



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 146

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 29, 2000

No. 20

## House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with amendments in which a concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1883. An act to provide for the application of measures to foreign persons who transfer to Iran certain goods, services, or technology, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill and a concurrent resolution of the following titles in which concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 400. An act to provide technical corrections to the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996, to improve the delivery of housing assistance to Indian tribes in a manner that recognizes the right of tribal self-governance, and for other purposes.

S. Con. Res. 83. Concurrent resolution commending the people of Iran for their commitment to the democratic process and positive political reform on the occasion of Iran's parliamentary elections.

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 106-79, the Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, appoints the following Senators to the Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission—

The Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE); and

The Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED).

### 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 min-

utes, 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.

### CREATING LIVABLE COMMUNITIES

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, a livable community is one where our families are safe, healthy, and economically secure. The Federal Government has an obligation to be the best partner it can in helping create and maintain livable communities. A critical element in creating the climate in which a livable community can thrive is reducing the threat of gun violence.

Since Richard Nixon was President of the United States, over a million Americans have lost their lives to gun violence. This is more than all the deaths in all the American wars since the Civil War. For every gun death, there are three to four injuries.

Mr. Speaker, this is clearly a major threat to the health of our communities. One hesitates to put a dollar cost on such tragedy, but the fact is gun deaths are the most expensive trauma-related deaths, costing over a third of a million dollars.

For each child shot by a gun, those injuries total what it would take to send them to college for a year. The total costs are over \$4 billion a year. If we add all of the indirect costs, lost of productivity, it is over \$100 billion by some estimates. It is important to note that no family today is safe from gun violence, whether it is in Jonesboro, Arkansas, whether it is in the high school in Columbine, Colorado, in my State of Oregon, in Springfield.

Mr. Speaker, this morning, as I was walking to this Chamber, I was given a notice that in Mount Morris Township, Michigan, this morning a first grader was shot by another pupil, a first grade child.

It is important for us to not be paralyzed in this Chamber and assume there is nothing we can do to reduce gun violence. There are a number of simple commonsense steps. I hope that the leadership in this Chamber will bring forward simple, commonsense gun violence provisions that passed the Senate and should find their way to the floor of this House.

There are other examples of what we can do. Yesterday's Washington Post had an article about the smart gun technology that the Clinton administration has proposed to invest in, a gun that can only be fired by one authorized person. In Maryland, Governor Glendening is proposing that there only be sold smart guns in 3 years.

Both of these proposals have merit and deserve serious attention by Congress and the Maryland Legislature. But there is another area that requires no massive legislation. And that is simple, for the Federal Government to lead by example to do what we are asking the rest of America to do.

Mr. Speaker, every year, the government purchases thousands of weapons for the men and women in law enforcement. If we decreed that only smart guns would be purchased from this point forward, we could use the market forces, the vast potential for sales to government to encourage, to incent the private sector to provide that need.

This is critical for men and women in law enforcement. One out of every six law enforcement officials who dies in the line of duty is killed by their own service revolver or by a service revolver of one of their colleagues. It would build a market for smart gun technology. It would send a signal that it is safe enough and important enough for law enforcement, that it is the right thing to do for private citizens.

□ 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.

H513

Every day in the United States, over a million children go home to homes where there are loaded guns that they have access to. There are over a third of a million firearm deaths every year in this country. If we take the simple, common sense approach to have smart gun technology available, we can make a significant step towards reducing that carnage. For the Federal Government, to lead by example, by putting its money where our mouth is, would be an important step.

Mr. Speaker, and last, and by no means least, as I mentioned, I do hope that the leadership in this assembly will enable us to vote on the Senate-passed provisions to take those simple steps towards safe gun storage, reducing the magazine size for automatic weapons to 10 or fewer bullets, and having background checks at gun shows. These are things that can make our families safer, healthier, and more economically secure.

#### GRANTING CHINA PERMANENT MOST FAVORED NATION TRADE STATUS

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

Mr. WOLF. Madam Speaker, I rise today to voice my concern about granting China permanent normal trade relations. According to the recently released 1999 State Department human rights report on China, it says, "human rights deteriorated markedly throughout the year." Every Member ought to read the report before they vote.

The State Department's human rights report describes the People's Republic of China as "an authoritarian state in which the Chinese Communist party is the paramount source of power." Did my colleagues know that the human rights report, it says that the Chinese Government carries out "numerous executions after summary trials"? Did my colleagues know that more people were executed in China last year than anywhere else in the world? My goodness, this Congress and this administration wants to give China MFN. For example, the State Department reports that a radio station in China reported that eight people were arrested and quickly executed right after being sentenced.

Do my colleagues know that the report says that China has still not accounted for those missing or detained in connection with the 1989 Tiananmen Square demonstrators? Eleven years. The moms and dads do not know where their children are. And this administration and this Congress wants to grant China permanent trade status? Shame.

Do my colleagues know that the State Department says that the Chinese Government has, "Intensified its efforts to suppress this dissent."? The

report says that by last year's end almost all the leaders of the China Democracy Party were serving long prison terms or were in custody without formal charges.

Do the Members of this body know that the report says that the Chinese Government sentenced numerous leaders of the Falun Gong spiritual movement to long prison terms and sent them to psychiatric hospitals? Do the Members know, does the Clinton administration know, does anybody care? The American people care. I do not know who cares up here or in the administration.

Do my colleagues know that the State Department reports that the Chinese Government ignores its own laws that are supposed to provide for fundamental human rights? Do my colleagues know that the report says the Chinese Government ignores these laws in practice with abuses that include extrajudicial killings, torture, mistreatment of prisoners, forced confessions, arbitrary arrests, detention and lengthy incommunicado detention? I have been in Beijing Prison Number One, and I can tell my colleagues that it is grim.

Do my colleagues know the report says the Chinese Government continues to restrict freedom of religion and has intensified controls on unregistered churches? Do my colleagues know that the report says the government infringes on its citizens' privacy rights, freedom of movement, freedom of press, freedom of free assembly?

Do my colleagues know that the report speaks to violence against women, including coercive family planning practices, which sometimes include forced abortions and forced sterilization? They track the women down and force them to have an abortion. The report speaks to trafficking, prostitution, discrimination against women, trafficking in women and children, abuse of children, discrimination against disabled and minorities. These are all problems. This is in the State Department report that every Member ought to read.

Do my colleagues know the report says that the Chinese Government continues to restrict tightly workers' rights and forced labor in prison facilities remains a problem? Do my colleagues know the report says child labor persists in China?

Do my colleagues know the report says that "Particularly serious human rights abuses persist in minority areas, especially in Tibet."? The Chinese government has plundered Tibet. They are persecuting the Muslims; they are persecuting the Catholic Church; they are persecuting the Protestant Church. Do my colleagues know that the report says that unapproved religious groups, including Protestant and Catholic groups, continue to experience varying degrees of official interference, repression and prosecution?

Do my colleagues know the report says that the Chinese "government

continues to require all places of religious activity to register with the government."? Do my colleagues know the report says that Chinese authorities, guided by national policy, make strong efforts to control unapproved Catholic and Protestant churches? Religious services were broken up and house church leaders or adherents were harassed and fined, detained, beaten and tortured? This is in the State Department report.

I could go on with other examples of human rights abuses by the Chinese Government, but I would end by asking if my colleagues know that the Chinese Government refuses to allow Catholics to recognize the authority of the Pope in matters of faith and morals?

Do my colleagues know the report says that numerous Catholic bishops and believers have been imprisoned and beaten? Do my colleagues know the report says that in May of last year, Bishop Yan Weiping was found dead in Beijing shortly after being released from prison? Do my colleagues know, looking at this picture, that this report says that the whereabouts of some of these bishops, like Bishop Su, reportedly arrested in 1997, are still unclear?

Every Member ought to read this report. And after reading this report, I know my colleagues will be with the American people and they will not support permanent normal trade relations for China.

#### A NINTH TIME ZONE FOR GUAM AND THE NORTHERN MARIANAS

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

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak to a bill which I will introduce that fills a time void which has long existed, and that is the naming of a time zone which exists under the American flag but which has no official title.

Wherever the flag behind us flies there is a title for each time zone in which it flies, whether it is in the Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico, with its Atlantic time zone; this city, with its eastern time zone; Chicago, with central time; Denver, with mountain time; Los Angeles, with Pacific time; Honolulu, with Hawaii standard time; Anchorage, with Alaska standard time; and even Pango Pango and American Samoa, with Samoa standard time. But there was a ninth time zone, where Guam sits and the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas sits as well; and where there is no official title for this time zone. Not that there is no time there, but that there is no specific name for this time zone.

Perhaps this is an oversight. The fact that this time zone is on the other side of the international date line and could appropriately claim the title of being the first American time zone, could get

the competitive spirits of those in the Atlantic time zone aroused. But when information is being sent out about changes in national time or announcements concerning time, this ninth time zone, in geography going west but first in terms of time, frequently gets ignored. After all, the existing law only allows for eight time zones under the American flag.

Consequently, Madam Speaker, I am introducing today a bill which fills the void, which corrects this oversight, and which appropriately designates each and every American time zone. If all Americans count, then all Americans should be included in time, in political participation, and in the national census. Each and every time we look at the clock or look at our watch, we should recognize that there exists nine time zones.

□ 1245

The unique feature of this particular piece of legislation is that it is responsive to a quandary that does not quite exist in the other time zones. We have two jurisdictions with two distinct names. We have Guam and we have the Northern Marianas. We could call it the Guam slash or dash Marianas time zone. However, in time, Guam would take center stage and the remainder of the Marianas would be ignored. Or we could call it the Marianas time zone, but that would be taken as a signal that Guam is not included.

Therefore, in honor of the historical unity of both Guam and the Northern Marianas and the people who were the original inhabitants of the entire island chain, I have designated in this legislation this new time zone as Chamorro Standard Time. The word "Chamorro" refers to the indigenous people, possesses a proud cultural heritage, and forms the basis of the underlying historical and cultural connection between the people of Guam and the people of Luta, Tinian, Saipan, Agrigan, and other islands in the Northern Marianas.

ManChamorro ham todū gi tinituhon. We were Chamorros in the beginning.

ManChamorro ham esta pa'go. We are still Chamorros today.

This amendment to the Calder Act has been discussed with Federal officials in NIST of the Department of Commerce, and we anticipate only support for this effort.

Madam Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues to cosponsor and pass this legislation quickly, dare I say it, in a timely way. Let us not waste any time. Let us take the time to make time for all Americans.

#### ELIMINATION OF MARRIAGE TAX PENALTY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). 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. Madam Speaker, today is a big day. The House Committee on Ways and Means is going to act on another item on our agenda, an issue of fairness; and today, in the House Committee on Ways and Means, we are going to move forward on an item on the Republican agenda which helps 800,000 senior citizens, senior citizens over the age of 65, who because they need to work or want to work, they want to be active longer, or maybe they have two pensions, had their Social Security benefits taxed away. And that is called the earnings limit, or the earnings penalty.

Today we are going to pass legislation which will wipe out that unfair quirk in Federal law which taxes away two-thirds of the Social Security benefits of 800,000 senior citizen who happen to earn more than \$17,000 a year.

We can all think of seniors that we know in our local communities who have to work, maybe they are waitresses, maybe they work or have a little hobby or they set aside some money and saved and invested well that they are making more than \$17,000 a year, and today they are punished; they are penalized.

We are going to pass legislation which deserves bipartisan support which wipes out the earnings limit for 800,000 senior citizens. That is a big victory as we work to bring about fairness to every American.

Today I want to talk about another issue of fairness, an issue which this House has voted to address, an issue which responds to a fundamental question of fairness, the difference between right and wrong; and that is, is it right, is it 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?

Is it right that a working married couple with an identical income, identical circumstances, pays higher taxes than a couple that lives together outside of marriage with identical circumstances? Of course not. It is wrong; it is unfair that under our Tax Code a working married couple pays more in taxes just because they are married.

I want to introduce to my colleagues in the House Shad and Michelle Hallihan, two public school teachers from Joliet, Illinois. Shad and Michelle, of course, teach public school; they just had a little baby, a young couple, a nice couple. They suffer the marriage tax penalty just because they are married.

They have a combined income of about \$62,000. They are two public school teachers supposed to have identical incomes of about \$30,000 each. They are middle class. Well, they pay the average marriage tax penalty.

Michelle pointed out to me, she said, Congressman, as you work to eliminate that marriage tax penalty, let your colleagues in the Congress know that that marriage tax penalty that the Hallihans pay would buy about 4,000 diapers for their newborn child.

It is real money for real people. And for other families in Joliet, Illinois, the hometown of Michelle and Shad Hallihan, that \$1,400, the average marriage tax penalty, is 1 year's tuition at Joliet Junior College or a local community college. It is 3 months' of day-care at a local childcare center in the south suburbs of Chicago. It is 7 months' worth of car payments. It is a washer and a dryer for couples like Michelle and Shad. And they are a beautiful couple. They are young.

But the marriage tax penalty is suffered by the elderly, as well. We have all heard the stories about elderly couples who get divorced because they can save money. Well, the marriage tax penalty punishes young and old just because they are married. And this House has done something about that. We have been working over the last several years to wipe out the marriage tax penalty. And 230 Members of this House joined together to cosponsor H.R. 6, the Marriage Tax Elimination Act, legislation which wipes out the marriage tax penalty for couples like Michelle and Shad Hallihan.

I am proud to say that this House voted, in fact 48 Democrats joined with every House Republican to vote to wipe out the marriage tax penalty, benefiting 25 million married, working couples who suffer the marriage tax penalty.

Our legislation will essentially wipe out the marriage tax penalty for Shad and Michelle Hallihan. We do it in several ways. It has three key components. It is legislation designed to help everybody who suffers the marriage tax penalty, and we do it in three approaches.

