropped to the lowest level since 1993. This glorious news demonstrates that our legislative efforts, and the diligent efforts of organizations like Childhelp USA, do make a difference. More importantly, it means that more children are out of harm's way. Nonetheless, we cannot become complacent because too many children remain victims of abuse. Therefore, we must stand firm in our commitment to our children and their well-being.

This Day of Hope resolution demonstrates this resolve and I urge my colleagues to support this resolution for the sake of our national treasures—our children.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PATRICK J. KENNEDY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2000

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, on February 14, 2000, I was unavoidably detained and consequently missed two votes.

Had I been here I would have voted:

''Yes'' on the passage of H. Con. Res. 247—Expressing Sense of Congress Regarding the Importance of Organ, Tissue, Bone Marrow and Blood Donation and Supporting National Donor Day.

''Yes'' on the passage of H. Con. Res. 76—Recognizing the Social Problem of Child Abuse and Neglect and Supporting Efforts to Enhance Public Awareness of it.

HONORING WILLIAM CHARLES ''BILL'' PUMPHERY

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2000

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to remember and honor a man that was dedicated to helping people. William Charles ''Bill'' Pumphery passed away on February 1, 2000. He was 77 years old.

During World War II, Bill was a pilot in the Army Air Corps. He took part in Operation Varsity, the Allied assault across the Rhine River that marked the demise of Nazi Germany. Bill was one of the glider pilots who transported troops and equipment across the river.

Bill was an active supporter of the YMCA in Pueblo, Colorado. He was a member of the club and served on the board of directors for many years. Bill's dedication to the organization could be seen from the many fundraisers he participated in to build cabins for camps. Camp Jackson, formerly known as Camp Crockett, was built primarily from funds raised by the Pueblo YMCA men's club. When it came to needing a new building for the Pueblo location, Bill was instrumental in raising funds for the structure.

Bill was also proud of Pueblo and he showed his pride by volunteering at the Pueblo Chamber of Commerce. He spent much time at the visitor's center, making sure that new comers received any information they needed about the area. Such an advocate of the Pueblo community will be missed greatly.

It is with this, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to offer this tribute in Bill Pumphery's memory. He was a great man that was dedicated to making his community a better place to live.

IN LOVING MEMORY OF DOMITILIA DOMINGUEZ

HON. JOE BACA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2000

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, it is with much sadness that I inform my colleagues of the passing of a great individual, a person who graced our world and our lives with so much love and compassion.

Domitilia Dominguez, the grandmother, and godmother, of my dear wife, Barbara, passed away yesterday, on Valentine's Day, at Victorville Hospital in California. She was a long-time resident of Barstow, CA. Domitilia lived a very full and a very fulfilling life, a life graced by her husband, who passed away 20 years ago, with whom she was blessed by eight children: Ted, Flora, Margaret, Frank, Albert, Fabiola, Liz, and Larry. These children and many grandchildren brought tremendous joy and inspiration into their lives.

Domitilia Dominguez was and remains so much a tremendous person in our thoughts and in our memories. I appreciate so much and will long remember the many good and positive things she brought into my life and into the life of my wife, Barbara Dominguez Baca, our children, Joe, Jr., Jeremy, Nataline, and Jenifer, and our grandchildren, Katie Baca

and Anthony Baca Ramos. I join with Domitila's friends and family members in honoring such a truly remarkable and outstanding person, a mother, a grandmother, a great-grandmother, and great-great-grandmother, to all those who loved her so much.

Domitilia gave so much to those she loved, and each of us is better and more fortunate for what she unselfishly gave to us and gave to our world, a world made so much brighter and more gentler by her life and her presence.

Mr. Speaker, we are all gifted by the lives of mothers and grandmothers who do so much in guiding our lives and providing us comfort and proper direction. I join with all those who loved Domitilia Dominguez, in extending our prayers, knowing that God's heaven is blessed and graced by one of his most beautiful and loved angels.

STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF MRS. BONO'S LEGISLATION TO AUTHORIZE CONVEYANCE OF PUBLIC DOMAIN LAND IN THE SAN BERNARDINO NATIONAL FOREST

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2000

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Representative BONO for her follow through on the KATY issue. It was three or four years ago when her late husband, our colleague Sonny Bono, began to tackle the problem of keeping a small radio antenna on the edge of the San Bernardino National Forest for an important local radio broadcaster. With the introduction of this bill, Mrs. BONO begins the last chapter to settle an important issue for her constituents.

The station is KATY–FM, and it is the only radio link for emergency broadcasting that covers a large sector of the San Bernardino valley. An elderly couple, the Gills, owned the station. Mr. Gill passed away recently, so it is an important tribute to him that this bill is being introduced today. We will get right to work on it in my committee, the Committee on Resources, this year.

I offer thanks to the Forest Service for working hard to settle this issue, and for protecting the public by ensuring that fair market value will be paid for the small parcel by KATY–FM. While we hoped to help the Forest Service move two unrelated administrative provisions in this bill, it could not be done before introduction. However, I will make every effort to accommodate the needs of the Service on the two unrelated matters, working with the other committee with joint jurisdiction over those provisions, as the bill moves through the Committee and the House. I appreciate the Service's good faith work on these matters, and we will work in the same manner.

Congratulations again, Mrs. BONO. Your follow through is commendable.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ELTON GALLEGLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2000

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be in Washington yesterday and I missed two rollcall votes. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes'' on rollcall vote No. 16 and ''yes'' on rollcall vote No. 17.

HONORING THE GRAND JUNCTION BUSINESS OF THE YEAR, ALPINE BANK

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2000

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to recognize the 1999 Grand Junction Chamber of Commerce Business of the Year, Alpine Bank.

Alpine Bank opened its first facility in Mesa County in 1992. With a focus on giving back to the community, it did not take long for this bank to become recognized as a leading corporate citizen. Among the organizations that the bank has contributed time and money to are: the American Heart Association, March of Dimes, Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation, Lion's Club, Rotary, Museum of Western Colorado, Club 20 Mesa County Land Trust Alliance, Mesa County Homebuilders, Young Life, Crime Stoppers, Ducks Unlimited, League of Women Voters, Western Colorado Arts Center, the Grand Junction Chamber, Habitat for Humanity, Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, American Lung Association, Salvation Army, Mesa County Library, Western Slope Center for Children, Junior Service League, Western Colorado Botanical Society and the grand Junction Symphony.

In addition to this long list of involvement, Alpine Bank has taken great interest in helping Grand Junction schools. Through the Classroom Credits program, Alpine Bank has donated over $45,000 to the Mesa County Business Education Foundation for the last two years. Along with Classroom Credits, Alpine Bank has found a way to reward students who received excellent grades with the ''Pay for As'' program. Most recently, the bank has pursued plans to build an ice skating rink. To encourage bank employees to help out in the community, the bank has started providing paid time off for those who wish to become involved in the community.

It is with this, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to offer this tribute to the Alpine Bank. A business that is worthy of thanks and praise for unparalleled commitment to the community.

TRIBUTE TO SUSAN B. ANTHONY

HON. JO ANN EMERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2000

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, Susan B. Anthony is remembered for her pioneering work to establish equal rights for women. As she fought to widen society's guarantee of equal rights to include women, she also sought to widen this guarantee for others as well. For Susan B. Anthony, this meant opposing slavery. And it also meant rejecting abortion, which she considered nothing less than ''child murder.'' Today, 180 years after Susan B. Anthony's birth which we commemorate today, we continue her legacy in promoting equality under the law for all, including the unborn.

Susan B. Anthony rejected abortion because she championed equal rights for all. In Anthony's view, abortion violated the rights of both women and children for it deprived the unborn of their right to life, and exploited women. As Susan B. Anthony said: ''When a woman destroys the life of her unborn child, it is a sign that, by education or circumstance, she has been greatly wronged.''

On this the 180th anniversary of her birthday, let us recommit ourselves to fulfilling the pro-life and pro-women vision of Susan B. Anthony, moving toward that day when neither women nor children shall ever again be greatly wronged by abortion.

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT S. JOE, LOS ANGELES DISTRICT, U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

HON. JERRY LEWIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2000

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, for a number of years now, my colleague, Mr. CALVERT, and I have worked closely with the Army Corps of Engineers on one of the largest flood-control projects now under way in our nation. The Santa Ana River Mainstem flood control system, which is well on its way to completion, will protect millions of southern California residents and save billions of dollars in property from potentially devastating floods. We would like today to pay tribute to the man who oversaw this project: Mr. Robert A. Joe, the Deputy District Engineer for Programs and Project Management of the corps' Los Angeles District.

The Los Angeles District is one of the largest Corps of Engineers districts in the contiguous 48 states, covering 226,000 square miles in southern California, southern Nevada, and all of Arizona. They operate in the second largest urban area in the United States, as well as the booming growth areas of Phoenix and Las Vegas. Activities directed by Bob Joe have ranged from the deepening of Los Angeles Harbor—one of the largest in the world—to massive flood control projects protecting millions of people throughout southern California, to the environmental restoration of the Rio Salado through Tempe and Phoenix.

Bob Joe has directed this $300 million annual operation since August 1998—the highlight of a nearly 30-year career with the Los Angeles district that also saw him lead the planning division for 11 years. Throughout this time, southern California has benefited from the corps work in preventing flood damage, improving our harbors, and protecting our valuable coastal property.

Mr. CALVERT and I recently attended the dedication of perhaps the most important corps project in our Inland Empire—the Seven Oaks Dam in the San Bernardino Mountains. Completion of this dam—on time and on budget—will save thousands of homeowners along the Santa Ana River thousands of dollars a year in flood insurance. We believe it is an accomplishment that will bring pride to the entire corps. Mr. Joe has also been of indispensable help in accomplishing stabilization of the Norco Bluffs and beginning a flood control

project along San Timoteo Creek—projects of immense importance to our constituents.

Mr. Speaker, we recently learned that Bob Joe will soon retire from the corps. We ask you and all of our colleagues to join us and expressing our gratitude for his years of tremendous service to southern California and the Southwest, and wishing him well in his future professional endeavors.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TERRY EVERETT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2000

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, on February 10, I was in Alabama attending to pressing personal matters and was unable to cast my vote in favor of H.R. 6, the Marriage Tax Penalty Relief Act. As an original cosponsor of this legislation and supporter of past efforts to repeal this onerous tax, I am very pleased that this measure passed with such bipartisan support.

Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes'' on the rule (roll 12) and on final passage (roll 15); and I would have voted ''no'' on the Rangel Substitute (roll 13) and the motion to recommit (roll 14).

HONORING FRANK MILFORD MILLIGAN

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2000

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to pause in remembrance of Frank Milford Milligan who died on November 7, 1999.

Mr. Milligan was born on October 24, 1925, in Beulah, Colorado, to Cecil Milligan and Elta Parker. Mr. Milligan attended grade school in Beulah and high school in Cortez. In January of 1944, he enlisted in the United States Navy and served for two years. After his service in the Navy, he returned to Cortez to reside.

Following his return from the military, Mr. Milligan went to work as a farm hand. He was a member of the Ute Mountain American Legion Post 375 and enjoyed socializing with his fellow members at the post. Mr. Milligan will always be remembered as a man that loved to spend time with his family and doing family activities.

It is with this, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to pay tribute to the life of Mr. Frank Milford Milligan, a great American and friend.

HAIDER AND THE EUROPEAN UNION

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2000

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member commends to his colleagues and submits for the RECORD this February 10, 2000, opinion column from the Financial Times regarding Jorg Haider.

WHY EUROPE WOULD LIKE HAIDER TO DISAPPEAR

The rightwing Austrian politician is a threat only because he has highlighted problems that are common to the rest of the EU

(By Quentin Peel)

Why on earth are we so worried about Jorg Haider?

The leader of Austria's inappropriately-named Freedom party is nothing more than a lightweight provincial politician, a plausible populist more notable for changing his opinions by the hour than for any consistency of fanatical thought.

One moment he is in favour of the European Union, the next he is a passionate Eurosceptic. One day he shows some sympathy for the Nazi regime in Germany, and the next he condemns it. He is an erratic gadfly with a grin, who has cynically exploited the widespread hostility to immigrants in the Austrian provinces, and the wider resentment of a political establishment that has carved up all the public sector jobs in Vienna.

Yet the appearance of his party in the Austrian government has united the rest of the European Union in a chorus of condemnation. He is in danger of being demonised as a reincarnation of Adolf Hitler, when he should instead be treated with disdain and contempt.

The year 2000 is not 1933, and the prosperous citizens of Austria are scarcely the embittered unemployed of Germany between the wars. The democratic institutions of post-war western Europe are surely resilient enough to resist the blandishments of a half-baked extremist.

Yet the truth is that Mr. Haider, in himself, is not the problem. The international overreaction is driven by fear of contamination in other parts of the EU. He is a symbol, and many of the causes of his popularity are present in most of the states of the union.

Austria is not alone in demonstrating resentment of a tired and corrupt political establishment, a fear of excessive immigration, and growing uncertainty about what enlargement of the EU will mean for the cozy lifestyle of the present member states.

Germany and France both took a lead in the decision by the rest of the EU to freeze bilateral relations with Austria, and with good reason. Both have been hit by a series of political scandals, threatening an upsurge in public disgust with the political process. Scarcely a European country has been unaffected by allegations of illicit or corrupt party financing.

As for immigration and EU enlargement, neither may be quite as big an issue as it is in Austria, but they could easily be exploited by a rabble-rouser in most EU countries. All the EU governments have gone a long way to tighten up controls on immigration and asylum-seekers, in precisely the direction that Mr. Haider demands, for fear of a backlash.

Enlargement, now intended eventually to bring 13 new members into the EU, may be officially supported by all the present governments, but their voters remain decidedly skeptical. EU leaders will have to go out and sell the idea, with passion and conviction, or they could face an upsurge in xenophobia at the polls.

If and when enlargement happens, as I fervently hope it does, it will change the EU substantially. The only way to accommodate such a wide variety of member states, at very differing political and economic stages of development, will be to build much more flexibility into the system. Somehow it has to be adapted to preserve the single market, without forcing the new members into instant bankruptcy. The high standards of developed west European economies cannot be adopted overnight in the east.

Nor is it simply a matter of economics. The accession candidates are all relatively fragile democracies. Most have only recently recovered their full sovereignty from the former Soviet empire. There are unresolved ethnic conflicts, and minority rights issues, within their borders. They could well spark the emergence of nationalist movements at least as unattractive as the Freedom party of Mr. Haider.

All these profound issues raised by EU enlargement are supposed to be tackled by the intergovernmental conference (IGC) of the present 15 member states, which opens next Monday. They are supposed to be streamlining the institutions so that they remain workable with as many as 28 members. Yet the chances are that the IGC will stick to a very narrow agenda, and leave the EU ill-prepared for the revolution to come.

Romano Prodi, president of the European Commission, says the prospect of more Haiders in an enlarged EU makes it all the more necessary to take most decisions by majority voting, not unanimity. Yet majority decisions enforced on unhappy minorities could be a formula for breeding more Haiders. The answer must be more flexible arrangements, more devolution of power, and a minimum of rules.

If an enlarged EU is going to hold together, and enjoy the support of its inhabitants, it is going to have to be rather more than a glorified common market. It does not have to be the federal super-state that British Eurosceptics fear and loathe. But it will have to be a community of common values.

That is why the initiative running in parallel with the IGC may ultimately prove more important: the drafting of a Charter of Fundamental Rights. This should be clear, concise and easily intelligible. It does not have to add any exotic new rights that are not already present in the EU treaty and the European convention of human rights. But it should spell out the minimum rights and freedoms to which all member states of the union will be committed. It should also spell out what will happen if they transgress.

For the advent of Mr. Haider in Austria is surely only a foretaste of the challenges to come in an enlarged EU. The member states need a clear yardstick by which to judge the acceptable behaviour of any government—a yardstick that voters can read and understand before they vote. That might discourage them from voting for anti-democratic extremists. And it might restrain the other member states from ad hoc overreactions.

TRIBUTE TO FATHER FRED

HON. BART STUPAK

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2000

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I and many, many residents of northern Michigan continue to mourn the passing of the Rev. Edwin Frederick, our beloved Father Fred, who affected so many lives by the simple act of tending and caring for those in need.

It may be misleading, Mr. Speaker, to describe Father Fred's work as simple. The simple act of sharing is to offer a hungry man half one's loaf of bread. The simple act of caring is to put one's own coat over the shoulders of a child shivering with a cold.

Father Fred went much further than that. The foundation he created has provided food, clothing and other basic necessities to literally

thousands of families. The Father Fred Foundation now distributes more than a million dollars in aid each year to individuals and families in the Traverse City area. It is, at its heart, the story of the loaves and fishes, a miracle being worked by our Savior through this simple man of the cloth who was willing to ride on the back of Harley Davidson motorcycles and oversee garage sales to build this sustaining fund.

I was fortunate, Mr. Speaker, to have been one of Father Fred's instruments in his performance of good works. I looked forward each year to assisting him in serving Thanksgiving dinner to those in need. In this most basic act of charity, helping to provide sustenance to another human, I learned that most basic of Christian lessons, learning to love a stranger.

My heart was heavy this year at Thanksgiving, because as I left I knew I would never again see Father Fred alive. His smile was as wide as ever, but the cancer that was killing him had left this once powerful man very frail. Father Fred died in January at the age of 74.

We in Congress have an opportunity to meet many stately, strong, wise, and wonderful people. But in those quiet moments when I can reflect on the individuals who have really had an impact on my view of the world and my feelings for my fellow man, it is Father Fred who marches at the forefront of that long procession of men and women whose lives have at one time or another intersected with mine.

He will continue to live among us in the foundation he created, and in the special place in our hearts and memories that he created.

IN REMEMBRANCE OF TWO FALLEN POLICE OFFICERS

HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2000

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, sadly I rise to call to the attention of my colleagues the passing of two of San Francisco's finest police officers—Inspector Kirk ''Bush'' Brookbush and Officer James ''J.D.'' Dougherty.

On Wednesday, January 19 thousands of police officers from throughout California and the nation gave their final farewell salute to their two San Francisco comrades who had died on January 11 when their helicopter crashed returning from a routine maintenance session. ''The Air Marshall and his Sidekick'' as they called themselves are remembered as dedicated police officers who went above and beyond the call of duty.