One is, first we help the working poor. Those who participate in the earned income credit, which helps those working poor families, particularly with children, well, there is a marriage penalty and we adjust the income threshold so that working, married couples who participate in earned income credit will see their marriage penalty eliminated.

Let us remember that the biggest part of the marriage tax penalty is caused when we have a husband and wife like Shad and Michelle Hallihan, who, because they are married, they file jointly, they combine their income. We eliminate the marriage tax penalty by widening the 15 percent tax bracket as well as doubling the standard deduction.

The Senate needs to act. I hope the Senate will join us and move in a quick way, a timely way, and in a bipartisan way to join us in wiping out the marriage tax penalty.

#### IMPROVING BUDGET PROCESS—KEEPING SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICAID SOLVENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) is recognized

during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I would like to talk today about a couple of challenges facing this country.

One challenge is, is there a way to improve our budget process? Should we go to a biannual budget or other techniques that might be used to better serve the taxpayers of this country? And the second issue is the tremendous challenge of keeping Social Security and Medicare solvent.

In yesterday's Roll Call there was an article on page 46 of yesterday's Roll Call, I wrote an article: "Entitlement Reform the Way to Go."

Madam Speaker, I include for the RECORD a copy of the article on page 46 of yesterday's Roll Call:

THE ONE THING I WOULD CHANGE ABOUT CONGRESS . . . ENTITLEMENT REFORM THE WAY TO GO

(By Rep. Nick Smith)

For 224 years, Congress has wrestled with the budget. As an ex-wrestler and current Budget Committee member, I know that can be both strenuous and challenging.

This has led some Members to seek a "quick fix" in an attempt to end the annual struggle. Biennial budgeting, however, is a mirage that distracts us from the real budget problems we face.

Biennial budgeting would be an enormous change in our budget processes, the biggest since at least 1974. The effects on the budget struggle would be far-reaching and very largely negative from the Congressional perspective. Biennial budgeting will deprive Congress of much of the leverage it needs to compete equally with the administration. Specifically, Congress gives up.

Reconciliation in off years. The Congressional majority could lose much of its power in election years to use reconciliation. This will endanger its priorities in election years and would rule over the House tax cut strategy for this year.

Congress could include multiple reconciliation instructions in a biennial budget resolution, but this deprives Congress of flexibility needed to react to changing political and economic needs. The majority would have to fashion its political strategy for the next two years just three months after the preceding election.

Control over the agencies. The annual budget process allows Congress to express its will to government agencies. I know that we were more eager to cooperate with Congress at budget time when I was a member of the Nixon administration. Biennial budgeting will reduce our leverage to hold agencies accountable and encourage defiance.

Budget accuracy and flexibility. Economic forecasting is highly uncertain. The Congressional Budget Office estimate for fiscal 2000 two years ago was for a \$70 billion unified budget deficit. That's \$240 billion off the current fiscal 2000 estimate of a \$170 billion unified budget surplus. The estimate has shifted by \$40 billion just since October 1999.

This uncertainty means, the President would bargain for high second-year spending, and we would frequently need or be tempted to reopen the budget. When we reopen the budget, we would find ourselves with little leverage against a pre-funded administration that can resist unwanted budget modification with near impunity. When revenue is lower or spending is higher than projected, the pressure to increase fees, taxes and borrowing, rather than cut the administration, would be considerable.

Leverage over spending. Congress will inevitably grapple with supplemental spending requests in the off years. In the absence of pressure to produce a complete budget, an administration will always have poll-tested and politically motivated requests in off years that will be hard to fend off in the absence of broader budget issues.

As a result, we will pass supplemental appropriations bills in most years that will grow as Members add their own pet election-year projects. All of this threatens even the very modest spending restraint that we've been able to exercise over the last five years.

I find it surprising, then, to hear of growing support for moving from our current annual budget to a biennial budget process. It does seem sometimes that we are on a budget treadmill that never stops. There is no solution, however, in ducking our responsibilities to exercise the power the Constitution grants us. Power atrophies unless it is used, and that is what will surely continue to happen to Congressional power if we adopt biennial budgeting.

Members interested in getting a handle on the budget should focus on substance rather than process. The truth is that the discretionary portion of the budget—which is the substance of the 13 annual appropriations bills—makes up just one-third of total federal spending.

The rest of our spending—chiefly, entitlement programs—is on automatic pilot and rising faster than inflation. This growth in entitlement spending puts enormous pressure on the other parts of the budget and will inevitably necessitate higher taxes or a return to excessive government borrowing.

Acting promptly and boldly will bring benefits as well. The unremarked secret of our current budget surplus is the welfare reforms enacted in 1996 and the Medicare changes enacted in 1997. To be blunt, we would still be in deficit without these reforms. But in both cases, one could also argue that the programs have been strengthened.

I have long believed that there are similar opportunities to improve our largest entitlement, Social Security, which is now 23 percent of total federal spending. As chairman of the Budget Committee Task Force on Social Security, I helped develop 18 unanimous and bipartisan findings that could serve as the basis for reform.

After the completion of the task force's business, I also introduced the bipartisan Social Security Solvency Act (H.R. 3206), which is scored to keep Social Security solvent based on these findings.

The effect of this reform (or of similar reforms such as the 21st Century Retirement Act (H.R. 1793)) would be to dramatically reduce the growth of government spending for decades to come. The charts on this page show how significant reform can be.

The first chart shows that federal spending will rise to nearly 35 percent of the nation's gross domestic product without changes in our entitlement programs, about 75 percent higher than it is today. Needless to say, giant tax increases will be needed to sustain this level of spending.

In contrast, the second chart shows what could happen if we simply adopt the Social Security Solvency Act. Under this scenario, we would experience a gradual reduction in federal spending as we shift to a retirement system based partly on worker-owned accounts starting at 2.5 percent of income and partly on traditional government-paid benefits.

This legislation would also fully restore the program's shaky finances and create opportunities for workers to live better in retirement by making full use of the power of compound interest.

This is not easy work. But if we do nothing, taxes will have to rise to the equivalent

of 40 percent of payroll by 2040 to pay for Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid. Social Security and our other entitlement programs are complicated and alteration carries political risk.

The benefits from this effort, however, will also be substantial. Sound reforms will allow Congress to master the federal budget where gimmicky process reforms such as biennial budgeting are bound to fail.

Madam Speaker, what we are faced with in this country is an expanding cost of Social Security and Medicare. The two greatest challenges that the United States faces is the increased cost of the entitlement programs.

We have played around for the last 5 years desperately trying to reduce the expansion and increase of discretionary programs. But the entitlement programs account for almost two-thirds of Federal spending. One-third of Federal spending, the 13 appropriation bills that we agonize, that we argue, that we debate for almost 8 months of the year, only account for one-third of total Federal spending.

We have been successful in starting to slow down the increase in that expanding. So some years, in fact, it has been less than inflation. Generally, it is about inflation.

But the challenges that we are facing with Social Security and Medicaid are the hugest challenges we can say for future taxpayers. Because if we do not do something, Madam Speaker, if we do not force ourselves to deal with these kind of problems, because of the fact that life spans are increasing dramatically and because of the fact that the birth rate has substantially been reduced in the last 50 years, that means that fewer young people, fewer workers in this country are asked to pay a higher FICA tax to support the senior program.

The actuaries give an estimate that, if we are to continue the programs as they exist today, within 40 years, our payroll tax, our FICA tax, will be approximately 40 percent. Right now it is 15.3 percent. That is our FICA tax for senior programs.

Some people say, well, that would be unreasonable; that cannot happen. All we have to do is look at what is happening in countries around the world. Czechoslovakia, Japan, other countries in Europe are approaching already 40 percent payroll tax to support their senior program.

The country of France has an effective payroll charge, a payroll deduction, of 70 percent of what each worker in France earns to support their senior program. I mean, it is no wonder that France has such a tough time competing.

If we allow our entitlement programs to go on the way they are without some modification, without some change, without greater priority to use the surpluses for those programs, but we cannot do it with the surpluses alone, put all of the \$4 trillion surpluses that we expect over the next 10 years and it will be less than half

enough to pay for the unfunded liability of Social Security alone, let alone Medicare and Medicaid.

I just cannot urge my colleagues enough or the American people to look at the consequences of what is going to happen if we do not deal with these important programs. Number one, Social Security probably is the most successful program that we have in terms of making sure our senior population does not live out the remainder years of their lives in poverty. So I think we cannot afford to let it go by the wayside.

Neither can we afford to put off the decision. The longer we put off the decision on Social Security, the greater and more drastic the changes are going to have to be.

We should have done it 4 years ago. We should have done it 6 years ago. How do we develop the leadership in the United States to make the tough decisions that need to be made to change these programs? I mean, I appreciate the political vulnerability that any politician goes through if they suggest change in a popular program. We have approximately 12 percent of our seniors that depend almost entirely just on their Social Security check.

I urge my colleagues to read this article in Roll Call. I ask my colleagues and the President of the United States to be more aggressive coming forward with programs and proposals that can be scored to keep Social Security solvent for at least the next 75 years.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There being no further requests for morning hour debates, pursuant to clause 12, rule I, the House will stand in recess until 2 p.m.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.) the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

#### AFTER RECESS

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

#### PRAYER

The Reverend Joseph S. Edmonds, First Baptist Church of Ballston, Arlington, Virginia, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, from everlasting to everlasting, Thou art God. We thank Thee for Thy presence and for Thy love.

Help us to lift up our eyes unto the hills, from whence cometh our help. Our help cometh from the Lord, which have made heaven and earth.

We thank Thee for enabling our forefathers to establish freedom of speech, freedom to worship Thee, freedom from want and freedom from fear.

We thank Thee for those who represent the American people in this House. I pray they will have the faith and courage of our fathers to make correct decisions. May they be a bridge to peace and justice in this troubled world, and may they bring joy and fulfillment to the American people. In Jesus' name, amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

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

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

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. LANTOS 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.

#### THE REVEREND JOSEPH S. EDMONDS

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

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Madam Speaker, it is my distinct honor to introduce this morning's guest chaplain, the Reverend Joseph S. Edmonds. Actually, it is not morning. It is now afternoon. Reverend Edmonds serves as pastor of the First Baptist Church of Ballston in Arlington, which is just across the Potomac, in the 8th District of Virginia.

Madam Speaker, Reverend Edmonds was born in Grenta, Virginia, spent his childhood in the District of Columbia, not far from this very building. After attending public school in D.C., Reverend Edmonds obtained his undergraduate degree from Carson-Newman College in Tennessee and earned a Masters of Divinity at Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary in North Carolina.

Reverend Edmonds has been serving the Ballston community for over 10 years. He has been, and continues to be, a true shepherd to his congregation. Many have benefited from his spiritual guidance and generous spirit. Before moving to the Ballston area, Reverend Edmonds served communities in Maryland, D.C., and Florida.

On behalf of our district, I am pleased to welcome Reverend Edmonds here today.

#### RECOGNITION OF OCTORARA BOYS SOCCER CHAMPIONS

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor some athletes from my district in Pennsylvania, the Octorara High School Boys Varsity Soccer Team. These outstanding young men are the 1999 Boys Double A Pennsylvania Soccer Champions.

Winning this State championship is no small feat. Octorara is not a large district, and they went up against some of Pennsylvania's traditional powerhouses. But what they lacked in size, they made up for in heart and determination.

Victory by victory, this team built a winning season and made it into a championship year. They were ably lead by their coaches, Chip Smallwood, Ken Baldt, and Paul Wood. The team is in Washington today with their principal, Hank Detering, receiving many well-deserved congratulations.

Madam Speaker, I just want to say that those of us from back home who watched this team fight its way to the top are very, very proud of them. So welcome to Washington, Octorara Braves. Let us do it again this year.

#### HAIDER'S INFLUENCE SEEN UNDIMINISHED

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

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, in a few days, we in this House will be voting on a resolution I introduced concerning the new government of Austria. Since the leader of this party, which is the Austrian government, the racist, xenophobic, neo-Nazi party has now resigned, it may be useful to ask why did he do so. He did not do so because he does not want to be part of the unpleasant political decisions that will have to be taken in Austria, tax increases, cutbacks on spending, layoffs of large numbers of government employees, but he is still the top man of this racist, xenophobic political party.

One of his principal allies, Deputy Speaker of Parliament Prinzhorn, yesterday said the following about his resignation: "It is not a resignation. He is a provincial governor and remains our strong man. It is a step backwards which is necessary in order to make two solid steps forward."

I am urging all of my colleagues who have not yet cosponsored this resolution to come on board. We cannot allow the new Europe to have governments in which neofascist parties play a key role. The European Union has expressed itself; it is time we do so.

#### TIME TO REPEAL THE SOCIAL SECURITY EARNINGS LIMIT

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Madam Speaker, it has been said that the time to fix the roof is when the sun is shining. Our economy is shining brightly, and it is time to fix much of the unfairness in our Tax Code.

Right now our government unfairly punishes working seniors through the social security earnings limit. Americans have a strong work ethic. We have a strong desire to contribute to our surroundings. Yet, after the age of 65, our government punishes senior citizens who wish to stay in the work force.

Social security was designed to give some protection to senior citizens. It was not designed to be a program that would punish those who chose to keep working past the age of 65. Right now in this country more than 800,000 working senior citizens lose part or all of their social security benefits because of this earnings limit. This is ridiculous.

This week the Republicans in the House will bring up a bill that would repeal the social security earnings limit, and I hope the President will sign it. The time has come to give working seniors a break and repeal the social security earnings limit.

#### CRIMES OF THE FBI AT WACO, TEXAS, AND RUBY RIDGE, IDAHO

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Madam Speaker, reports say that the FBI lied to Congress about Waco. They withheld a memo that "warned FBI bosses to not use teargas because it would provoke a massive disaster."