For nearly 30 years they were devoted, reliable and hard-working street cops. They were highly respected, trusted and loved by their colleagues, family and friends. Both were Vietnam vets, loving husbands and fathers who were trained airline pilots recently given the opportunity to fulfill their dreams of becoming police pilots. They were passionate about their work and were making a positive impact on the San Francisco Police Department's air unit.

Indeed, the San Francisco Bay Area deeply mourns the loss of Kirk and J.D. Their colleagues will continue to look up to them with respect and admiration for as described by their boss, Commander Heather Fong, they will continue to be ''two angels looking over the shoulders'' of San Francisco's police officers. They were men of courage and inspiration.

I would like to express my personal condolences and prayers to their friends and loved ones, especially to Kirk Brookbush's wife, Suzanne and their son, Andrew and to James Dougherty's wife, Sun Kang and his stepsons, Chon and Paul and his children, Brigid, Jeff and Chris.

RECOGNIZING AND SUPPORTING EFFORTS TO ENHANCE PUBLIC AWARENESS OF SOCIAL PROBLEM OF CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT

SPEECH OF

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 14, 2000

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 76, recognizing the social problem of child abuse and neglect, and supporting efforts to enhance public awareness of it. Through the efforts of Childhelp USA, a ''Day of Hope'' will be observed on the first Wednesday in April to focus public awareness on this social ill.

Childhelp USA has been coming to the rescue of children in distress since 1959. It is one of America's oldest and largest organizations dedicated to the prevention and treatment of child abuse.

Childhelp's many excellent programs help keep children safe. Childhelp training programs instruct adults who work with children on how to recognize the signs and symptoms of abuse, how to respond to a child who discloses abuse and how to interrupt a suspected abuse situation. Childhelp Abuse Prevention instructors teach school children the knowledge and skills they need to prevent or interrupt abuse. This organization provides a 24-hour National Child Abuse Hotline, which delivers free, high quality professional counseling services to children and families in crisis and connects them with social service and law enforcement agencies in their community. Child Advocacy Centers have implemented programs that work with law enforcement and child protective services to investigate abuse reports in a manner that avoids further trauma to the victim. Childhelp Head Start classes provides early enrichment for at-risk children and parenting education for their mothers and fathers. The Villages of Childhelp and Childhelp therapeutic foster homes provide the finest available residential care and treatment for victims of severe abuse.

There is an epidemic of violence against children in America. The direct and collateral damage to the individual and the community is vast. A problem this large will end only when everyone does something to help. I commend Childhelp USA for all that it does for America's children and families, and for it superior model of service in the 8th district of VA, and throughout the country.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JULIA CARSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2000

Ms. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent yesterday, Monday, February 14, 2000, and as a result, missed rollcall votes 16 and 17. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes'' on rollcall vote 16 and ''yes'' on rollcall vote 17.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MAJOR R. OWENS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2000

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent on a matter of critical importance and missed the following votes:

On H. Con. Res. 247, expressing the sense of Congress regarding the importance of organ, tissue, bone marrow, and blood donation introduced by the gentlelady from Florida, Mrs. THURMAN, I would have voted ''yea.''

On H. Con. Res. 76, recognizing the social problem of child abuse and neglect and supporting efforts to enhance public awareness of it introduced by the gentleman from Arizona, Mr. SALMON, I would have voted ''yea.''

SALUTE TO D.C. UNITED, ''AMERICA'S SOCCER TEAM''

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2000

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and applaud D.C. United as ''America's Soccer Team,'' which won its third Major League Soccer (MLS) championship while Congress was in recess. It is a well-deserved title, not only because the team is located in the Nation's Capital, but especially because D.C. United has won three of the four MLS championships offered by the league. Rarely, if ever, has an American team so dominated its sport or displayed greater skill and sportsmanship. Both were in full view last November, when United snared its latest championship in a two-to-nothing victory over Los Angeles.

We, who live in the District of Columbia, are proud that D.C. United took our hometown name. Our hometown soccer team has become the District's version of a triple crown champion that does not know how to lose. D.C. United's victories over the past several years have paralleled the continuing revitalization of the team's hometown. After what our city went through in the 1990's, the team's championship means much more to D.C. than it would to Baltimore or New York, or Atlanta or Los Angeles. D.C. United has taught this town that we, too, can be winner. Now, when Americans and people from around the world visit the Nation's Capital, they come not only to see our monuments. They want to see our monumental team.

Our team reflects the nations of the world in a sport that is played by virtually ever country

in the world. Across the nation and throughout the soccer world, D.C. United fans applaud the team's determination to fight and to win. Today, we salute D.C. United for a job well done and send best wishes to ''America's Soccer Team.''

TRIBUTE TO JUSTIN KOREN

HON. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2000

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate and honor a young student from my district in Florida who has achieved national recognition for exemplary volunteer service in his community. Justin Koren of Miami has just been named one of my State's top honorees in The 2000 Prudential Spirit of Community Awards program, an annual honor conferred on the most impressive student in each State, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico.

Mr. Koren, a senior at Coral Reef Senior High School, is being recognized for creating a volunteer teenage community theater group that brings the joys of live theater to others by performing at retirement homes, senior centers, day care centers, and migrant farms in the greater Miami area.

In light of numerous statistics that indicate Americans today are less involved in their communities than they once were, it is vital that we encourage and support the kind of selfless contribution this young citizen has made. People of all ages need to think more about how we, as individual citizens, can work together at the local level to ensure the health and vitality of our towns and neighborhoods. Young volunteers like Mr. Koren are inspiring examples to all of us, and are among our brightest hopes for a better tomorrow.

The program that brought this young role model to my attention—The Prudential Spirit of Community Awards—was created by the Prudential Insurance Company of America in partnership with the National Association of Secondary School Principals in 1995 to impress upon all youth volunteers that their contributions are critically important and highly valued, and to inspire other young people to follow their example. In only five years, the program has become the largest youth recognition effort based solely on community service, with nearly 75,000 youngsters participating since its inception.

Mr. Koren should be extremely proud to have been singled out from such a large group of dedicated volunteers. I heartily applaud Mr. Koren for his initiative in seeking to make his community a better place to live, and for the positive impact he has had on the lives of others. He has demonstrated a level of commitment and accomplishment that is truly extraordinary in today's world, and deserves our sincere admiration and respect. His actions show that young Americans can—and do—play important roles in our communities, and that America's community spirit continues to hold tremendous promise for the future.

INTRODUCTION OF THE PRESCRIPTION PRICE EQUITY ACT OF 2000

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2000

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Prescription Price Equity Act of 2000, a bill to deny research tax credits to pharmaceutical companies that sell their products at significantly higher prices in the U.S. as compared to their sales in other industrialized countries.

At my request, the Congressional Research Service recently completed an analysis of the tax treatment of the pharmaceutical industry. The conclusion of that report is that tax credits contributed powerfully to lowering the average effective tax rate for drug companies by nearly 40% relative to other major industries from 1990 to 1996. Specifically, it finds that while similar industries pay a tax rate of 27.3%, the pharmaceutical industry is paying a rate of only 16.2%. At the same time, after-tax profits for the drug industry averaged 17%—three times higher than the 5% profit margin of other industries.

The need for this bill is clear. The U.S. Government provides lucrative tax credits to the pharmaceutical industry in this country in order to promote research and development of life-saving new pharmaceutical products. Yet, in return for these government subsidies, the drug companies charge uninsured Americans the highest prices for drugs paid by anyone in the world.

Numerous studies have shown that uninsured seniors pay exorbitant prices for pharmaceuticals. I recently asked the House Government Reform Committee to compare the prices of prescription drugs in the district I represent in Congress with the prices of prescription drugs in Canada. The report found that seniors in Alameda and Santa Clara counties who lack insurance coverage for prescription drugs pay far more than consumers in Canada for the exact same medications.

The study compared the 1997 prices of the five brand name drugs with the highest '97 sales to the elderly—Zocor (a cholesterol reducing medication), Prilosec (an ulcer and heartburn medication), Procardia XL (a heart medication), Zoloft (a medication used to treat depression), and Norvasc (a blood pressure medication). On average, seniors in the 13th District are paying prices that are 100% higher than the prices Canadian consumers pay. For example, for a one-month supply of Prilosec, the average uninsured senior living in our District pays over $70 more than a consumer in Canada.

This price discrimination against seniors is happening across the country. Yet, America's seniors are the least likely to be able to afford these higher costs. Nearly half of Medicare beneficiaries live on yearly incomes of less than $15,000 a year and a third live on less than $10,000. While some Medicare beneficiaries have prescription drug coverage through employer retirement packages, Medicare HMOs (which are lowering their prescription drug coverage each year), and Medigap policies, about 35% of Medicare beneficiaries have no coverage at all and must pay inflated prices for their needed medications. It is also estimated that nearly two-thirds of Medicare beneficiaries are at risk for being without prescription drug coverage for reasons such as: being unable to afford rising Medigap premiums; Medicare HMOs dropping out of Medicare; and employers reneging on retiree health benefits.