Let us tell it like it is. The FBI and Janet Reno must answer for the 80 murders at Waco. The FBI and Janet Reno must answer for the murders of the Weaver family in Idaho.

And another thing, Congress must grow a backbone. Do Members realize when the FBI is accused of committing a crime, the FBI investigates the FBI and finds no crime? Beam me up. I yield back the crimes of the FBI at Waco, Texas, and Ruby Ridge, Idaho.

#### CONDEMNING RELIGIOUS AND RACIAL INTOLERANCE AT BOB JONES UNIVERSITY

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Madam Speaker, I come to the floor today to denounce Bob Jones University, an institution of higher learning, for preaching hatred and practicing racism, religious intolerance, and segregation.

Today, along with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), I am introducing a resolution condemning the discriminatory practices prevalent at Bob Jones University. Bob Jones Uni-

versity espouses hate-filled, racist and anti-Catholic views upon its students.

While officials there say they are not anti-Catholic and they do not preach anything other than what is in the Bible, their own online magazine calls Catholicism "a satanic counterfeit," and says, "Papists are doing the work of the devil."

The University states that it is their First Amendment right to speak their beliefs. I support the First Amendment, but I do not support using a school to indoctrinate hate, segregation, and intolerance into today's youth.

We have seen, all too often in the past year, the results of hate: a school shooting targeted at a prayer group in Paducah, Kentucky; the shooting at a Jewish daycare center; the race-targeted killings in Illinois.

Hate propaganda may be free speech, but it must not be sanctioned by this body. We must loudly denounce it. As a Nation, we have fought too hard and come too far not to end discrimination and bigotry based on race and religion.

#### INTERNATIONAL ABDUCTION

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

Mr. LAMPSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to begin my series of one-minutes that recognize the enormous problem that this Nation has with children who have been abducted internationally. There are over 10,000 American children who have been taken to foreign countries, like Saif Ahmed from my district.

My constituent, Melanie Al Mufti, was awarded sole custody of her son in 1998, but he was abducted by his father, Sayed Ahmed, to Cairo, Egypt, that same year. He was ordered to return the child to Texas, but instead, he ignored the order, and since then there is an FBI warrant out for his arrest.

Melanie contacted me that year, and I have been working closely with her ever since. She has worked with the Egyptian courts. I have worked with the Egyptian government, even spoken with President Mubarek. Yet Melanie has not had contact with her son since his abduction.

Melanie and parents like her need our help. I will be introducing bills that will focus on reuniting parents with their children. Madam Speaker, it is time for Congress, the media, and the American people to stand up for Melanie and Saif and the other American families who are being kept apart. We must bring our children home.

#### THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT MUST INSTITUTE AN INVESTIGATION IN THE CASE OF AMADOU DIALLO

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, last week the Amadou Diallo family suffered a double tragedy, the loss of their son with 41 shots and 19 bullets to the body, and then a sense of injustice in our judicial system.

This is not a comment on that judicial process or the deliberations of the jury. It is simply a statement to America that we must stop tolerating man's inhumanity to man: an unarmed individual, an immigrant seeking only opportunity, not definitively told that police were asking him to stop, and in front of his own home.

I applaud the New Yorkers who have marched in peace, and I ask for Americans to join hands in peace, but at the same time, it is now appropriate for the Federal government to move in and to do a thorough and rightful investigation to determine whether or not Mr. Diallo's civil rights were violated.

Only when America understands that we are truly one America and that every life is precious, no matter how you came to this country, will we meet the promise for Americans for the 21st century.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM STAFF MEMBER OF HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR., MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Claire M. Maluso, senior counsel of Hon. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, Jr., Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, February 22, 2000.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House that I have received a subpoena for testimony before the grand jury issued by the United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio.

Sincerely,

CLARIE M. MALUSO.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM PRODUCTION OPERATIONS MANAGER, OFFICE OF COMMUNICATIONS MEDIA, OFFICE OF CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Gary Denick, production operations manager, Office of Communications Media, Office of Chief Administrative Officer:

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, February 17, 2000.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a subpoena for testimony issued by the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

GARY DENICK,  
Production Operations Manager,  
Office of Communications Media.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair announces that she 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, but not before 6 p.m. today.

#### DESIGNATING WILSON CREEK IN NORTH CAROLINA AS COMPO- NENT OF NATIONAL WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS SYSTEM

Mr. SHERWOOD. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1749) to designate Wilson Creek in Avery and Caldwell Counties, North Carolina, as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1749

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

#### SECTION 1. DESIGNATION OF WILSON CREEK IN NORTH CAROLINA AS A WILD, SCE- NIC, AND RECREATIONAL RIVER.

*Section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:*

*“(161) WILSON CREEK, NORTH CAROLINA.—(A) The 23.3 mile segment of Wilson Creek in the State of North Carolina from its headwaters to its confluence with Johns River, to be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture in the following classifications:*

*“(i) The 2.9 mile segment from its headwaters below Calloway Peak downstream to the confluence of Little Wilson Creek, as a scenic river.*

*“(ii) The 4.6 segment from Little Wilson Creek downstream to the confluence of Crusher Branch, as a wild river.*

*“(iii) The 15.8 segment from Crusher Branch downstream to the confluence of Johns River, as a recreational river.*

*“(B) The Forest Service or any other agency of the Federal Government may not undertake condemnation proceedings for the purpose of acquiring public right-of-way or access to Wilson Creek against the private property of T. Henry Wilson, Jr., or his heirs or assigns, located in Avery County, North Carolina (within the area 36°, 4 min., 21 sec. North 81°, 47 min., 37° West and 36°, 3 min., 13 sec. North and 81° 45 min. 55 sec. West), in the area of Wilson Creek designated as a wild river.”*

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

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

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

Madam Speaker, H.R. 1749 was introduced by our esteemed colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER), and would designate Wilson Creek in Avery and Caldwell Counties, North Carolina, as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

When the Subcommittee on Forests and Forest Health held a hearing on August 3, 1999, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER) and the Forest Service testified in support of the bill. The bill was amended at subcommittee to make a technical correction.

Both the subcommittee and the full committee favorably reported this bill, as amended by voice vote.

□ 1415

I strongly urge passage of H.R. 1749.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, first I would like to certainly commend the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER), my good friend, for his sponsorship of this legislation.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 1749 would designate 23.3 miles of Wilson Creek in Avery and Caldwell Counties, North Carolina, as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. Approximately 2.9 miles would be designated as scenic, 4.6 miles as wild, and 15.8 miles as recreational area.

The Forest Service deemed the creek, which is rich in aquatic and plant life, eligible and suitable for wild and scenic status since 1990. There is a great deal of local support in this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER), the author of the bill.

Mr. BALLENGER. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of my bill, H.R. 1749, to designate Wilson Creek in my congressional district as a Wild and Scenic River. And I want to thank the gentleman from Alaska (Chairman YOUNG) and the gentlewoman from Idaho (Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE), chairwoman of the subcommittee, for their support of this bill and their diligent efforts to get this bill to the floor.

Madam Speaker, I would like to invite any of my colleagues from Congress that get to our area, if they want to see something fabulously beautiful, look at the Wilson Creek. Wilson Creek is a free-flowing, crystal clear waterway which passes through some of the most beautiful scenery in the Nation. It provides pristine habitat for a multitude of fish species and plant life which live within the creek and along its banks.

From its headwaters below Calloway Peak on Grandfather Mountain in Avery County, to where it empties into Johns River in Caldwell County, Wilson Creek meets and exceeds all the requirements for such an important designation.

Specifically, my bill would designate 23.3 miles of Wilson Creek as a Wild and Scenic River. And in my opinion, having this creek designated as Wild and Scenic would help maintain its natural beauty while helping to improve the quality of recreational opportunities like hunting, fishing, camping, canoeing, and other activities for thousands of people who visit it each year.

Madam Speaker, the potential designation of Wilson Creek as a Wild and Scenic River has received tremendous support from the County Commissioners of both Avery and Caldwell Counties, as well as the local residents and outdoor enthusiasts. In fact, when I met with the County Commissioner in Caldwell and Avery Counties prior to the introduction of my bill, I was presented with letters of support from local residents, positive newspaper articles and editorials, and a letter from the U.S. Forest Service which indicated a willingness to help us in this effort.

Madam Speaker, I am convinced that the designation of Wilson Creek as a Wild and Scenic River is well supported within the communities which surround it. I know CBO is trying to find some cost for it. They have not been able to. There is no expense. And I believe this is an excellent bill that would do much to preserve Wilson Creek, making it both a natural asset and a natural treasure, and I urge its passage.

Mr. BURR of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1749, designating Wilson Creek in northwest North Carolina as a wild and scenic river.

Madam Speaker, one of the hidden beauties—and there are few—of the ever changing North Carolina congressional district map is that in any given election, with the blessing of the electorate, the members our delegation are given the honor of serving different parts of different counties for short periods of time. During my first two terms of Congress, I had the opportunity to serve parts of Caldwell County that we are honoring today.

Although the majority of the legwork here in Washington was done by my colleague Mr. BALLENGER and his staff, the reason the designation is becoming a reality is the process by which it matured. You see, Mr. Speaker, this was not a decision forced upon the people of Avery and Caldwell County by a Federal bureaucracy with little or no local input. This project has been the result of local initiative, spearheaded by county commissioners and community leaders. These officials, at every step of the way, explained the process and benefits of wild and scenic designation to the local community and landowners, enlisting the advice and counsel of the local U.S. Forest Service. The professionalism of Forest Supervisor John Ramey, District Ranger Mike Anderson and Recreation Planner Kathy Ludlow quickly put to rest any misconceptions or fears

the local community may have harbored towards seeking this Federal designation.

Madam Speaker, this designation will do more than protect the 23 miles of river which rolls through the shadow of Grandfather Mountain. What also is being affirmed here is an example of how our Federal conservation policy should be administered—from local decisions by local leaders working in partnership with the Federal Government towards a universal goal of preserving the most pristine and natural resources of our country.

I thank Mr. BALLENGER for bringing this bill forward and I ask for its immediate approval.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1749, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### INDIAN TRIBAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND CONTRACT ENCOURAGEMENT ACT OF 1999

Mr. SHERWOOD. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 613) to encourage Indian economic development, to provide for the disclosure of Indian tribal sovereign immunity in contracts involving Indian tribes, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 613

*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 "Indian Tribal Economic Development and Contract Encouragement Act of 1999".

##### SEC. 2. CONTRACTS AND AGREEMENTS WITH INDIAN TRIBES.

Section 2103 of the Revised Statutes (25 U.S.C. 81) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2103. (a) In this section:

"(1) The term 'Indian lands' means lands the title to which is held by the United States in trust for an Indian tribe or lands the title to which is held by an Indian tribe subject to a restriction by the United States against alienation.

"(2) The term 'Indian tribe' has the meaning given that term in section 4(e) of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b(e)).

"(3) The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of the Interior.

"(b) No agreement or contract with an Indian tribe that encumbers Indian lands for a period of 7 or more years shall be valid unless that agreement or contract bears the approval of the Secretary of the Interior or a designee of the Secretary.

"(c) Subsection (b) shall not apply to any agreement or contract that the Secretary (or a designee of the Secretary) determines is not covered under that subsection.

"(d) The Secretary (or a designee of the Secretary) shall refuse to approve an agree-

ment or contract that is covered under subsection (b) if the Secretary (or a designee of the Secretary) determines that the agreement or contract—

"(1) violates Federal law; or

"(2) does not include a provision that—

"(A) provides for remedies in the case of a breach of the agreement or contract;

"(B) references a tribal code, ordinance, or ruling of a court of competent jurisdiction that discloses the right of the Indian tribe to assert sovereign immunity as a defense in an action brought against the Indian tribe; or

"(C) includes an express waiver of the right of the Indian tribe to assert sovereign immunity as a defense in an action brought against the Indian tribe (including a waiver that limits the nature of relief that may be provided or the jurisdiction of a court with respect to such an action).

"(e) Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Indian Tribal Economic Development and Contract Encouragement Act of 1999, the Secretary shall issue regulations for identifying types of agreements or contracts that are not covered under subsection (b).

"(f) Nothing in this section shall be construed to—

"(1) require the Secretary to approve a contract for legal services by an attorney;

"(2) amend or repeal the authority of the National Indian Gaming Commission under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.); or

"(3) alter or amend any ordinance, resolution, or charter of an Indian tribe that requires approval by the Secretary of any action by that Indian tribe."

##### SEC. 3. CHOICE OF COUNSEL.

Section 16(e) of the Act of June 18, 1934 (commonly referred to as the "Indian Reorganization Act") (48 Stat. 987, chapter 576; 25 U.S.C. 476(e)) is amended by striking ", the choice of counsel and fixing of fees to be subject to the approval of the Secretary".

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

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

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

Madam Speaker, Senate 613, authored by Senator CAMPBELL of Colorado, would amend existing law to provide that the Secretary of Interior approve only those Indian land contracts which encumber Indian lands for a period of 7 or more years. Senate 613 would update Federal laws enacted in 1872 by removing antiquated and unnecessary Indian land contract approval requirements which apply to "all" contracts, irrespective of their brevity or insignificance.

We must maintain some Federal control over contracts which encumber Indian lands for 7 or more years because of the trust responsibility incurred by the Federal Government when the land was initially taken into trust.

Madam Speaker, this bill was passed unanimously in the Senate and is long overdue. I urge my fellow Members to support it and thus forward it to the President for his signature.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Madam Speaker, Senate bill 613 would amend provisions of law requiring certain contracts made with Indian tribes to be approved by the Secretary of the Interior. The current law, commonly referred to as Section 81, was enacted in 1872 in response to concerns that Indian tribes were being taken advantage of by non-Indian attorneys in bringing claims against the United States for treaty violations.

Numerous contracts were signed between attorneys and Indian tribes which provided for exorbitant attorneys' fees. For decades, the Bureau of Indian Affairs interpreted Section 81 as applying solely to such tribe-attorney contracts.