Yet, at the same time that seniors are being asked to pay these outrageous prices, the drug companies are reaping the benefit of generous governmental subsidies. There's something wrong with a system that gives drug companies huge tax breaks while allowing them to price-gouge seniors. My bill attempts to correct this glaring inequity in a very even-handed approach. So long as your company gives U.S. consumers a fair deal on drug prices as measured against their same products sold in other OECD countries, you will continue to qualify for all available research tax credits. But if your company is found to be fleecing American taxpayers with prices higher than those charged for the same product sold in Japan, Germany, Switzerland, or Canada, then you become ineligible for those tax credits.

I know that the Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America will strongly oppose the Prescription Price Equity Act. PhRMA will say that this bill spells the end of pharmaceutical R&D. That is complete nonsense. As shown by CRS, drug industry profits are already threefold higher than all other major industries. This legislation doesn't change the current system of research tax credits at all unless companies refuse to fairly price their U.S. products. The intent of my bill is by no means to reduce the U.S. Government's role in promoting research and development. It is simply to say that in return for such significant government contributions to their industry, drug companies must treat American consumers fairly. Why should U.S. tax dollars be used to allow drug prices to be reduced in other highly developed countries, but not here at home as well?

Again, this bill simply tells PhRMA that U.S. taxpayers will no longer subsidize low prices in the OECD countries with our tax code. Research and development is important and that is why we give these huge tax breaks, but they do consumers little good if they can't afford the product.

The Prescription Price Equity Act is not the solution to the problems facing America's seniors' abilities to purchase prescription drugs. That problem will only be addressed by improving Medicare to include a prescription drug benefit. I have introduced separate legislation to achieve that goal and look forward to working with my colleagues to achieve that vital Medicare improvement this year.

The Prescription Drug Equity Act is important because it would end the abuse of the U.S. tax code to subsidize an industry that has so far refused to treat American consumers fairly. I urge my colleagues to join with me in support of this legislation to end pharmaceutical companies' abilities to profit at the expense of American taxpayers.

TRIBUTE TO JEFFREY FULLER

HON. GARY G. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2000

Mr. GARY MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I am very honored to rise before you today

to acknowledge the achievements and contributions of Mr. Jeffrey Fuller, President of the Montclair, California Chamber of Commerce. Under his leadership, the Chamber has succeeded in expanding its role in the promotion of local businesses, public policy and community involvement.

During Mr. Fuller's tenure, the Montclair Chamber of Commerce has expanded its membership by 20 percent, increased cash reserves for future expansion and upgraded its computer system to better serve local businesses and residents. At the same time, he reinstated the Chamber's involvement with the State of the City address and organized the first annual Montclair Safety Fair and Business Expo.

Mr. Fuller has tirelessly fought to preserve the spirit of the American dream. I appreciate his work and wish him well in his future endeavors.

INTRODUCTION OF THE OMBUDSMAN REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2000

HON. MICHAEL BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2000

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Ombudsman Reauthorization Act of 2000. This legislation is a companion to S. 1763, which was introduced last year by Senator ALLARD of Colorado. The bill reauthorizes the Office of the National Solid Waste and Superfund Ombudsman within the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

I have experienced first-hand the important work of the National Superfund Ombudsman in connection with the Stauffer Chemical Superfund Site, which is located in my congressional district in Tarpon Springs, Florida.

I fought tirelessly with my constituents for years to have the Stauffer site designated as a federal Superfund site. In 1994, the Stauffer site was finally included on the National Priorities List. It has been a long and tedious process since then. After six years, we are still waiting for the cleanup to begin. Clearly, this process is taking too long. The Supefund program must be streamlined to make it work within reasonable time frames—consistent with public expectations.

All of my constituents agree on the need for prompt cleanup of the Stauffer site. The question is how and when this will be accomplished in a manner consistent with protecting the public health and safety.

I joined with many of my constituents in repeatedly urging the EPA to carefully consider the unique geography of the Tarpon Springs area, with a particular focus on our sources of drinking water. In 1996, I was pleased to help secure funding for the Pinellas and Pasco County Technical Assistance Grant (Pi-Pa-TAG) to monitor cleanup activities at the Stauffer site. Throughout the years, I have sponsored several public meetings and written many letters regarding necessary standards for the cleanup of the site.

The process of selecting a remedy that is both cost-effective and protective of the public health and safety has been extremely difficult. The affected parties have different opinions regarding the most appropriate solution to the problem, and many area residents feel that they have been ''shut out'' of the process.

Mr. Speaker, if anyone deserves to have their voice heard in the debate on cleanup of a hazardous waste site, it should be the local citizens who live in the surrounding neighborhoods.

At my request, the National Superfund Ombudsman, Robert Martin, has launched an independent review of the EPA's proposed cleanup plan for the Stauffer site. To date, Mr. Martin has participated in two public meetings I have sponsored, which were held on December 2, 1999, and February 12, 2000.

These discussions have provided an opportunity for local residents, technical experts, Stauffer company representatives, and federal, state and local officials to express their concerns directly to the Ombudsman. The Ombudsman is continuing to gather additional information and will not make recommendations until the investigation is completed.

During the course of the public meetings, it has become apparent that certain hydrogeological issues were not addressed before the proposed cleanup plan was advanced by the Stauffer Management Company and the EPA. For example, no studies regarding the possibility of sinkholes were conducted prior to the proposal of the remedy outlined in the Record of Decision. Because of Florida's unique environment, sinkholes pose a serious concern for the residents of the surrounding community. If contaminated soil collapses into the groundwater, more than 30 contaminants could be introduced into the area's drinking water supply.

The effect of contaminants from the site on local groundwater is an issue that demands further scrutiny. There has been conflicting evidence regarding the direction of groundwater flow, and it is critical that more comprehensive studies be undertaken to identify the potential for groundwater contamination.

Mr. Speaker, without the involvement of the Ombudsman, my constituents' concerns about sinkholes and groundwater would not have received the attention they deserve.

My constituents have welcomed the Ombudsman's participation in discussions about the proposed cleanup plan. Many of them have renewed confidence that their concerns will be seriously considered in this process. The Ombudsman has been their advocate, giving a voice to those who might otherwise have limited input in the design of a remedy for the site.

The Ombudsman has worked effectively and aggressively to uncover the facts surrounding the Stauffer site, as well as other Superfund sites around the nation. In fact, he has been so successful that EPA officials are considering eliminating his office. This cannot be allowed to occur. Without the Ombudsman's investigation of the Stauffer site, the residents of Tarpon Springs would have been left in the dark and without a voice. I applaud the Ombudsman for his advocacy on their behalf and for bringing integrity back into the process.

The Ombudsman Reauthorization Act will ensure that the Ombudsman is allowed to continue his critical work. This bill reauthorizes the office for ten years, allowing the Ombudsman to carry on the fact-finding investigations that lead to better solutions for communities burdened with Superfund sites.

Mr. Speaker, our constituents benefit enormously from the advocacy efforts of the National Superfund Ombudsman. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor and support passage of this important legislation.

TRIBUTE TO GENERAL JOHN H. TILELLI, JR.

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 15, 2000

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and pay tribute to Gen. John H. Tilelli, Jr., who retired from the U.S. Army on January 31, 2000, after more than 33 years of exemplary service.

General Tilelli was raised in Holmdel, NJ. A 1963 graduate of Pennsylvania Military College, he received a bachelor's degree in economics and was commissioned as an armor officer. He attended the armor officer basic and advanced courses and Airborne School. General Tilelli is also a 1974 graduate of the U.S. Marine Corps Command and Staff College and completed the U.S. Army War College in 1983. He received a master's degree in education administration from Lehigh University in 1972. Widener University awarded him an honorary doctorate in business management in 1996 and the University of Maryland presented him with an honorary doctorate in law in 1997.

General Tilelli saw combat in two wars during his career. In Vietnam, he served as the company commander, 18th Engineer Brigade and as the district senior advisor, Advisory Team 84. During Desert Shield and Desert Storm, General Tilelli was the commanding general, 1st Cavalry Division.

In other assignments, General Tilelli served in the 3d Battalion, 77th Armor, Fort Devens, MA. He also held positions in the 2d Armored Cavalry Regiment, the 11th Armored Cavalry Regiment, and then 1st Armored Division while stationed in Germany. Additionally, he had the opportunity to mentor future soldiers as an assistant professor of military science, Lafayette College, PA, and shared his technical expertise during a tour at the U.S. Army Armor School, Fort Knox, KY.

General Tilelli commanded the Seventh Army Training Command and Combat Maneuver Training Center in Germany before assuming command of the 1st Cavalry Division. After that, he served in the Pentagon as the Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Plans, then as Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Plans. After his promotion to general, he served as Vice Chief of Staff of the Army before assuming command of U.S. Army Forces Command. General Tilelli then became the Commander of the United Nations Command, Republic of Korea/United States Combined Forces Command and United States Forces Korea.

General Tilelli made monumental contributions and improvements to the United States and Republic of Korea military coalition and vastly improved its ability to deter and defend against attack. He also served as a vital link between the United States and the civilian government of the Republic of Korea, proving to be one of the Army's most successful diplomats. His political and military expertise resulted in the right application and employment of forces to ultimately deescalate the rising

tensions during several crucial periods on the Korean peninsula. In addition to improving military readiness and force projection capability, General Tilelli ensured that all soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines under his command received the best care, the best facilities and the best service possible for themselves and their family members.

General Tilelli's decorations included the Defense Distinguished Service Medal, the Distinguished Service Medal (with three Oak Leaf Clusters), the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star with ''V'' Device (with two Oak Leaf Clusters), the Meritorious Service Medal (with three Oak Leaf Clusters), the Air Medal, the Army Commendation Medal (with two Oak Leaf Clusters), and the Vietnamese Cross of Gallantry with Silver Star and Palm. He also wears the Combat Infantryman Badge, Parachutist Badge, the Office of the Secretary of Defense Badge, the Joint Chiefs of Staff Badge, and the Army Staff Identification Badge.

Mr. Speaker, General John Tilelli is the kind of officer that all soldiers strive to be. He has served with honor and distinction, dedicating over 33 years to our soldiers and our Nation. The U.S. Army is a better institution for his service. I know the Members of the House will join me in offering gratitude to General Tilelli and his family—his wife, Valerie, and his daughters, Christine, Margaret, and Jeanne—for their service to our country, and we wish them all the best in the years ahead.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

House passed H.R. 3557, to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to John Cardinal O'Connor, Archbishop of New York, in recognition of his accomplishments as a priest, a chaplain, and a humanitarian.

House passed H.R. 3642, to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to Charles M. Schulz in recognition of his lasting artistic contributions to the Nation and the world.

House passed H.R. 2086, to authorize funding for networking and information technology research and development for fiscal years 2000 through 2004.

Senate

Chamber Action

The Senate was not in session today. It will next meet on Tuesday, February 22, 2000 at 11 a.m.

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: 13 public bills, H.R. 3655–3667; 1 private bill, H.R. 3668; and 2 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 250–251, were introduced. **Page H454**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H. Res. 423, providing for consideration of H.R. 2366, to provide small businesses certain protections from litigation excesses and to limit the product liability of nonmanufacturer product sellers (H. Rept. 106–498). **Pages H453–54**

Journal: Agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal of February 14 by a recorded vote of 375 ayes to 33 noes with 2 voting "present," Roll No. 21. **Pages H378–79, H413–14**

Recess: the House recessed at 9:57 a.m. and reconvened at 11 a.m. **Page H378**

Private Calendar: Agreed to dispense with the call of the Private Calendar for today. **Page H379**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Congressional Gold Medal to John Cardinal O'Connor: H.R. 3557, to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to John Cardinal O'Connor, Archbishop of New York, in recognition of his accomplishments as a priest, a chaplain, and a humanitarian (passed by a yea and nay vote of 413 yeas to one nay, Roll No. 18); **Pages H380–85, H388–89**

Congressional Gold Medal to Charles M. Schulz: H.R. 3642, to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to Charles M.

Schulz in recognition of his lasting artistic contributions to the Nation and the world (passed by a yea and nay vote of 410 yeas to one nay, Roll No. 19); **Pages H385–88, H389**

Omnibus Parks Technical Corrections Act: Agreed to the Senate amendments to H.R. 149, to make technical corrections to the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996—clearing the measure for the President; and **Pages H409–10**

Carter G. Woodson Home National Historic Site: H.R. 3201, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating the Carter G. Woodson Home in the District of Columbia as a National Historic Site (passed by a yea and nay vote of 413 yeas to 1 nay, Roll No. 20. **Pages H410–13**

Networking and Information Technology Research and Development Act: The House passed H.R. 2086, to authorize funding for networking and information technology research and development for fiscal years 2000 through 2004. **Pages H392–H408**

Agreed To:

The Hall of Texas amendment that increases funding for the National Science Foundation, Department of Energy, and Networking and Information Technology Research and Development including an increase in the number of grants authorized; **Pages H400–01**

The Smith of Michigan amendment that allows the United States Geological Survey to participate in or support all research programs that are authorized by the Act; **Pages H401–02**

The Morella amendment that authorizes funding for the National Institutes of Health to conduct research directed toward computational techniques and software tools in support of biomedical and behavioral research; **Pages H402–03**

The Larson amendment that requires reports to identify the status of high-speed, large bandwidth capacity access to public schools and libraries in the United States; how access to the internet can be utilized within each school and library; consider the effect that regional circumstances may have on access; and include options and recommendations to address the issues identified in the reports; **Pages H403–04**

Hoeffel amendment that requires a National Research Council study on the accessibility to information technologies by the elderly and individuals with disabilities; **Pages H404–05**

Andrews amendment that gives priority to basic research grants that, among other issues, address security, including privacy and counterinitiatives, and consider the social and economic consequences, including healthcare, of information technology; **Page H405**

Jackson-Lee amendment that requires a Comptroller General study analyzing the effects of the Act on lower income families, minorities, and women; **Pages H405–06**

Capuano amendment that strikes language that requires a Comptroller General study on the impact of fiscal year 2000 information technology research appropriations in various agencies; **Page H406**

Capuano amendment that increases the funding authorized for the National Science Foundation for fiscal years 2000 through 2004 with offsets from the Department of Energy; and **Pages H406–07**

Traficant amendment that requires procurement, to the extent possible, of goods and products made in America. **Page H407**

H. Res. 422, the rule that provided for consideration of the bill was agreed to by voice vote. **Pages H389–92**

Referral: S. 1052 was referred to the committee on Resources. **Page H453**

Amendments: Amendment ordered printed pursuant to the rule appears on page H455.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yea and nay votes and one recorded vote developed during the proceedings of the House and appear on pages H388–89, H389, H412–13, and H413–14. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 12:30 p.m. and adjourned at 10:03 p.m.

Committee Meetings

COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT—OVER-THE-COUNTER DERIVATIVES MARKETS

Committee on Agriculture: Subcommittee on Risk Management, Research, and Specialty Crops held a hearing to review the President's Working Group Report on the over-the-counter derivatives markets and the Commodity Exchange Act. Testimony was heard from Lee Sachs, Assistant Secretary, Financial Markets, Department of the Treasury; C. Robert Paul, General Counsel, CFTC; Patrick M. Parkinson, Associate Director, Division of Research and Statistics, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System; Annette L. Nazareth, Director, Division of Market Regulation, SEC; and public witnesses.

INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior held an oversight hearing on the Fish and Wildlife Service Land Acquisition Accounts and Priority Setting. Testimony was heard from Jim Wells, Director, Energy and Natural Resources Division, GAO; and Jamie Rappaport Clark, Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior.

LABOR-HHS-EDUCATION APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education held a hearing on the Director, National Institutes of Health, and on the National Cancer Institute. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Health and Human Services: Ruth Kirschstein, M.D., Acting Director, NIH; and Richard D. Klausner, M.D., Director, National Cancer Institute.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Military Construction held a hearing on overview. Testimony was heard from William J. Lynn, III, Under Secretary, Comptroller, Department of Defense.

TRANSPORTATION APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Transportation held a hearing on the Secretary of Transportation. Testimony was heard from Rodney E. Slater, Secretary of Transportation.

AMERICAN HOMEOWNERSHIP AND ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT

Committee on Banking and Financial Services: Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity approved for full Committee action, as amended, H.R. 1776, American Homeownership and Economic Opportunity Act of 1999.

FAIRNESS IN SECURITIES TRANSACTION ACT

Committee on Commerce: Subcommittee on Finance and Hazardous Materials approved for full Committee action, as amended, H.R. 2441, Fairness in Securities Transactions Act.

EMERGENCY COMMODITY DISTRIBUTION ACT

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Youth, and Families held a hearing on H.R. 3614, Emergency Commodity Distribution Act of 2000. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

ERISA—25 YEARS LATER

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Subcommittee on Employee-Employer Relations held a hearing on the Evolving Pension and Investment World After 25 years of ERISA. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

OVERSIGHT—2000 CENSUS

Committee on Government Reform: Subcommittee on the Census held an oversight hearing of the 2000 Census: Examining the GAO's Census 2000 Oversight Activities. Testimony was heard from J. Christopher Mihm, Acting Associate Director, Federal Management and Workforce Issues, GAO.

COLOMBIA CRISIS—U.S. RESPONSE

Committee on Government Reform: Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources held a hearing on The U.S. Response to the Crisis in Colombia. Testimony was heard from Barry R. McCaffrey, Director, Office of National Drug Control Policy; the following officials of the Department of Defense: Gen. Charles Wilhelm, USMC, Commander, U.S. Southern Command; and Ana Maria Salazar, Drug Enforcement Policy and Support; William Ledwith, Chief, International Operations, DEA, Department of Justice; Ambassador Peter F. Romero, Department of State; and public witnesses.

"IS THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR REGULATING THE PUBLIC THROUGH THE BACKDOOR?"

Committee on Government Reform: Subcommittee on National Economic Growth, Natural Resources, and Regulatory Affairs held a hearing on "Is the Department of Labor Regulating the Public Through the Backdoor?" Testimony was heard from Henry L. Solano, Solicitor, Department of Labor; and public witnesses.

CONGO—PEACE KEEPING

Committee on International Relations: Subcommittee on Africa held a hearing on Peace Keeping in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Testimony was heard from Ambassador Richard Holbrooke, U.S. Representative to the United Nations, Department of State.

BUDGET VIEWS AND ESTIMATES; TRAFFIC STOPS STATISTICS STUDY ACT

Committee on the Judiciary: Began consideration of the following: Committee Budget Views and Estimates for Fiscal Year 2001 for submission to the Committee on the Budget; and H.R. 1443, Traffic Stops Statistics Study Act of 1999.