During the 1980's, several Federal Court cases ruled the Secretary of the Interior was required to approve any contract that was found to be, and I quote, "relative to Indian lands." End of quote. Because of the ambiguity of this phrase, more and more contracts were submitted for Secretarial approval. Today, the Secretary of the Interior is asked to approve contracts for everything from construction of a new building to the purchase of tribal office supplies. The Bureau of Indian Affairs is overwhelmed by these unnecessary requests and the process severely hinders economic development on Indian lands.

Madam Speaker, Senate bill 613 would eliminate the current requirement that tribes seek approval for contracts between Indian tribes and attorneys, unless the tribe's constitution requires such approval. The bill instead provides that only contracts that encumber Indian lands for 7 or more years be approved by the Secretary of the Interior. Additionally, this bill explicitly leaves in place the National Indian Gaming Commission's authority to review and approve Indian gaming agreements.

Madam Speaker, I am concerned about one provision of the bill which affects the sovereign immunity of Indian tribes. This bill requires that contracts which continue to be approved include remedies for breach of contract, disclosure of tribe sovereign immunity, or express waiver of the right to assert immunity as a defense.

Recent Supreme Court cases have strongly affirmed that notions of sovereignty that existed when the Constitution was formed have lost none of their relevance in the subsequent two centuries. A most basic component of sovereignty is the right to decide for itself when and under what circumstances a sovereign will be sued. These provisions would force Indian tribes to address, disclose, or waive their sovereign immunity in basic contracts, where a State or the Federal

Government would not be required to do so.

Madam Speaker, I also note that this bill defines the term "Indian tribes" using the definition from the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act. That definition of the tribe includes, and I quote, "any Alaska native village or regional or village corporation as defined in or established pursuant to the Alaska Native Claims Act." End of quote.

Senate bill 613 has no application on Alaska, and the Alaska Corporation does not possess "Indian lands" as such lands are defined in this bill. It is unfortunate that the Senate has not been more careful in the drafting of Senate bill 613. There is no reason to confuse the matters by references to tribes and the corporations in Alaska, especially since the bill has no impact or application to the State of Alaska and the treatment of the Native Alaskans.

However, Madam Speaker, since this bill does have the support of the administration and the National Congress of the American Indians, I urge support of this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 613.

The question was taken.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Madam 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.

#### REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 396

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of H. Res. 396.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

#### LOWER SIOUX INDIAN COMMUNITY LAND TRANSFER

Mr. SHERWOOD. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (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.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2484

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

#### SECTION 1. APPROVAL NOT REQUIRED TO VALIDATE LAND TRANSACTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, without further approval, ratification, or authorization by the United States, the Lower Sioux Indian Community in the State of Minnesota, may lease, sell, convey, warrant, or otherwise transfer all or any part of the Community's interest in any real property that is not held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Community.

(b) TRUST LAND NOT AFFECTED.—Nothing in this section is intended or shall be construed to—

(1) authorize the Lower Sioux Indian Community in the State of Minnesota to lease, sell, convey, warrant, or otherwise transfer all or any part of an interest in any real property that is held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Community; or

(2) affect the operation of any law governing leasing, selling, conveying, warranting, or otherwise transferring any interest in such trust land.

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

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

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2484, legislation which will give the Lower Sioux Indian Community in Minnesota the right, without further approval from the Federal Government, to lease or sell land which the tribe has bought but which has not been taken into trust.

Existing Federal law enacted in 1834 provides that an Indian tribe may not lease, sell, or otherwise convey land which it has acquired unless conveyance is approved by Congress. This antiquated law applies even though the land was purchased by the tribe with its own money, and even though the land is located outside the tribe's reservation, and even though the land has never been taken into trust for the tribe.

The Lower Sioux Community has found this law to be a major detriment to economic development. The law puts the tribe at a distinct disadvantage, because it finds that it cannot develop or use land which it has acquired to its full advantage.

H.R. 2484 will allow the Lower Sioux Indian Community to use the fee land it has purchased just like any other landowner, without having to come to Congress any time it wants to sell, lease, or even mortgage that land.

Madam Speaker, this is important to this small Minnesota tribe and I recommend its adoption.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Madam Speaker, I certainly want to commend the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. MINGE), my good friend, for sponsoring of this legislation. This legislation would permit the Lower Sioux Indian Community in Minnesota to lease or sell certain lands the tribe currently holds in fee status without further approval by the United States Government.

This provision would apply only to lands held in fee by the tribe and not lands held in trust by the United States for the tribe's benefit.

Current law and regulations established to protect Indian lands from alienation have been, in some instances, interpreted in a very restrictive manner. The Lower Sioux Indian Community has had trouble leasing and selling land which is not held in trust but in fee status without receiving prior approval of the Secretary of the Interior. This legislation would allow the tribe to make decisions and use land it has purchased and holds in fee status in the same manner as any other landowner, without having to commit to additional congressional or Secretarial approval.

Madam Speaker, although no formal administration views have been received by us on this legislation, I have been told informally by the Bureau of Indian Affairs that they do support the legislation, provided it does deal solely with lands held in fee status.

Not all tribes have encountered problems like this, Madam Speaker, when selling or leasing fee land. However, we need to address the problems faced by the Lower Sioux Indian Community of Minnesota, and I do urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

□ 1430

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. MINGE) in response to this bill.

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

Mr. MINGE. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the Speaker and I would like to thank the Chair and the ranking member of the subcommittee for moving this legislation through the committee.

I would also like to report that I am familiar with the Indian tribe that is involved here, the Lower Sioux community. It is in my congressional district. It is a relatively small Indian community, Native American community; but I would like to emphasize it is very well administered. It has acquired this land and feels that, in order to remove a cloud from title, this act of Congress is necessary.

I would like to suggest to the subcommittee that it consider legislation that deals with this type of situation

because I expect that the Lower Sioux community is not the only Native American group in the United States that faces this type of obstacle to the disposition of land that it has purchased which has not been in trust status which is off of its reservation area.

As we see here in the 21st century, we have a number of Native American communities that are becoming more prosperous. They are engaging in commerce. I think that it would certainly facilitate the activities of these communities if, in these fairly well-defined situations where there is not a concern about any abuse in connection with the assets of the community, that they had the flexibility to, on their own, make these transfers and not have the cloud on title that exists in situations such as this one.

I have worked with the community in crafting this legislation, with the administration, and also with the committee and subcommittee staff. I would like to express my appreciation to the staff, members of both the committee and the subcommittee.

At the request of the Lower Sioux Indian Community I have sponsored legislation that would exempt land owned in fee by the Community from the effect of the Indian Nonintercourse Act, 25 U.S.C. 177 (1994) (INA). In recent years, the Community has acquired several parcels of property outside the boundaries of its Reservation. It is likely that not all of those parcels will not be needed for the development which the Community contemplates. Therefore, the Community should have the ability to dispose of any unneeded portions of fee land as and when appropriate purchasers may appear. At present it is unclear whether the INA prohibits such transactions absent an Act of Congress. It was this problem which prompted the Community to seek legislation that will permit similar conveyances without resorting to the cumbersome and time-consuming legislative process each time an individual sale is agreed to.

The terms of the INA does not distinguish between fee land and trust land. My bill states that "No conveyance of lands from any tribe of Indians shall be of any validity unless the same be made by treaty or convention entered into pursuant to the Constitution." In the past, this has been interpreted to mean that Congress must either give direct approval or must establish the process for giving such approval. Although Congress has allowed the Secretary of the Interior to approve the conveyance of lands owned in trust for tribes by the United States, Congress has never set up any process for approving the conveyance of fee lands.

The "clouding" effect of the INA is illustrated in a discussion contained in a brief filed with the United States Supreme Court by the United States Department of Justice, in *Cass County, Minnesota v. Leech Lake Band of Chippewa Indians*. The brief observed that "[i]n recent times, Congress and the Executive Branch have assumed that the INA requires congressional approval of sales of all tribally owned lands, whether or not those lands are within a reservation". [Brief of the United States as Amicus Curiae, supporting Respondent, Case No. 97-174 (January, 1998), at 28 (footnote 13).] Congress repeatedly has

passed legislation allowing individual fee parcels of tribal land to be sold. Congress has on several occasions in recent years adopted legislation similar to that which the Community seeks.

For example, P.L. 86-505, § 1, 74 Stat. 199, authorizing the Navajo Tribe to dispose of its fee lands without federal approval; P.L. 101-630, 104 Stat. 4531, authorizing the sale of a parcel of land owned in fee simple by the Rumsey Indian Rancheria; P.L. 101-379, § 11, 104 Stat. 473, authorizing the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians to convey a particular parcel of its fee land; P.L. 102-497, § 4, 106 Stat. 3255, authorizing the Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians to convey certain lands which it owned in fee.

The Supreme Court has never ruled that the wording of the INA does not apply to fee lands. In fact, in a case decided just last year, the Court made a point of saying that the question is open: "This Court has never determined whether the Indian Nonintercourse Act . . . applies to land that has been rendered alienable. . . . *Cass County v. Leech Lake Bank*," U.S., 118 S.Ct. 1904 (1998). The assumption has been, and still is, that the Act prevents the sale of fee land without congressional approval. This is the legal position of the United States, citing the amicus brief of the United States in the *Cass County* case. And the Department of the Interior has taken the position that it cannot not give the Lower Sioux Community permission to sell fee land because Congress has not given the Department that authority.

Most importantly, purchasers assume that the consent of Congress is required before tribal fee land can be sold. The effect of all this is that the Lower Sioux Community is stymied. The wording of the INA seems to say that congressional permission is needed to sell fee land; the Justice Department acknowledges that; the Department of the Interior acknowledges that; Congress has acknowledged that; and purchasers acknowledge that. This bill will solve that problem for the Lower Sioux Indian Community. This is a matter of fairness.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2484.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHERWOOD. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1749, S. 613, and H.R. 2484, the three bills just debated.

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

There was no objection.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

HERITAGE AND HORIZONS: THE AFRICAN AMERICAN LEGACY AND THE CHALLENGES OF THE 21ST CENTURY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Madam Speaker, it is always a great opportunity for me to have opportunity to address the Congress in a special order, particularly when the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON) is the Speaker pro tempore.

Our theme today is Heritage and Horizons: The African American Legacy and the Challenges of the 21st Century. As we come to the close of the celebrated African American history month, it is a great opportunity for the Congressional Black Caucus to organize a special order to celebrate black history. I want to thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Chairman CLYBURN) for designating me to organize this special order.

I took up the mantle after my predecessor, the Congressman from the 11th Congressional District of Ohio, Congressman Louis Stokes, who had this responsibility for his 30 years in Congress.

The theme for this year's Black History Special Order is Heritage and Horizons: The African American Legacy and the Challenges of the 21st Century.

As we embark upon a new millennium, I believe it painful and powerful that this theme allows us to pay tribute to our past and allows us to make plans for our future. The question is how do we plan for our future. One way is to plan for our future by giving tribute to our past, learning the lessons of our past and paying tribute to our successes as a people.

I believe the past can serve as a blueprint for future generations on how to get things done.

There are many events that have shaped and defined the African American experience in America today that never should be forgotten. What should never be forgotten is the sacrifice that others have made to ensure future generations' success.

For that reason, I have chosen to highlight my predecessor, the former Representative, Congressman Louis Stokes. He retired from Congress on January 2, 1999. He currently serves as senior counsel at Squire, Sanders and Dempsey, a worldwide law firm based in Washington, D.C. He is also a member of the faculty at Case-Western Reserve University in Cleveland, Ohio, where he is a senior visiting scholar at the Mandel School of Applied Social Sciences.

On November 6, 1968, Louis Stokes was elected to the United States Congress on his first bid for public office.

By virtue of his election, he became the first African American Member of Congress from the State of Ohio. First sworn in at the 91st Congress, Congressman Stokes served 15 consecutive terms in the United States House of Representatives. When he retired at the end of the 105th Congress, he became the first African American in the history of the United States Congress to retire having completed 30 years in office.

In the 105th Congress, Representative Stokes was a member of the Committee on Appropriations where, by virtue of his seniority, he was the third-ranking minority member of the full committee and the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on VA, HUD and Independent Agencies. In addition, he served as a member of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services and Education.

He was the ninth Ranking Democratic Member of Congress. By virtue of his seniority, Congressman Stokes also served as the Dean of the Ohio Congressional Delegation. He is also a founding member of the Congressional Black Caucus and chaired the CBC Health Braintrust.

He was born February 23, 1925 in Cleveland, Ohio to the late Charles and Louise Stokes. His father died when he was a young boy and Louis and his brother, the late Ambassador Carl B. Stokes, were reared by their young widowed mother.

Stokes was educated in the Cleveland public schools, graduating from Central High School. Following 3 years in the United States Army, from 1943 to 1946, he returned to Cleveland and utilized the G.I. bill to attend Western Reserve University. He received his Doctor of Laws degree from Cleveland Marshall Law School in 1953.

Prior to his election to the United States Congress, Congressman Stokes practiced law for 14 years in Cleveland. He was chief trial counsel for the firm of Stokes, Character, Terry, Perry, Whitehead, Young and Davidson. As a practicing lawyer, Representative Stokes participated in three cases in the United States Supreme Court, including the landmark "stop and frisk" case of *Terry versus Ohio*.

Congressman Stokes' younger brother, the late Carl B. Stokes, made history in 1967 when he was elected mayor of Cleveland, serving with distinction as the first black mayor of a major American city. Carl Stokes also enjoyed a career as an award-winning broadcaster and municipal court judge. In 1994, he was appointed by President Bill Clinton as U.S. Ambassador to the Republic of Seychelles. Ambassador Stokes died in April 1996.

Louise Stokes, a proud mother who always encouraged her sons to get an education, lived to witness many of her sons' historic achievements. Prior to her death in 1978, she was the recipient of numerous awards, including Cleveland's "Woman of the Year" award in 1968 and Ohio's "Mother of the Year" award in 1969.

Let us talk a little bit about Congressman Louis Stokes' congressional career. In his first term in public office, he served as a member of the Committee on Education and Labor in the House, Committee on un-American Activities, later renamed the House Committee on Internal Security.

In his second term, he was appointed the first African American to sit on the Committee on Appropriations in the House. On February 8, 1972, Louis Stokes was elected as the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus. He served two consecutive terms.

In addition to his seat on the powerful Committee on Appropriations, on February 5, 1975, he was elected by the Democratic Caucus to serve on the newly formed House Committee on Budget. He was re-elected to the Committee on Budget twice, serving a total of 6 years.

On September 21, 1976, Representative Stokes was appointed by Speaker Carl Albert to serve on the House Select Committee on Assassinations. The committee had a mandate to conduct an investigation and study of the circumstances surrounding the deaths of President John F. Kennedy and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. On March 8, 1977, Speaker Thomas P. O'Neill appointed Congressman Stokes as chairman of this committee. On December 31, 1978, Congressman Stokes completed these historic investigations and filed with the House of Representatives 27 volumes of hearings, a final report, and recommendations for administrative and legislative reform.

In February of 1980, in the 96th Congress, Congressman Stokes was appointed by Speaker O'Neill to the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, also known as the Ethics Committee. In the 97th, 98th, and 102nd Congresses, he was elected chairman of this committee. Also, in the 101st Congress, Representative Stokes was appointed by Speaker Wright to serve on the Ethics Task Force.

In February of 1983, the 98th Congress, Representative Stokes was appointed by Speaker O'Neill to the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. In the 99th Congress, Representative Stokes was elected chairman of the Subcommittee on Program and Budget Authorization for the committee. In January of 1987, the 100th Congress, House Speaker Jim Wright appointed Congressman Stokes as chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. In the 100th Congress, Representative Stokes was also appointed to serve on the House Select Committee to Investigate Covert Arms Transactions with Iran, and the Pepper Commission on Comprehensive Health Care.

As a result of the 1990 census and the redistricting mandate in 1992, the 21st Congressional District of Ohio was redesignated as the 11th Congressional District. In the 103rd Congress, which commenced in January of 1993, Congressman Stokes was elected to chair

the House Committee on Appropriations Subcommittee on VA, HUD and Independent Agencies. He also served as a member of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services and Education, and the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia.

Congressman Stokes is married to Jeanette (Jay) Stokes. He has children: Shelley, Angela, Louis, and Lorene. Angela is an elected official in Cleveland in the Cleveland municipal court. Shelley and Louis C. are both involved in broadcasting, one in New York and the other in Michigan.

He has several grandchildren. He is a graduate of the Cleveland public schools, Case-Western Reserve University, and Cleveland Marshall College of Law where he received his doctor of law.

He has been given numerous designations and honors, among them, the 100 Most Influential Black Americans/Black Achievement Award. The Louis Stokes Bridge was named in his honor, which is a bridge over Lake Shore Boulevard over Euclid Creek; Louis Stokes Telecommunications Center/Cuyahoga Community College; the Central High School Hall of Fame; the Louis Stokes Community Center; the Louis Stokes Wing of the Cleveland Public Library. A street is called Stokes Boulevard in the city of Cleveland named after him and his brother. There is a Louis Stokes Health Sciences Center at Case-Western Reserve University. There is a Louis Stokes HUD Hall of Fame. He has been given the award by the National Minority Transplant Hall of Fame. There is a Louis Stokes Head Start Day Care Center. There is a Stokes Rapid Transit Station in Windermere. There is a Louis Stokes Health Sciences Library at Howard University. There is a Stokes Web site.

There is a Stokes Family Library and Museum, which is housed at the Cuyahoga Metropolitan Housing Authority in the area where Congressman Stokes grew up as a boy. There is a Louis Stokes Cleveland Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center. There is a Louis Stokes building at the National Institutes of Health.

He has received more than 23 honorary degrees from colleges and universities across this country.

I would like to particularly personally pay tribute to Congressman Louis Stokes. It is through his support and encouragement that I stand here on the floor of the House of Representatives today. I can only recall with great admiration all of the wonderful things that he did on my behalf and on behalf of the 11th Congressional District. For me to be able to stand, the daughter of a skycap for United Airlines and the daughter of a woman who worked in a factory, standing here as a Member of the House of Representatives, one of 39 African Americans who serve in the House of Representatives, and in fact the first African American woman to serve in the House of Representatives from the State of Ohio.

It gives me great pleasure to be able to recognize and give Congressman Stokes his roses while he can still smell them on this February 29, the year 2000, as the CBC honors Black History Month.

#### FORMER CONGRESSMAN LOUIS STOKES

Former Congressman Louis Stokes retired from Congress on January 2, 1999. He is currently Senior Counsel at Squire, Sanders and Dempsey L.L.P., a world-wide law firm based in Washington, D.C. He is also a member of the faculty at Case-Western Reserve University, Cleveland, Ohio, where he is Senior Visiting Scholar at the Mandel School of Applied Social Sciences.

On November 6, 1968, Louis Stokes was elected to the United States Congress on his first bid for public office. By virtue of his election, he became the first African American Member of Congress from the State of Ohio. First sworn in at the 91st Congress, Representative Stokes served fifteen consecutive terms in the United States House of Representatives. When he retired at the end of the 105th Congress, he became the first African American in the history of the U.S. Congress to retire having completed 30 years in office.

In the 105th Congress, Representative Stokes was a member of the Appropriations Committee where, by virtue of his seniority, he was the third ranking minority member of the full committee, and the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Veterans Affairs-Housing and Urban Development-Independent Agencies. In addition, he served as a member of the Subcommittee on Labor-Health and Human Services-Education. In the Congress, Representative Stokes ranked eleventh overall in House seniority. He was the ninth ranking Democratic Member of Congress. By virtue of his seniority, Congressman Stokes also served as Dean of the Ohio Congressional Delegation. He is also a founding member of the Congressional Black Caucus (CBC) and chaired the CBC Health Braintrust.

#### BACKGROUND

Congressman Stokes was born on February 23, 1925, in Cleveland, Ohio, to the late Charles and Louise Stokes. His father died when he was a young boy and Louis and his brother, the late Ambassador Carl B. Stokes, were reared by their young widowed mother. Stokes was educated in the Cleveland Public Schools, graduating from Central High School. Following three years in the United States Army from 1943 to 1946, he returned to Cleveland and utilized the G.I. Bill to attend Western Reserve University. He received his Doctor of Laws Degree from Cleveland Marshall Law School in 1953.

Prior to his election to the United States Congress, Congressman Stokes practiced law for fourteen years in Cleveland. He was chief trial counsel for the firm of Stokes, Character, Terry, Perry, Whitehead, Young and Davidson. As a practicing lawyer, Representative Stokes participated in three cases in the United States Supreme Court, including the landmark "stop and frisk" case of Terry v. Ohio.

Congressman Stokes' younger brother, the late Carl B. Stokes, made history in 1967 when he was elected Mayor of Cleveland, serving with distinction as the first black mayor of a major American city. Carl Stokes also enjoyed a career as an award-winning broadcaster and municipal court judge. In 1994, he was appointed by President Bill Clinton as U.S. Ambassador to the Republic of Seychelles. Ambassador Stokes died in April 1996. Louise Stokes, a proud mother who always encouraged her sons to get an education, lived to witness many of her sons'

historic achievements. Prior to her death in 1978, she was the recipient of numerous awards including Cleveland's "Woman of the Year" award in 1968 and Ohio's "Mother of the Year" award in 1969.

#### CONGRESSIONAL CAREER

During his first term in public office (91st Congress), Congressman Stokes served as a member of the Education and Labor Committee and the House Un-American Activities Committee, later re-named the House Internal Security Committee. In his second term in office (92nd Congress), he was appointed the first black Member ever to sit on the Appropriations Committee of the House. On February 8, 1972, Louis Stokes was elected as Chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus. He served two consecutive terms in this office. In addition to his seat on the powerful Appropriations Committee, on February 5, 1975, he was elected by the Democratic Caucus to serve on the newly formed Budget Committee of the House. He was re-elected to the Budget Committee twice, serving a total of six years.

On September 21, 1976 (94th Congress) Representative Stokes was appointed by Speaker Carl Albert to serve on the House Select Committee on Assassinations. The Committee had a mandate to conduct an investigation and study of the circumstances surrounding the deaths of President John F. Kennedy and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. On March 8, 1977, Speaker Thomas P. O'Neill appointed Congressman Stokes as Chairman of this committee. On December 31, 1978, Congressman Stokes completed these historic investigations and filed with the House of Representatives 27 volumes of hearings, a Final Report and Recommendations for Administrative and Legislative Reform.

In February of 1980 (96th Congress), Congress Stokes was appointed by Speaker O'Neill to the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct (Ethics Committee). In the 97th, 98th, and 102nd Congresses, he was elected Chairman of this committee. Also, in the 101st Congress, Representative Stokes was appointed by Speaker Wright to serve on the Ethics Task Force.

In February of 1983 (98th Congress), Representative Stokes was appointed by Speaker O'Neill to the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. In the 99th Congress, Representative Stokes was elected Chairman of the Subcommittee on Program and Budget Authorization for the committee. In January of 1987 (100th Congress), House Speaker Jim Wright appointed Congressman Stokes as Chairman of the Intelligence Committee. In the 100th Congress, Representative Stokes was also appointed to serve on the House Select Committee to Investigate Covert Arms Transactions with Iran, and the Pepper Commission on Comprehensive Health Care.

As a result of the 1990 census and the redistricting mandate, in 1992 the 21st Congressional District of Ohio was re-designated as the 11th Congressional District. In the 103rd Congress, which commenced in January of 1993, Congressman Stokes was elected to chair the House Appropriations Subcommittee on VA-HUD-Independent Agencies. He also served as a member of the Subcommittee on Labor-Health and Human Services-Education and the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia.

#### PERSONAL INFORMATION

Birthdate: February 23, 1925.  
 Wife: Jeanette (Jay) Stokes.  
 Children: Shelley, Angela, Louis C. and Lorene.

Grandchildren: Brett S., Eric S., and Grant W. Hammond; Kelley C. and Kimberly L. Stokes; Alexandra F. and Nicolette S. Thompson.

Education: Cleveland Public Schools (Giddings and Central High School), Western

Reserve University, Cleveland Marshall Law School (The Cleveland State University)—Doctor of Jurisprudence.

#### DESIGNATIONS AND HONORS

Throughout his tenure in the United States Congress, Representatives Stokes has played a pivotal role in the quest for civil rights, equality and social and economic justice. He is the recipient of countless awards and honors which recognize his strong leadership and commitment.

100 Most Influential Black Americans/Black Achievement Award. Each year since 1971, Congressman Stokes has been named by Ebony Magazine as one of the "100 Most Influential Black Americans." In 1979, he was nominated by Ebony in three categories for the Second Annual American Black Achievement Awards. His nomination was based upon his becoming the first African American to head a major congressional investigation and to preside over nationally televised hearings which revealed new facts on the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and President John F. Kennedy.

William Dawson Award. Congressman Stokes has twice received the Congressional Black Caucus' William L. Dawson Award. In 1980, Congressman Stokes was presented the prestigious award in recognition of his "unique leadership in the development of legislation." In 1994, he received the second Dawson Award for "significant research, organizational and leadership contributions in the development of legislation that addresses the needs of minorities in the United States.

Louis Stokes Bridge. On June 24 1988, the Board of County Commissioners Cuyahoga County dedicated the Lake Shore Boulevard Bridge over Euclid Creek as the "Louis Stokes Bridge," in recognition of Congressman Stokes' leadership in public service, and his support for federal funding to support road and bridge improvement projects.

Louis Stokes Telecommunications Center/Cuyahoga Community College. On September 24, 1988, Cuyahoga Community College designated the Louis Stokes Telecommunications Center in the Unified Technologies Center in honor of Congressman Stokes.

Central High School Hall of Fame. On March 30, 1990, Congressman Stokes' alma mater, Central High School (now Central Middle School) recognized his historic achievements by presenting him with the school's Alumnus Award and including him into the school's Hall of Fame. On that occasion, the school also dedicated its auditorium as the "Louis Stokes Auditorium."

Louis Stokes Community Center. On September 5, 1992, in recognition of the achievements of Ohio's first and only African American to serve in the United States Congress, the community center in Outhwaite Homes was renamed as the "Louis Stokes Community Center" by the Cuyahoga Metropolitan Housing Authority.

Louis Stokes Wing/Cleveland Public Library. On January 19, 1994, the Cleveland Public Library Board of Trustees unanimously adopted a resolution to name the new Cleveland Public Library East Wing in honor of Congressman Stokes. The resolution stated that his career "has extended into areas of law, civil rights, support for education and public libraries, and congressional, national and local leadership on a wide range of issues important to the Cleveland area and the nation."

Stokes Boulevard—Cleveland, Ohio. To mark Congressman Stokes' historic achievements in the United States Congress, the City of Cleveland voted on June 6, 1994 to designate East 107th Street and portion of

Fairhill Road as "Stokes Boulevard." Appropriate signs mark this special salute to Congressman Stokes.

Case Western Reserve University/Louis Stokes Health Sciences Center. Case Western Reserve University honored Congressman Stokes on June 24, 1994 with the dedication of the "Louis Stokes Health Science Center." Congressman Stokes was lauded for his work "to improve the lives of all Americans and to ensure the full participation of members of minority groups in the many initiatives in health, science, education, and public welfare."