Will continue tomorrow.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Resources, Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources held a hearing on H.R. 3432, to direct the Minerals Management Service to grant the State of Louisiana and its lessees a credit in the payment of Federal offshore royalties to satisfy the authorization for compensation contained in the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 for oil and gas drainage in the West Delta field. Testimony was heard from Walt Rosenbusch, Director, Minerals Management Service,

Department of the Interior; Jack C. Caldwell, Secretary, Department of Natural Resources, State of Louisiana; and a public witness.

OVERSIGHT—FUNDING OF ENVIRONMENTAL INITIATIVES

Committee on Resources: Subcommittee on Forests and Forest Health held an oversight hearing on the Funding of Environmental Initiatives and Their Impacts on Local Communities. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

SMALL BUSINESS LIABILITY REFORM ACT

Committee on Rules: The Committee granted, by voice vote, a structured rule, providing one hour of general debate on H.R. 2366, Small Business Liability Reform Act of 2000, equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. The rule makes in order the Committee on the Judiciary amendment in the nature of a substitute now printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment. The rule makes in order only those amendments printed in the Rules Committee report accompanying the resolution. The rule provides that the amendments made in order may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in the report. The rule permits the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone votes during consideration of the bill, and to reduce voting time to five minutes on a postponed question if the vote follows a fifteen minute vote. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. Testimony was heard from Representatives Rogan, Conyers, Scott, Berman, Watt of North Carolina, Lofgren, and Jackson-Lee.

The Committee also approved the Committee Budget Views and Estimates for Fiscal Year 2001 for submission to the Committee on the Budget.

U.S. AND GREAT BRITAIN—AVIATION NEGOTIATIONS BREAKDOWN

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Aviation held a hearing on the Recent Breakdown of Aviation Negotiations Between the United States and the United Kingdom. Testimony was heard from Rodney E. Slater, Secretary of Transportation; and public witnesses.

CERTAIN EPA'S PROPOSED REGULATIONS

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment concluded hearings on the EPA's Proposed Regulations Regarding Total Maximum Daily Loads, the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System, and the Federal Anti-Degradation Policy. Testimony was heard from Jim Lyons, Under Secretary, Natural Resources and Environment, USDA; and public witnesses.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFITS—SENIORS' ACCESS

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing on Seniors' Access to Prescription Drug Benefits. Testimony was heard from David M. Walker, Comptroller General, GAO; and public witnesses.

SOCIAL SECURITY WORK INCENTIVES IMPROVEMENTS

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Social Security held a hearing on improving Social Security Work Incentives. Testimony was heard from Representatives Sam Johnson of Texas and Peterson of Minnesota; Kenneth S. Apfel, Commissioner, SSA; and public witnesses.

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Met in executive session to consider pending business.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 2000

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

Committee on Agriculture, to consider the following: H.R. 3615, Rural Local Broadcast Signal Act; and the Committee Budget Views and Estimates for Fiscal Year 2001 for submission to the Committee on the Budget, 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, on the Secretary of Agriculture, 1 p.m., 2362A Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Defense, executive, on Military Readiness, 9:30 a.m., H–140 Capitol.

Subcommittee on Interior, oversight on the Forest Service and on the National Association of Public Administration, 10 a.m., B–308 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, on the National Institute on Aging and the National Center for Research Resources, 10 a.m., and

on the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development and the National Institute of Deafness and Other Communication Disorders, 2 p.m., 2358 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Military Construction, on the Quality of Life, 9:30 a.m., B–300 Rayburn.

Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Military Procurement and the Subcommittee on Military Research and Development, joint hearing on ballistic missile defense programs, 2 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on Banking and Financial Services, to consider Committee Budget Views and Estimates for Fiscal Year 2001 for submission to the Committee on the Budget, 2:30 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit, hearing on Merging the Deposit Insurance Funds, 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on the Budget, hearing on Preliminary Analysis of the Administration's Fiscal Year 2001 Budget, 10 a.m., 210 Cannon.

Committee on Commerce, Subcommittee on Health and Environment, hearing on Seniors' Access to Affordable Prescription Drugs: Models for Reform, 10 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Telecommunications, Trade, and Consumer Protection, hearing on Video on the Internet: iCraveTV.com and Other Recent Developments in Webcasting, 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Education and the Workforce, to mark up the following bills: H.R. 3222, Literacy Involves Families Together Act; and H.R. 3616, Impact Aid Reauthorization Act of 2000, 10:30 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Government Reform, Subcommittee on National Security, Veterans' Affairs, and International Relations, hearing on Defense Security Service Oversight, 10 a.m., 2247 Rayburn.

Committee on International Relations, hearing on the Administration's Fiscal Year 2001 International Affairs Budget Request, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, hearing on Indonesia: Confronting the Political and Economic Crises, 1:30 p.m., 2200 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, February 15, to continue consideration of the following: Committee Budget Views and Estimates for Fiscal Year 2001 for submission to the Committee on the Budget; and H.R. 1443, Traffic Stops Statistics Study Act of 1999; and to consider the following: H.R. 1283, Fairness in Asbestos Compensation Act of 1999; and H.R. 2372, Private Property Rights Implementation Act of 1999, 10:15 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Resources, to mark up the following bills: S. 613, Indian Tribal Economic Development and Contract Encouragement Act of 1999; H.R. 1680, to provide for the conveyance of Forest Service property in Kern County, California, in exchange for county lands suitable for inclusion in Sequoia National Forest; H.R. 1749, to designate Wilson Creek in Avery and Caldwell Counties, North Carolina, as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Systems; H.R. 2484, to provide that land which is owned by the Lower Sioux Indian Community in the State of Minnesota but which is not held in trust by the United States for the Community may be leased or transferred by the Community without further approval by the United States; and the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs Improvement Act of 2000, 11 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Rules, hearing on Biennial Budgeting: A Tool for Improving Government Fiscal Management and Oversight, 10:30 a.m., H–313 Capitol.

Committee on Science, Subcommittee on Basic Research, hearing on National Science Foundation Fiscal Year 2001 Budget Authorization Request, Part I: Research and Related Activities and Major Research Equipment, 2 p.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics, hearing on Fiscal Year 2001 NASA Authorization, NASA Posture, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, hearing on Association Health Plans, and to consider the Committee Budget Views and Estimates for Fiscal Year 2001 for submission to the Committee on the Budget, 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, to consider the following: Committee Budget Views and Estimates for Fiscal Year 2001 for submission to the Committee on the Budget; Corps of Engineers Survey Resolutions; and other pending business, 1 p..m., 2167 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Oversight, Investigations, and Emergency Management, hearing on Flood Water Rescue, 2 p.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Ways and Means, to consider Committee Budget Views and Estimates for Fiscal Year 2001 for submission to the Committee on the Budget, 10 a.m., and to hold a hearing on the U.S.-China Bilateral Trade Agreement and the Accession of China to the WTO, 10:30 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Social Security, to mark up H.R. 5, Senior Citizens' Freedom to Work Act of 1999, 4 p.m., B–318 Rayburn.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, hearing on the State of Counterintelligence at the Department of Energy and Its Three Key Nuclear Weapons Laboratories, 1 p.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

11 a.m., Tuesday, February 22

Senate Chamber

Program for Tuesday: Senator Moynihan will read Washington's Farewell Address; following which, there will be a period of morning business (not to extend beyond 12:30 p.m.).

At 2:15 p.m., Senate will consider any cleared executive or legislative business.

(Senate will recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. for their respective party conferences.)

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Wednesday, February 16

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Consideration of H.R. 1714, Electronic Signatures in Global and National Commerce Act. (motion to go to conference); and

Consideration of H.R. 2366, Small Business Liability Reform Act of 2000 (structured rule, one hour of debate)

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Baca, Joe, Calif., E144
Baldacci, John Elias, Maine, E143
Bereuter, Doug, Nebr., E142, E146
Bilirakis, Michael, Fla., E149
Blagojevich, Rod R., Ill., E141
Carson, Julia, Ind., E147
Clayton, Eva M., N.C., E144
Clement, Bob, Tenn., E143
Clyburn, James E., S.C., E140, E141
Diaz-Balart, Lincoln, Fla., E148
Emerson, Jo Ann, Mo., E145
Everett, Terry, Ala., E146
Gallegly, Elton, Calif., E145
Kennedy, Patrick J., R.I., E144
Lazio, Rick, N.Y., E139
Lewis, Jerry, Calif., E145
McGovern, James P., Mass., E144
McInnis, Scott, Colo., E139, E140, E142, E144, E144, E145, E146
Miller, Gary G., Calif., E148
Moran, James P., Va., E147
Myrick, Sue Wilkins, N.C., E140, E141, E142
Norton, Eleanor Holmes, D.C., E147
Owens, Major R., N.Y., E147
Pelosi, Nancy, Calif., E147
Salmon, Matt, Ariz., E139, E140
Skelton, Ike, Mo., E149
Smith, Christopher H., N.J., E141
Stark, Fortney Pete, Calif., E148
Stupak, Bart, Mich., E143, E146
Towns, Edolphus, N.Y., E142
Visclosky, Peter J., Ind., E141
Young, Don, Alaska, E145

Congressional Record The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed at one time. ¶Public access to the Congressional Record is available online through *GPO Access,* a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. The online database is updated each day the Congressional Record is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d session (January 1994) forward. It is available on the Wide Area Information Server (WAIS) through the Internet and via asynchronous dial-in. Internet users can access the database by using the World Wide Web; the Superintendent of Documents home page address is http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs, by using local WAIS client software or by telnet to swais.access.gpo.gov, then login as guest (no password required). Dial-in users should use communications software and modem to call (202) 512–1661; type swais, then login as guest (no password required). For general information about *GPO Access,* contact the *GPO Access* User Support Team by sending Internet e-mail to gpoaccess@gpo.gov, or a fax to (202) 512–1262; or by calling Toll Free 1–888–293–6498 or (202) 512–1530 between 7 a.m. and 5:30 p.m. Eastern time, Monday through Friday, except for Federal holidays. ¶The Congressional Record paper and 24x microfiche will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, $179.00 for six months, $357.00 per year, or purchased for $3.00 per issue, payable in advance; microfiche edition, $141.00 per year, or purchased for $1.50 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly Congressional Record Index may be purchased for the same per issue prices. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250–7954, or phone orders to (202) 512–1800, or fax to (202) 512–2250. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily Congressional Record is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the Congressional Record.