Louis Stokes HUD "Hall of Fame." On April 5, 1995, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development inducted Congressman Stokes into the nation's first "Public Housing Hall of Fame." Located in HUD's Washington, D.C. Headquarters, the Hall of Fame recognizes Congressman Stokes as a strong advocate of safe and affordable housing for America's families.

National Minority Transplant Hall of Fame. On September 18, 1996, Congressman Stokes was chosen for inclusion in the first National Minority Transplant Hall of Fame. The designation recognizes Stokes' strong leadership in the area of organ transplant education and awareness.

Louis Stokes Head Start Day Care Center. Dedicated during the weekend of June 20, 1997, the "Louis Stokes Head Start Center" was built specifically to serve the needs of pre-school children in the Metropolitan Cleveland Area. The Center was named for Congressman Stokes for his dedication in fighting for the rights of Cleveland's disadvantaged.

Stokes Rapid Transit Station/Windermere. On November 17, 1997, Cleveland's Regional Transit Authority designated the Windermere Rapid Transit Station as the "Louis Stokes Station at Windermere" in honor of Congressman Stokes for his support for public transit.

Louis Stokes Health Sciences Library/Howard University. Howard University voted to recognize Congressman Stokes for his strong leadership in the United States Congress. On August 11, 1998, Howard University paid tribute to "one of our nation's most prolific Members of Congress" by naming their new health sciences library "The Louis Stokes Health Science Center."

Stokes Web Site. On August 11, 1998, top executives from Cleveland's business community announced that a web site will be set up in Congressman Stokes' name to inform young people of internships, scholarships and job training opportunities. The site will be called the "Living Legacy Project: Aim High." Stokes was known for autographing photos for young students with the phrase "Aim High!"

The Stokes Family Library and Museum. Unveiled during Cuyahoga Metropolitan Housing Authority's Louis Stokes Day 1998, on September 12, 1998, Congressman Stokes' boyhood home in the Outhwaite housing projects will be transformed into the "Stokes Family Library and Museum." The Library will serve as a home for many of the Congressman's awards and memorabilia for organizations around the country.

Louis Stokes Cleveland Department of Veteran Affairs Medical Center. On October 6, 1998, on the floor of the United States House of Representatives, Congressman Stokes was honored with the naming of the Cleveland Department of Veteran Affairs Medical Center in his honor. The designation recognizes a lawmaker who worked tirelessly on behalf of the nation's veterans and other citizens throughout his 30-year career.

Louis Stokes Building, National Institutes of Health. On October 20, 1998, the House of Representatives voted for passage of an Om-

nibus Appropriations Bill to fund the Departments of Labor-Health and Human Services-Education. The bill includes language designating Building #50, the Consolidated Laboratories Building on the campus of the National Institutes of Health, in honor of Congressman Stokes. The renaming honors Congressman Stokes for his staunch leadership on the health front.

Honorary Degrees. Congressman Stokes is the recipient of 23 honorary Degrees from colleges and universities across the nation. The degrees were conferred upon Congressman Stokes in recognition of his national leadership and strong commitment to public service.

Madam Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to yield to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) for yielding to me. Even more so, I thank her for the leadership she is showing in making sure that the month of February does not go by without yet another black history celebration in the name of her predecessor, I must say who was always in charge of this particular feature on the House floor when he was here.

□ 1445

And you follow in his footsteps in many ways, I say to the gentlewoman from Ohio, and this is a wonderful one which both honors him and to make sure that the Congressional Black Caucus is once again heard on this floor for Black History Month and all that it stands for.

If I may say to the gentlewoman, I would like to discuss two subjects this afternoon related to black history. One is some finished business that this House finished only this month, and the other is tragically unfinished.

The finished business has to do with a bill that was passed on the floor on February 16 that will allow the home of Carter G. Woodson to become a national historic site under the National Park Service. The reason that this was so important is that Carter G. Woodson is the father of black history, the man who discovered black historiography, the second black person to receive a Ph.D. from Harvard in the early part of this century, and yet his house, which is a gorgeous Victorian house, stands closed, virtually boarded up.

So here we are celebrating Black History Month every year and right there in the Shaw district, a historic part of the district which was the virtual seat of black America, is the home of the man who is responsible for what was, when I was a child called Negro History Week and has developed into Black History Month, closed. With the bill that the House passed just before we recessed, Carter G. Woodson's home will be open to the public the way Frederick Douglass' home is open to the public in this city and the way that Mary McLeod Bethune's home is open to the public, and will be kept open under the National Park Service, as it deserves.

This man was of immense importance. Without uncovering black his-

tory we could never have gotten to the civil rights remedies, because the portrayals of African Americans were so pervasively stereotyped and negative after slavery, with Jim Crow and all that it stood for, that Carter G. Woodson's work looms much larger than life. He started the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History, which continues his work today. They would like to occupy this house when it is fully renovated. He used his house not only to live but to train researchers. It is a glorious history in and of itself.

May I say to the gentlewoman, I would like to remark on some unfinished business having to do with African Americans. This is a majority black city. Historically it was the capital of black intellectual life because of Howard University and because freed and runaway slaves often found their way here. The Capitol where we now debate was built with the help of slave labor. A glorious kind of intellectual leadership emanated from this city. It always had a large black population, probably because it was so close to the South and, therefore, there was a large segment of freed slaves and a large segment of runaway slaves, one of whom was my great grandfather.

This city has been the home of Benjamin Banneker, who of course helped design the city, and of many great African Americans; Charles Drew, who is responsible for the discovery of the blood bank and the use of stored blood; Duke Ellington, whose 100th birthday we celebrated last year; Frederick Douglass; Mary McLeod Bethune; Senator Edward Brooke, who graduated from the same high school I graduated from, Dunbar High School; and yet, Madam Speaker, this is the only part of the United States where black and white people do not enjoy the full privileges of citizenship.

This used to be the place where people from the South came escaping the harshness of segregation and terrible discrimination. We who live in the District, particularly we who are native Washingtonians, have seen the whole of the South come into its own, with people able to vote, as models for self-government throughout the South, and yet in this town, where the majority of the population is African American, there is still not the same basic rights that blacks throughout the South have finally been able to win.

I am the only representative of the District of Columbia. Although I won the right to vote on the House floor, that vote was taken from me when the majority assumed power. We do not have a full voting representative in this House. We have no voting representative in this House. Does this not sound like the Old South? This is the new capital. This is the capital of the United States I am talking about.

There is rage in this town, particularly because more than 60 percent of the people are African Americans and have seen their folks down home come

into full citizenship, while in this town we still exist without the basic rights that everybody else takes for granted. We saw the Congressional Black Caucus expanded by 50 percent, largely from people from the old Confederate States, sent here by whites and African Americans; and yet we cannot send a full voting Member to this House, even though we pay full Federal income tax.

What we have done is to sue in court. And I say to my colleagues, every time an attempt is made to attach a rider to the appropriation of the District of Columbia, consisting of our money not these other Members, democracy is defamed in the United States. And that is why my colleagues will see me on this floor and will always see me on this floor as long as I am a Member of this House reminding my fellow colleagues of that defamation of democracy. The court suit we have brought intends to rectify this situation, since we have not been able to get it rectified in this body.

Some have said that the reason the District has never had its full rights is because of its large African American population. I am not so sure of that. Until the 1970s, this city was majority white. The city, the Jim Crow-segregated city in which I grew up, the segregated schools that I went to, was in a majority white city, and this body was willing to deny those whites their full rights in the House, the Senate, and their full home rule as much as they are willing to deny it to blacks.

And yet there may well be something to the notion that the city always had a large black population. If we look at the history books, that seems to have influenced the way the Congress looked at the District of Columbia. Well, the Congress needs to take that taint off of it. It needs to grant my white constituents and my black constituents the same rights that their white constituents, their Hispanic constituents, and their black constituents have.

Until that happens, until that happens I will not, I will not let an appropriate opportunity go by to remind this body that we have not lived up to our stated ideals. One appropriate time to inject that reminder into the record is during Black History Month, in a largely black city where black citizens and white citizens and citizens of every background wait, no longer patiently, but wait for the same rights that many other Americans have.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Madam Speaker, as part of our special hour I would now like to yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. Cummings).

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me, and I also want to thank the gentlewoman from Washington, D.C. for her words.

There is absolutely no question that she is absolutely right, and we in the Congressional Black Caucus and many others in this great body stand with

her and behind her. And I want to commend her for constantly keeping an issue that is so significant and very important, and one that shows the contradictions of this country and what we are doing in this Congress, shows it up so clearly. I want to thank her for all that she does every day to keep us aware of the situation that we find ourselves in in the very place where we write the laws. So I thank her.

I want to go on to say, Madam Speaker, that this month, through a series of Dear Colleague Letters, I saluted several famous African American Marylanders, and today I rise again to recognize African Americans from my home district of Baltimore, Maryland, for their significant contributions to the American political and educational process, and for distinguishing themselves as the first African Americans to achieve in their chosen professions.

The recognition of these individuals comes as we nationally observe Black History Month. This year's theme, Heritage and Horizons, the African American Legacy and the Challenges of the 21st Century, is most appropriate to these Baltimoreans who, by accepting the challenges and overcoming the obstacles of their day, have prepared us to meet the challenges facing us in this new millennium.

I cite Roberta B. Sheridan, the daughter of a life-long resident of Baltimore and educated as a teacher. She was dedicated to public education. Even though she was denied the opportunity to teach in the black public schools, because African Americans at that time were deemed unqualified, she persisted in her efforts. With the help of the African American community, a campaign was waged to allow African Americans to teach in black public schools. This campaign resulted in the appointment of Roberta Sheridan in 1888 as the first African American teacher in a Baltimore City public school. Indeed, in the State of Maryland.

Her goal was to ensure that African Americans received a quality education, and she sought to end the educational inadequacies fostered by white teachers who dominated the education of blacks following the Civil War.

I also cite Harry S. Cummings, no relation, from Baltimore's ward 11, one of the two first African American males to graduate from the University of Maryland School of Law in 1889. Mr. Cummings' career focused on the legal, educational, and political professions. He was known as the father of the Colored Polytechnic Institute because he introduced a measure for establishing this educational facility and other high schools for African Americans in this area.

Politically he was successful in becoming the first African American to be elected to the Baltimore City Council in 1890. In 1904, he had the distinction of seconding the nomination of Theodore Roosevelt at the Republican National Convention in Chicago. He re-

ceived acclaim for his speech. In 1907, he was again elected to a 4-year term to the Baltimore City Council, representing the 17th ward. He served two additional terms in 1911 and 1915. As a fellow University of Maryland graduate, I am pleased to honor him.

I also cite Thurgood Marshall, lawyer and product of a Baltimore black middle class and the impetus for the Civil Rights movement in the United States. Beginning his career, he served as counsel to the Baltimore branch of the NAACP. He argued cases before the United States Supreme Court 32 times, winning 29 cases. He is probably most famous for *Brown versus Board of Education*, which we won in 1954.

□ 1500

With this success, doors were opened ending segregated schools and educational inequalities for African Americans. Using the legal process, Thurgood Marshall's legacy was to ensure that African Americans would no longer be excluded from participating in the American fabric because of discrimination.

When asked for a definition of "equal," Marshall stated, "Equal means getting the same thing at the same time in the same place."

Thurgood Marshall's achievements culminated in his appointment as the Nation's first African American Supreme Court justice on August 30, 1967. Because of his achievements, I have urged adoption of my resolution urging the United States Postal Service to issue a commemorative stamp in his honor because he is immediately deserving of this recognition.

Finally, I cite Parren J. Mitchell, a native Baltimorean, who represents several firsts. He was the first African American to graduate from the University of Maryland Graduate School with a master's degree in sociology. Coming from a family involved in local politics and community affairs, he embarked upon an educational, human resources, and political career. He was Maryland's first black Representative to the United States House of Representatives from Baltimore's 7th Congressional District and one of my predecessors to this body.

Elected to the 92d Congress beginning in 1971, he remained in the House for seven succeeding Congresses until 1987. He enjoyed a successful Congressional career, serving as chairman of the Committee on Small Business for the 97th, 98th, and 99th Congresses. He was instrumental in the formation of the House Black Caucus, now known as the Congressional Black Caucus, to bring to the attention of Congress and the President of the United States legislative concerns primarily affecting African Americans.

I am honored to recognize these African Americans from my district of Baltimore who were the firsts, who dared to meet the challenges of their day, who paved the way and opened doors to ensure equal opportunities for African

Americans and their succeeding generations. Indeed, they represent a legacy that gives us hope and confirmation that African Americans continue to succeed and contribute to this wonderful American structure.

As we live today, as we look at our pasts, and as we look to our future, we can take pride in the rich heritage that these individuals have bequeathed to all of us as Americans.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Madam Speaker, it gives me great pleasure at this time to yield to the gentleman from Chicago (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman very much for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I want to first of all thank the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. JONES) for organizing this special order and certainly for giving me the opportunity to share in it with her and the gentlewoman from Washington, D.C. (Ms. NORTON) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS).

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the rich legacy and heritage that our ancestors have contributed to American life. I want to use the few minutes that I have to pay homage to the African American church.

There are many outstanding religious institutions in the district that I live and represent, notwithstanding even the one that I hold membership in, the New Galilee Missionary Baptist Church, under the leadership of the Reverend Charlie Murray, where they let me serve as a member of the deacon board sometimes when I am there.

But I really want to use the few minutes that I have to pay homage to two other churches, Quinn Chapel African Methodist Episcopal Church, under the leadership of Reverend Thomas Higgonbotham, and the First Baptist Congregational Church, under the leadership of Dr. Arthur Griffin, both located in the 7th Congressional District of Illinois.

These two churches have followed the historical tradition of the black church as being the most stable, viable, and reliable entity in black life. Throughout slavery, segregation, black codes, and injustice, the church has served as the major instrument for hope and for change. It was the black church that produced some of our greatest leaders, educators, theologians, scientists, and administrators.

Quinn Chapel was formed in 1847 under the leadership of the Reverend George Johnson. The church was named in honor of the renowned Bishop William Paul Quinn. Bishop Quinn was one of the most prolific circuit-riding preachers in the 1800s who personally organized 97 AME churches, prayer bands, and temperance societies.

It is interesting to note that Quinn Chapel's first community project focused on the abolition of slavery; and, ironically, Quinn Chapel became a stop on the Underground Railroad. For over 150 years during race riots, depressions,

recessions, the great Chicago Fire of 1871, and a myriad of other natural disasters and human crises, African Americans came to Quinn Chapel for protection, information, support, and inspiration.

Quinn Chapel was the birthplace of Provident Hospital of Chicago, organized by Dr. Daniel Hale Williams in 1891. Dr. Williams was the first surgeon to successfully operate on a human heart, and Provident was the first United States hospital where African American nurses could be trained and employed.

In addition, it was Quinn Chapel who initiated in 1898 the first known retirement home for African Americans. Most recently, Quinn Chapel was one of the locations that hosted a regional Congressional Black Caucus hearing on law enforcement misconduct.

Similarly, the First Baptist Congregational Church, formally known as the Union Park Congregational Church, was founded in 1851 under the leadership of Philo Carpenter. Philo Carpenter and a group of 48 abolitionist members left the parent church, the Third Presbyterian, over the issue of slavery. The departing members felt that the General Assembly had not adopted a strong enough position against slavery. Ironically, the church also served as a stop along the Underground Railroad.

Carpenter was Chicago's first drug-gist, opening a drugstore in a small log home on the bank of the river at the point that is now Lake Street. In addition to meeting the congregants' need for spirituality, the church was instrumental in forming several institutions of higher learning.

Among the black colleges founded by this church include Dillard University in Louisiana, Fisk University in Tennessee, LeMoyne-Owen College in Tennessee, Talladega College in Alabama, Tougaloo College in Mississippi, and Huston-Tillotson College in Texas.

Obviously, these colleges represent some of the finest institutions of higher education. And so this church like Quinn Chapel has been instrumental in shaping the minds of some of our greatest thinkers and leaders.

I attended a meeting just last week of another church at the Rock of Ages Missionary Baptist Church in Maywood, Illinois, where Reverend Marvin Wiley had more than a thousand residents come out to talk about community development.

I also take this opportunity to highlight the work of Reverend Bill Winston at the Living Word Christian Center in Forest Park, Illinois.

Madam Speaker, these churches have all helped to set the standards by which other institutions have learned to live. Even today, they continue to inspire through the three cornerstones of life: faith, hope, and love. Because of the contributions of Quinn Chapel AME and First Baptist Congregational, Chicago is indeed a better place in which to live. But more importantly, the

United States of America and people throughout the world have benefited from the shining light that has emanated from these institutions.

And so I thank my colleague for the opportunity to share this moment with her and again commend her for putting this special order together.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) and all my other colleagues for supporting me in this process.

I am expecting a couple more of my colleagues, so I am going to proceed with a few more things that I have in front of me until they get here.

It is appropriate today that I recognize or memorialize from the 11th Congressional District of Ohio a gentleman by the name of Gus Joiner. Mr. Joiner's funeral is today at the Second Tabernacle Baptist Church in Cleveland, Ohio. Unfortunately, I could not be there. But it would be appropriate at this time that I talk a little bit about Mr. Joiner right here on the floor of the Congress.

"Gus Joiner, a former union organizer," and this comes from the obituary section of the Cleveland Plain Dealer, "who became chairman of the Legislative Committee of the Federation of Retired Workers in Cleveland, died Friday at Hospice of the Western Reserve.

The 90-year-old Cleveland resident spent his life fighting unfair labor practices, racism and injustice. He also encouraged others to stand up for their rights.

Mr. Joiner, who worked for the Euclid Road Machinery Co. from the 1940s to the 1970s, once went to court to force the independent union at the company to allow non-Caucasians into its ranks. Later, he was instrumental in bringing his fellow workers under the umbrella of the United Auto Workers as Local 426.

After retiring in 1976, he joined the Federation of Retired Workers and spoke out on behalf of senior citizens throughout Greater Cleveland. He showed up at Cleveland City Council committee meetings to share his views on pending legislation and attended hearings to protest the rising cost of utilities.

His most recent crusade was to preserve Madonna Hall, an inner-city nursing home, as a charitable asset of the State of Ohio. Mr. Joiner, chairman of the nursing home's board until stepping down from the unpaid position in 1997, led the trustees' battle against attempts by the home's landlords to claim ownership and sell the nursing home.

"He was the crusader," said Mary Davis, the lawyer who represented him in a lawsuit filed in conjunction with the case. "He had a sense of what was right and what was fair. It's not that often you see somebody willing to risk themselves for what's right or put themselves on the line for what they believe in. He was a person of such extraordinary faith that everything is going to work out OK. When you look at the difficulty of his life, he turned to joy, thanksgiving and celebration rather than bitterness."

Mr. Joiner, an Alabama native, was a teenager when he started working at a coal company's coke yard in Virginia. He moved on to Chicago to work in the stockyards, but was laid off during the Depression. For a while, he hopped freight trains and rode the rails in search of work.

In the 1930s, he joined relatives in West Virginia, where he worked in the coal mines and organized labor unions under volatile circumstances. As a local officer and organizer with the United Mine Workers out of Fairmount, W. Va., he once chaired the speakers' platform with legendary UMW President John L. Lewis at a state convention. Mr. Joiner also worked undercover to help organize unions in the western Pennsylvania communities of Johnstown and Uniontown.

During World War II, he worked in the Navy yard in Norfolk, Va. By the mid-1940s, he was in Cleveland and working at Euclid Road Machinery.

Mr. Joiner considered voting not only a right, but a responsibility. He voted in every primary and general election for 66 years, including the general election of November 1999.

He had been church treasurer, Audit Committee chairman and trustees secretary at the Second Tabernacle Baptist Church in Cleveland, where he was a member for more than 50 years. In 1972, he was named the parish's Man of the Year. He also was a trustee of the United Black Fund.

When his children were younger, Mr. Joiner participated in PTA activities at John Hay High School, where he complained about the better resources given to the white West Side schools.

"He was an advocate for us if we had any trouble or problem at school," said his daughter, Margaret of Cleveland. "That same zeal he used to make sure the little person wasn't trampled, he used to defend his children."

Mr. Joiner and his wife, Mildred, who died 15 years ago, raised seven daughters and a son.

In addition to Margaret, Mr. Joiner is survived by daughters, Mary Heard, Betty Pittman, Barbara, Victoria and Kathryn, all of Cleveland, and Carolyn Williams of Albany, N.Y.; son, Franklin of Cleveland; 12 grandchildren; 14 great-grandchildren; and a sister.

I stand here with pride, even on the day of the memorial services of Mr. Joiner, to talk about this wonderful 90-year-old man that I knew all the time that I grew up in the city of Cleveland, as well as part of my public life. I am glad that I had the opportunity to get to know him as well as to memorialize him in the RECORD of the United States Congress.

□ 1515

Madam Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to yield to the gentlewoman from Indiana (Ms. CARSON).

Ms. CARSON. I thank the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) a member of this august body for whom I have the greatest admiration and the respect for in terms of her commitment to justice and equality for all people. I am very happy that my distinguished colleague has allowed me to be just a very brief part of this black history celebration in the month of February that was inspired by Carter G. Woodson many years ago, first as the Negro History Week, if you will, and later extended to a whole month.

It is ironic, I believe, that it is in the shortest month of the year, that is, the month of February, given that we have so many virtues to extol of so many African Americans who have done a yeo-

man's job in building this great Nation in which we all enjoy freedom. Very briefly, let me pay a special tribute to a young man, a young man who at the age of 108 years old just last year made his transition, Dr. John Morton-Finney.

At the time of his transition he was believed to be the oldest practicing attorney in the whole United States. But even more importantly, John Morton-Finney was the first teacher to join the staff of Crispus Attucks High School when it was opened in 1927, an African American school in my district for which I am a proud graduate that was built on the bedlam of racism but indeed produced some of the most outstanding scholars and noted sportsmen that this country has ever known.

John Morton-Finney finally had the education center in Indianapolis named for him after a year of my insistence that began because John Morton-Finney's work, his life, his legacy is a hallmark in terms of the contributions of African Americans in my particular district; and it stands there as a beacon of hope, a beacon of testimony, a beacon of illustration of what people can be if they decide that that is what they want to be.

John Morton-Finney had over 30 earned degrees. He headed up the language department. He was a quasi-scientist, quasi-inventor and just a noble, noble individual. I am so happy that our school board in Indianapolis finally got around to paying due where due was certainly earned because in the course of an ordinary life, many of us would leave some things undone, but in the life of John Morton-Finney it is a challenge to figure out what in the world it was that he did not do or what it was that he left unaccomplished and that is merely one of the qualities of his life so worth celebrating, especially in this month of African American history celebration for their contributions. I want to thank my colleagues that preceded me and thank the gentlewoman from Ohio specifically for bringing this to the floor of the United States Congress, to the ears and eyes of America and certainly for allowing little old me from Indianapolis, Indiana to have just an infinitesimally small part of this very vital process.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. I would like to thank my colleague for being so modest but as she sits here she is the one who had the idea of awarding Rosa Parks the Gold Medal.

Madam Speaker, I await the chairman of the CBC, and so I have a poem that I am going to attempt to do very quickly in his absence. The author is Gloria Wade-Gayles. The poem is entitled *And The Women Gathered*. I think it is appropriate that I do this poem right now because it talks about black history and then we are on the brink of the month of March, which happens to be Women's History Month as well.

I want to give my best at doing this piece of poetry. I would also like to give appropriate credit to my former

chief of staff, Marcia Fudge, the national president of Delta Sigma Theta Sorority Inc., who is now the mayor of Warrensville Heights, Ohio. It is as a result of her love of poetry that I even learned about this particular poem. I think Gloria Wade-Gayles does a fabulous job of writing. It is entitled *And the Women Gathered*.

AND THE WOMEN GATHERED

(By Gloria Wade-Gayles)

And the women gathered.  
 And the women gathered.  
 And the women gathered.  
 Thin women  
 Stout women  
 Short women  
 Tall women  
 Young women  
 Not so young women  
 Flat chested women  
 Big bosomed women  
 Women with blue eyes  
 Green eyes  
 Brown eyes  
 Women with silky hair  
 Curly hair  
 Bleached hair  
 Permed hair  
 Graying hair  
 And the women gathered.  
 Coming by planes  
 Buses  
 Vans  
 Cars  
 Trains  
 And strong feet never tired  
 To gather for freedom  
 Married women  
 Divorced women  
 Single women  
 Widowed women  
 The Women Gathered  
 Cocoa  
 Cream  
 Nut brown  
 Beige  
 Caramel  
 Fudge  
 Blackberry black  
 As different as the stars that grace the night  
 The women gathered  
 As one constellation.  
 And the world took notice  
 That women are warriors  
 (Always have been even in the beginning)  
 And so they gathered as women will  
 In the very eye of the storm  
 Pushing against its fury  
 With their own  
 And the world took notice  
 That women birth babies  
 And revolutions  
 The women gathered  
 Ten thousand Rosas inspired by one  
 You saw them.  
 You saw them.  
 You saw them.  
 You saw them.  
 The world saw them.  
 Montage from the movement: Headlines  
 Montgomery, Alabama  
 December 1, 1955, Rosa Parks, a seamstress  
 in Montgomery, Alabama refused to  
 surrender her seat to a white man when  
 ordered by a local bus driver. The  
 Montgomery bus boycott begins.  
 Blacks walk, walk, and walk for free-  
 dom and dignity.  
 Women were there.  
 Greensboro, North Carolina  
 February 1, 1960. Students sit in at lunch  
 counters and are refused service. Re-  
 turn. Are arrested.  
 A wave of sit-ins spreads to 15 cities in five  
 southern States.

Women were there

May 4, 1961. The freedom rides begin. Blacks and whites ride together on a chartered bus. Savage beatings, arson, legal harassment.

Women were there.

Birmingham, April 3, 1963.

Bull Connor turns on water hoses and unleashes ferocious dogs. Physical violence. Mass arrests.

Bombings.

Women were there.

Birmingham, September 15, 1963.

Four young black girls are killed in church bombing. Mississippi, summer of 1964

Civil rights activists, blacks and whites invade the State, registering voters establishing freedom Schools.

The South.

During the course of one year, 80 people were physically assaulted, 30 buildings bombed, 1,000 arrested and five murdered.

Women were there.

Throughout the movement,

Women sang the songs passionately.

"We shall not. We shall not be moved.

"Woke up this morning with my mind stayed on freedom.

"Ain't gonna let nobody turn me round, turn me round.

"And before I'll be a slave, I'll be buried in my grave, and go home to the Lord and be free."

And the women gathered.

In need of empowerment for themselves but they gathered to change the South.

They gathered because women do not sleep through nightmares.

We shall not call the roll.

It is as long as the Nile

Where civilization was born.

We shall not call the roll.

The women wore their courage

And not their names.

It is that way with women.

And so we say.

Women warriors

Trailblazers

Torchbearers

Activists

Thinkers

Movers and shakers

Dreamers

Revolutionaries

We salute you.

And we promise

That we will not

Sleep through the nightmares

Of homelessness, unemployment,

Poverty, violence against children, women, men, Ignorance

Oppression of all kinds.

We promise that

A new generation

Of women

Will gather.

We are that generation.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Speaker, as we celebrate Black History Month, there is much to celebrate. The economic climate is improving significantly. African American businesses are borrowing, investing, and building capital at record levels. For African Americans, median household income is up, the poverty rate is sharply down, and the unemployment rate is down to the lowest level on record (8.1 percent).