Schulz in recognition of his lasting artistic contributions to the Nation and the world (passed by a yea and nay vote of 410 yeas to one nay, Roll No. 19); **Pages H385–88, H389**

Omnibus Parks Technical Corrections Act: Agreed to the Senate amendments to H.R. 149, to make technical corrections to the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996—clearing the measure for the President; and **Pages H409–10**

Carter G. Woodson Home National Historic Site: H.R. 3201, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating the Carter G. Woodson Home in the District of Columbia as a National Historic Site (passed by a yea and nay vote of 413 yeas to 1 nay, Roll No. 20. **Pages H410–13**

Networking and Information Technology Research and Development Act: The House passed H.R. 2086, to authorize funding for networking and information technology research and development for fiscal years 2000 through 2004. **Pages H392–H408**

Agreed To:

The Hall of Texas amendment that increases funding for the National Science Foundation, Department of Energy, and Networking and Information Technology Research and Development including an increase in the number of grants authorized; **Pages H400–01**

The Smith of Michigan amendment that allows the United States Geological Survey to participate in or support all research programs that are authorized by the Act; **Pages H401–02**

The Morella amendment that authorizes funding for the National Institutes of Health to conduct research directed toward computational techniques and software tools in support of biomedical and behavioral research; **Pages H402–03**

The Larson amendment that requires reports to identify the status of high-speed, large bandwidth capacity access to public schools and libraries in the United States; how access to the internet can be utilized within each school and library; consider the effect that regional circumstances may have on access; and include options and recommendations to address the issues identified in the reports; **Pages H403–04**

Hoeffel amendment that requires a National Research Council study on the accessibility to information technologies by the elderly and individuals with disabilities; **Pages H404–05**

Andrews amendment that gives priority to basic research grants that, among other issues, address security, including privacy and counterinitiatives, and consider the social and economic consequences, including healthcare, of information technology; **Page H405**

Jackson-Lee amendment that requires a Comptroller General study analyzing the effects of the Act on lower income families, minorities, and women; **Pages H405–06**

Capuano amendment that strikes language that requires a Comptroller General study on the impact of fiscal year 2000 information technology research appropriations in various agencies; **Page H406**

Capuano amendment that increases the funding authorized for the National Science Foundation for fiscal years 2000 through 2004 with offsets from the Department of Energy; and **Pages H406–07**

Traficant amendment that requires procurement, to the extent possible, of goods and products made in America. **Page H407**

H. Res. 422, the rule that provided for consideration of the bill was agreed to by voice vote. **Pages H389–92**

Referral: S. 1052 was referred to the committee on Resources. **Page H453**

Amendments: Amendment ordered printed pursuant to the rule appears on page H455.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yea and nay votes and one recorded vote developed during the proceedings of the House and appear on pages H388–89, H389, H412–13, and H413–14. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 12:30 p.m. and adjourned at 10:03 p.m.

Committee Meetings

COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT—OVER-THE-COUNTER DERIVATIVES MARKETS

Committee on Agriculture: Subcommittee on Risk Management, Research, and Specialty Crops held a hearing to review the President's Working Group Report on the over-the-counter derivatives markets and the Commodity Exchange Act. Testimony was heard from Lee Sachs, Assistant Secretary, Financial Markets, Department of the Treasury; C. Robert Paul, General Counsel, CFTC; Patrick M. Parkinson, Associate Director, Division of Research and Statistics, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System; Annette L. Nazareth, Director, Division of Market Regulation, SEC; and public witnesses.

INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior held an oversight hearing on the Fish and Wildlife Service Land Acquisition Accounts and Priority Setting. Testimony was heard from Jim Wells, Director, Energy and Natural Resources Division, GAO; and Jamie Rappaport Clark, Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior.

LABOR-HHS-EDUCATION APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education held a hearing on the Director, National Institutes of Health, and on the National Cancer Institute. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Health and Human Services: Ruth Kirschstein, M.D., Acting Director, NIH; and Richard D. Klausner, M.D., Director, National Cancer Institute.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Military Construction held a hearing on overview. Testimony was heard from William J. Lynn, III, Under Secretary, Comptroller, Department of Defense.

TRANSPORTATION APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Transportation held a hearing on the Secretary of Transportation. Testimony was heard from Rodney E. Slater, Secretary of Transportation.

AMERICAN HOMEOWNERSHIP AND ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT

Committee on Banking and Financial Services: Subcommittee on Housing and Community Opportunity approved for full Committee action, as amended, H.R. 1776, American Homeownership and Economic Opportunity Act of 1999.

FAIRNESS IN SECURITIES TRANSACTION ACT

Committee on Commerce: Subcommittee on Finance and Hazardous Materials approved for full Committee action, as amended, H.R. 2441, Fairness in Securities Transactions Act.

EMERGENCY COMMODITY DISTRIBUTION ACT

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Youth, and Families held a hearing on H.R. 3614, Emergency Commodity Distribution Act of 2000. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

ERISA—25 YEARS LATER

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Subcommittee on Employee-Employer Relations held a hearing on the Evolving Pension and Investment World After 25 years of ERISA. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

OVERSIGHT—2000 CENSUS

Committee on Government Reform: Subcommittee on the Census held an oversight hearing of the 2000 Census: Examining the GAO's Census 2000 Oversight Activities. Testimony was heard from J. Christopher Mihm, Acting Associate Director, Federal Management and Workforce Issues, GAO.

COLOMBIA CRISIS—U.S. RESPONSE

Committee on Government Reform: Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources held a hearing on The U.S. Response to the Crisis in Colombia. Testimony was heard from Barry R. McCaffrey, Director, Office of National Drug Control Policy; the following officials of the Department of Defense: Gen. Charles Wilhelm, USMC, Commander, U.S. Southern Command; and Ana Maria Salazar, Drug Enforcement Policy and Support; William Ledwith, Chief, International Operations, DEA, Department of Justice; Ambassador Peter F. Romero, Department of State; and public witnesses.

"IS THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR REGULATING THE PUBLIC THROUGH THE BACKDOOR?"

Committee on Government Reform: Subcommittee on National Economic Growth, Natural Resources, and Regulatory Affairs held a hearing on "Is the Department of Labor Regulating the Public Through the Backdoor?" Testimony was heard from Henry L. Solano, Solicitor, Department of Labor; and public witnesses.

CONGO—PEACE KEEPING

Committee on International Relations: Subcommittee on Africa held a hearing on Peace Keeping in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Testimony was heard from Ambassador Richard Holbrooke, U.S. Representative to the United Nations, Department of State.

BUDGET VIEWS AND ESTIMATES; TRAFFIC STOPS STATISTICS STUDY ACT

Committee on the Judiciary: Began consideration of the following: Committee Budget Views and Estimates for Fiscal Year 2001 for submission to the Committee on the Budget; and H.R. 1443, Traffic Stops Statistics Study Act of 1999.

Will continue tomorrow.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Resources, Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources held a hearing on H.R. 3432, to direct the Minerals Management Service to grant the State of Louisiana and its lessees a credit in the payment of Federal offshore royalties to satisfy the authorization for compensation contained in the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 for oil and gas drainage in the West Delta field. Testimony was heard from Walt Rosenbusch, Director, Minerals Management Service,

Department of the Interior; Jack C. Caldwell, Secretary, Department of Natural Resources, State of Louisiana; and a public witness.

OVERSIGHT—FUNDING OF ENVIRONMENTAL INITIATIVES

Committee on Resources: Subcommittee on Forests and Forest Health held an oversight hearing on the Funding of Environmental Initiatives and Their Impacts on Local Communities. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

SMALL BUSINESS LIABILITY REFORM ACT

Committee on Rules: The Committee granted, by voice vote, a structured rule, providing one hour of general debate on H.R. 2366, Small Business Liability Reform Act of 2000, equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. The rule makes in order the Committee on the Judiciary amendment in the nature of a substitute now printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment. The rule makes in order only those amendments printed in the Rules Committee report accompanying the resolution. The rule provides that the amendments made in order may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in the report. The rule permits the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone votes during consideration of the bill, and to reduce voting time to five minutes on a postponed question if the vote follows a fifteen minute vote. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. Testimony was heard from Representatives Rogan, Conyers, Scott, Berman, Watt of North Carolina, Lofgren, and Jackson-Lee.

The Committee also approved the Committee Budget Views and Estimates for Fiscal Year 2001 for submission to the Committee on the Budget.

U.S. AND GREAT BRITAIN—AVIATION NEGOTIATIONS BREAKDOWN

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Aviation held a hearing on the Recent Breakdown of Aviation Negotiations Between the United States and the United Kingdom. Testimony was heard from Rodney E. Slater, Secretary of Transportation; and public witnesses.

CERTAIN EPA'S PROPOSED REGULATIONS

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment concluded hearings on the EPA's Proposed Regulations Regarding Total Maximum Daily Loads, the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System, and the Federal Anti-Degradation Policy. Testimony was heard from Jim Lyons, Under Secretary, Natural Resources and Environment, USDA; and public witnesses.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFITS—SENIORS' ACCESS

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Health held a hearing on Seniors' Access to Prescription Drug Benefits. Testimony was heard from David M. Walker, Comptroller General, GAO; and public witnesses.

SOCIAL SECURITY WORK INCENTIVES IMPROVEMENTS

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Social Security held a hearing on improving Social Security Work Incentives. Testimony was heard from Representatives Sam Johnson of Texas and Peterson of Minnesota; Kenneth S. Apfel, Commissioner, SSA; and public witnesses.

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Met in executive session to consider pending business.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 2000

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

Committee on Agriculture, to consider the following: H.R. 3615, Rural Local Broadcast Signal Act; and the Committee Budget Views and Estimates for Fiscal Year 2001 for submission to the Committee on the Budget, 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, on the Secretary of Agriculture, 1 p.m., 2362A Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Defense, executive, on Military Readiness, 9:30 a.m., H–140 Capitol.

Subcommittee on Interior, oversight on the Forest Service and on the National Association of Public Administration, 10 a.m., B–308 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, on the National Institute on Aging and the National Center for Research Resources, 10 a.m., and

on the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development and the National Institute of Deafness and Other Communication Disorders, 2 p.m., 2358 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Military Construction, on the Quality of Life, 9:30 a.m., B–300 Rayburn.

Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Military Procurement and the Subcommittee on Military Research and Development, joint hearing on ballistic missile defense programs, 2 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on Banking and Financial Services, to consider Committee Budget Views and Estimates for Fiscal Year 2001 for submission to the Committee on the Budget, 2:30 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Credit, hearing on Merging the Deposit Insurance Funds, 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on the Budget, hearing on Preliminary Analysis of the Administration's Fiscal Year 2001 Budget, 10 a.m., 210 Cannon.

Committee on Commerce, Subcommittee on Health and Environment, hearing on Seniors' Access to Affordable Prescription Drugs: Models for Reform, 10 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Telecommunications, Trade, and Consumer Protection, hearing on Video on the Internet: iCraveTV.com and Other Recent Developments in Webcasting, 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Education and the Workforce, to mark up the following bills: H.R. 3222, Literacy Involves Families Together Act; and H.R. 3616, Impact Aid Reauthorization Act of 2000, 10:30 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Government Reform, Subcommittee on National Security, Veterans' Affairs, and International Relations, hearing on Defense Security Service Oversight, 10 a.m., 2247 Rayburn.

Committee on International Relations, hearing on the Administration's Fiscal Year 2001 International Affairs Budget Request, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, hearing on Indonesia: Confronting the Political and Economic Crises, 1:30 p.m., 2200 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, February 15, to continue consideration of the following: Committee Budget Views and Estimates for Fiscal Year 2001 for submission to the Committee on the Budget; and H.R. 1443, Traffic Stops Statistics Study Act of 1999; and to consider the following: H.R. 1283, Fairness in Asbestos Compensation Act of 1999; and H.R. 2372, Private Property Rights Implementation Act of 1999, 10:15 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Resources, to mark up the following bills: S. 613, Indian Tribal Economic Development and Contract Encouragement Act of 1999; H.R. 1680, to provide for the conveyance of Forest Service property in Kern County, California, in exchange for county lands suitable for inclusion in Sequoia National Forest; H.R. 1749, to designate Wilson Creek in Avery and Caldwell Counties, North Carolina, as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Systems; H.R. 2484, to provide that land which is owned by the Lower Sioux Indian Community in the State of Minnesota but which is not held in trust by the United States for the Community may be leased or transferred by the Community without further approval by the United States; and the Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs Improvement Act of 2000, 11 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Rules, hearing on Biennial Budgeting: A Tool for Improving Government Fiscal Management and Oversight, 10:30 a.m., H–313 Capitol.

Committee on Science, Subcommittee on Basic Research, hearing on National Science Foundation Fiscal Year 2001 Budget Authorization Request, Part I: Research and Related Activities and Major Research Equipment, 2 p.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics, hearing on Fiscal Year 2001 NASA Authorization, NASA Posture, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, hearing on Association Health Plans, and to consider the Committee Budget Views and Estimates for Fiscal Year 2001 for submission to the Committee on the Budget, 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, to consider the following: Committee Budget Views and Estimates for Fiscal Year 2001 for submission to the Committee on the Budget; Corps of Engineers Survey Resolutions; and other pending business, 1 p..m., 2167 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Oversight, Investigations, and Emergency Management, hearing on Flood Water Rescue, 2 p.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Ways and Means, to consider Committee Budget Views and Estimates for Fiscal Year 2001 for submission to the Committee on the Budget, 10 a.m., and to hold a hearing on the U.S.-China Bilateral Trade Agreement and the Accession of China to the WTO, 10:30 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Social Security, to mark up H.R. 5, Senior Citizens' Freedom to Work Act of 1999, 4 p.m., B–318 Rayburn.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, hearing on the State of Counterintelligence at the Department of Energy and Its Three Key Nuclear Weapons Laboratories, 1 p.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

11 a.m., Tuesday, February 22

Senate Chamber

Program for Tuesday: Senator Moynihan will read Washington's Farewell Address; following which, there will be a period of morning business (not to extend beyond 12:30 p.m.).

At 2:15 p.m., Senate will consider any cleared executive or legislative business.

(Senate will recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. for their respective party conferences.)

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Wednesday, February 16

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Consideration of H.R. 1714, Electronic Signatures in Global and National Commerce Act. (motion to go to conference); and

Consideration of H.R. 2366, Small Business Liability Reform Act of 2000 (structured rule, one hour of debate)

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Baca, Joe, Calif., E144
Baldacci, John Elias, Maine, E143
Bereuter, Doug, Nebr., E142, E146
Bilirakis, Michael, Fla., E149
Blagojevich, Rod R., Ill., E141
Carson, Julia, Ind., E147
Clayton, Eva M., N.C., E144
Clement, Bob, Tenn., E143
Clyburn, James E., S.C., E140, E141
Diaz-Balart, Lincoln, Fla., E148
Emerson, Jo Ann, Mo., E145
Everett, Terry, Ala., E146
Gallegly, Elton, Calif., E145
Kennedy, Patrick J., R.I., E144
Lazio, Rick, N.Y., E139
Lewis, Jerry, Calif., E145
McGovern, James P., Mass., E144
McInnis, Scott, Colo., E139, E140, E142, E144, E144, E145, E146
Miller, Gary G., Calif., E148
Moran, James P., Va., E147
Myrick, Sue Wilkins, N.C., E140, E141, E142
Norton, Eleanor Holmes, D.C., E147
Owens, Major R., N.Y., E147
Pelosi, Nancy, Calif., E147
Salmon, Matt, Ariz., E139, E140
Skelton, Ike, Mo., E149
Smith, Christopher H., N.J., E141
Stark, Fortney Pete, Calif., E148
Stupak, Bart, Mich., E143, E146
Towns, Edolphus, N.Y., E142
Visclosky, Peter J., Ind., E141
Young, Don, Alaska, E145

Congressional Record The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed at one time. ¶Public access to the Congressional Record is available online through *GPO Access,* a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. The online database is updated each day the Congressional Record is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d session (January 1994) forward. It is available on the Wide Area Information Server (WAIS) through the Internet and via asynchronous dial-in. Internet users can access the database by using the World Wide Web; the Superintendent of Documents home page address is http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs, by using local WAIS client software or by telnet to swais.access.gpo.gov, then login as guest (no password required). Dial-in users should use communications software and modem to call (202) 512–1661; type swais, then login as guest (no password required). For general information about *GPO Access,* contact the *GPO Access* User Support Team by sending Internet e-mail to gpoaccess@gpo.gov, or a fax to (202) 512–1262; or by calling Toll Free 1–888–293–6498 or (202) 512–1530 between 7 a.m. and 5:30 p.m. Eastern time, Monday through Friday, except for Federal holidays. ¶The Congressional Record paper and 24x microfiche will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, $179.00 for six months, $357.00 per year, or purchased for $3.00 per issue, payable in advance; microfiche edition, $141.00 per year, or purchased for $1.50 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly Congressional Record Index may be purchased for the same per issue prices. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250–7954, or phone orders to (202) 512–1800, or fax to (202) 512–2250. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily Congressional Record is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the Congressional Record.