However, despite our economic progress and electoral gains, we still have not achieved all we can. In addition to the disparity of income in our country, one important area we must address is environmental justice—a significant human rights issue for this century. The issue of environmental justice stems from the concern that impoverished communities,

frequently comprised of people of color, suffer larger and disproportionate environmental risks compared to other Americans. The environmental justice movement also concerns inequality, including wealth and income disparities, inadequate schools, gaps in medical services, uneven economic opportunities and investment inequities.

In recent years, America has significantly improved its air and water quality and reduced waste disposal and toxic chemicals. However, the improvements have been uneven and the benefits skewed. These factors cause troubling health problems and threaten all our other progress. The fight for a healthy environment has been led by many local grassroots leaders. In San Francisco, Linda Richardson has helped lead the fight to address these problems and achieve environmental justice. Mrs. Richardson founded Southeast Alliance for Environmental Justice, a San Francisco based environmental organization. She also is a member of the San Francisco Planning Commission and an expert on the impact of environmental pollutants on poor communities.

Her work has demonstrated the importance of implementing safe, healthy, and equitable environmental policies to bring about environmental justice. Thanks to this grassroots work, Americans now realize that it is no longer tolerable for pollution and environmental toxins to prey heavily on our Nation's vulnerable population, including impoverished Americans; minorities; and our children.

Despite this realization, too many still take our Nation's environmental health for granted. For example, each year, more than 2.2 billion pounds of pesticides are used on crops, lawns, and public spaces. Consumers Union reports that many children are eating fruits and vegetables with unsafe levels of pesticide residues. This residue is dangerous and plagues our children at every meal. Our children are our most important resource.

Mrs. Richardson is committed to ensuring that our civil rights include the right to live in a clean and healthy environment. I commend her work and believe that a nation that preserves its environmental health establishes the foundation for a healthy, stable, and prosperous society. To complement the work of grassroots leaders, my colleagues joined me to request an increased budget for the Environmental Protection Agency to employ trained staff with a civil rights background. Our vision cannot be achieved without the combined force of private and public sector work toward the same goals.

To commemorate Black History Month, we should join together to organize, educate, and fight for better environmental, health, education, and economic outcomes for all Americans. While we work to adequately fund enforcement activities and implement safe environmental policies, we must also demand funding initiatives in infant mortality, heart disease, AIDS, immunizations, cancer screening and management to eliminate racial health disparities. Let's follow Linda's success and work to implement a more progressive vision that eliminates environmental injustice.

Mr. BISHOP. Madam Speaker, first, I appreciate the opportunity to join my colleagues in recognizing Black History Month, and I thank Congresswoman, JONES for arranging this year's Special Order to remember the far-reaching role that black Americans have played through the centuries in making our

country what she was, what she is, and what she will be.

Our topic is, "Heritage and Horizons: The African American Legacy and the Challenges of the 21st Century."

This is a big subject!

The legacy is certainly big—as so is the challenge!

Historian Benjamin Quarles has pointed out in his ground-breaking work on black history that, except for native American Indians, blacks are the country's oldest ethnic minority. In fact, the roots of black Americans sink deeper in the histories of the 13 original colonies than any other group from across the Atlantic.

America was born in diversity, and many groups have played a part in the country's phenomenal growth and development. And the part played by Americans of African descent has been huge. We are just now beginning to understand the impact that black America has had on every period in the country's history.

It's an historic fact that America could not have emerged as a great world industrial power as quickly or as forcefully as she did without the presence of a skilled black labor force, or without the contributions made by black Americans in every field, including the sciences, technology, exploration, business, religion, government and politics, the military, the arts, and in all aspects of our society.

As I took the floor this evening, I found myself thinking of Henry Flipper.

Some of you will recognize the name Henry Flipper—who was born in Thomasville, Georgia, which is located in an area of southwest Georgia that I have the privilege of representing—is remembered as the first black graduate of West Point, who went on to serve with distinction as a young military officer on the western frontier, and who was wrongly forced out of the service on the basis of false charges, even though he had been fully exonerated from those charges.

When he died in Atlanta in 1940, he was a forgotten man, and was buried in an unmarked grave. But, in recent years, historians have dug more deeply into his life. And what they have found is truly remarkable.

In spite of his bitter setback in the Army, historians have learned that he made enormous contributions to America's growth in the late 1800's and early 1900's. He helped develop the railroad in the West. He had a pioneering role in developing the oil industry. As an engineer, inventor, surveyor, and, later in his career, as a top advisor to the U.S. Secretary of the Interior, he played a big part in the country's Westward expansion.

Although born in servitude, he helped change the face of America.

There are countless examples of African-Americans who have made a real impact on the country's history. Henry Flipper is just one of many great black leaders produced by my own state of Georgia. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. is another. As the leading figure in the Civil Rights Movement, he played a big role in the transformation that took place in our country in the middle of the 20th Century.

Their stories all tell us that our country's unique diversity has been a great source of strength, and should be celebrated. In fact, America's heroes are not limited to any race, or creed, or gender or national background. We find examples of greatness among all people in this patchwork of cultures that has become the strongest, freest, and most productive nation the world has ever known.

By observing Black History Month, we learn more about our history; we celebrate our diversity; and we become inspired and motivated by Americans who have helped lead the way toward fulfilling the country's great promise of equality of opportunity and justice for all.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise to represent to citizens of the Thirtieth Congressional District to pay honor and tribute to scores of African-Americans who have paved the way for the realization of the American dream.

African-American history is American history. Even before there was a United States, Crispus Attucks became the first American martyr when he was killed during the Boston Massacre of 1770, fighting against taxation without representation. Over 5,000 black soldiers and sailors fought in the American Revolution, only to be told that they were only three-fifths human when the Constitution was ratified.

Africans transplanted to America endured centuries of oppression, beginning before they even set foot on the American shore. The middle passage was a terrible, often fatal voyage of slaves from Africa to the New World. Africans were herded like livestock into the lower decks of a ship, where they were shackled together in inhumane conditions, fed only substance portions, and thrown overboard in shark infested waters if they got sick, weak, or the weight of the ship was simply too heavy. Once here, they were subjected to every oppressive tactic known to man, from the spirit breaking submission demanded on the plantation, to the family breaking practice of slave breeding and trading, to the mind numbing laws forbidding slave education.

Yet, even in the days when it seemed that "hope unborn had died", Africans in America reached amazing heights of achievement in all areas of endeavor, from science and medicine to politics and education, from Benjamin Banneker and Daniel Hale Williams to Shirley Chisholm and Martha Collins. Over stony roads, African-Americans have trod over the obstacles to success, each time redefining the American Dream as they fought on to victory.

I would like to take this special opportunity to highlight the enormous contribution to African-American history, and thus, American history, by African-Americans from Texas, and, in many cases, from my district. Maynard Jackson, who went on to become the first and one of the most successful mayors of Atlanta, was born in Dallas in 1938. As mayor of Atlanta, he laid the foundation for the new South's centerpiece city by ensuring that all races were allowed to take part in Atlanta's economic opportunity.

"Blind" Lemon Jefferson used Dallas as a base to launch an extraordinary blues career, during which he made over 100 recordings of his intricate melodic rhythms and influenced countless artists, including B.B. King. Before Rafer Johnson went on to be a gold medalist and a world decathlon record holder, he also lived in Dallas.

Dallas native Bobby Seale went on to lead tens of thousands of African-Americans toward heightened political consciousness. Dallas served as a launching pad for James Farmer, the noted Congress of Racial Equality leader and winner of the Presidential Medal of Freedom. And as the first black mayor of Dallas, Mayor Ron Kirk continues to lead the city into unprecedented economic success.

North Dallas has produced extraordinary African-Americans. Dallas native Ernie Banks set records in baseball and was voted the "Greatest Chicago Cubs Player of All Time". Austin native Bill Pickett was the first black working cowboy, and revolutionized the genre with his unique style of bulldogging. From my birthplace, Waco, TX native Monroe Majors became the first black to practice medicine west of the Rocky Mountains, and Jules Bledsoe changed the face of opera through his groundbreaking production, "Showboat."

Madam Speaker, I have just scratched the surface of North Texas African-American contributions to the American fabric. From Al Lipscomb, who led the fight to make Dallas elected officials more representative of the populace, to Royce West and John Wiley Price, who led the fight for justice in Dallas today. As I look to the dawn of a new century, I am proud to be a part of America's esteemed legacy of African-American achievement.

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, I rise today on the last day of Black History Month to share with you a tribute to Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. The remarks to follow were given by my good friend and esteemed colleague, Representative JOHN SPRATT from the Fifth Congressional District of South Carolina. Representative SPRATT's remarks on the late Dr. King bring a very refreshing and much-needed view on the subject of America and where we ought to be heading as we enter the new Millennium. Our home State of South Carolina is involved in a national debate, as I've spoken about recently, regarding the confederate battle flag flying atop the Statehouse in Columbia. Were we all to read Representative SPRATT's remarks and take them into close consideration, we might be one step closer to understanding the past and moving towards the future that Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. envisioned for our nation.

Madam Speaker, I submit for the RECORD the following remarks given by Representative JOHN SPRATT on January 17, 2000, at the Mt. Prospect Baptist Church in Rock Hill, South Carolina.

TRIBUTE TO DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.—  
REMARKS OF U.S. REPRESENTATIVE JOHN SPRATT, MT. PROSPECT BAPTIST CHURCH, ROCK HILL, SOUTH CAROLINA, JANUARY 17, 2000

Martin Luther King, Jr. was born January 15, 1929. He was 26, in the pulpit of Dexter Avenue Baptist Church less than two years, when he was drafted to lead the Montgomery bus boycott. He was 39 the night he told the sanitation workers in Memphis that God had taken him up on the top of the mountain and let him see the promised land. "Mine eyes have seen the glory of the coming of the Lord," he said. "I'm not fearing any man."

He would have been 71 on Saturday, had he lived. But the next day in Memphis, he stepped out onto the deck of the Lorraine Motel, and a gunman, filled with the venom he had tried all his life to pacify, fired a rifle bullet through his jaw, and killed him instantly.

American history is pock-marked with violence, but it is also marked by turning points where God gave us great leaders who steered us in the right direction. George Washington was one. Abraham Lincoln, another. Franklin Roosevelt lifted us out of the Depression, assuring us we had "nothing to fear but fear itself." Martin Luther King, Jr. called us to "rise up and live out the true meaning of our creed, that all men are created equal."

There were Americans then, and there are Americans now, who have never understood that Dr. King was speaking to them when he stood on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial. But surely everyone can be thankful for this: that when African-Americans demanded their rights, they did not rally behind a leader filled with bitterness and belligerence; they turned to this man who told his followers, "The means we use must be as pure as the ends we seek."

Langston Hughes wrote, "We too sing America," but it was Martin King, Jr. who showed how. He brought audiences to their feet merely by reciting "My Country 'Tis of Thee." In a voice that sounded like the trumpet of Gideon, he called on America to let freedom ring, and all who heard it never forgot it.

At his funeral, they called him "a warrior for peace." A leader willing to die for his cause but not willing to kill. A protester who was also a peacemaker. A black man, of an oppressed people, who reached out to everyone, even his enemies, because his objective was not to win but to reconcile. He was a Nobel Prize winner who could have become a messianic figure, and preached in pulpits all over the country, but he chose to go to his death marching with the garbagemen of Memphis.

His greatest achievement was, in his words, "a method of struggle that made it possible to stand up against an unjust system and fight it with all your might, yet never stoop to violence and hatred in the process." He gave Gandhi credit for helping him understand the philosophy of nonviolent protest. But he believed that this spirit was rooted in the black church, in three centuries of Christian stoicism when African-Americans were gripped in bondage.

In the dark days of the Montgomery Bus Boycott, Martin Luther King, Jr. told his congregation at Dexter Avenue Baptist Church, "You who protest courageously, yet with dignity and Christian love, when the history books are written in the future, the historian will have to say, 'There was a great people, a black people, who injected new meaning and dignity into the veins of civilization.'"

This national holiday is not created out of magnanimity. It is created out of respect for a people who have earned it, to honor a man who belongs with the greatest American leaders.

We honor only two other Americans with national holidays bearing their names: George Washington and Abraham Lincoln. I am proud to say I voted for law designating this day, but I will be first to admit that all it does is make the third Monday in January a legal holiday. This can become just another "day off" unless we make it "a day on," a time to reach into our souls and ask what we can do to make the dream a reality.

Lyndon Johnson explained why this day matters long before it was ever designated, thirty-five years ago. The week after Bloody Sunday in Selma, Alabama, LBJ addressed the nation on television. John Lewis had been beaten into the ground after crossing the Edmund Pettus Bridge, but he was watching, and as LBJ spoke, his spirit soared. This, he says, was the "strongest civil rights speech any president ever made."

LBJ began by saying, "At times history and fate meet at a single place to shape a turning point in man's unending search for freedom. So it was at Lexington and Concord. So it was a century ago at Appomattox. So it was last week at Selma, Alabama."

"Rarely," he said, "in any time does an issue lay bare the heart of America itself . . . But the issue of equal rights for American Negroes is such an issue. Should we defeat every enemy, should we double our

wealth and conquer the stars, and still be unequal to this issue, we will have failed as a people and as a nation."

After thirty-five years, LBJ's words still ring true. The stakes are the same, and failure is not an option. That's why this holiday and what it's about are vitally important, not just to African-Americans but to all Americans.

Last spring, I went with my colleague and friend, John Lewis, on a pilgrimage to Selma, and to Birmingham and Montgomery. We prayed in the church in Birmingham, where the lives of four girls were cruelly cut short by dynamite, exploded in the midst of a Sunday morning worship. We sat in the pews at Dexter Avenue Baptist Church, and listened to Dr. King tell his congregation during the bus boycott: "The tension in this city is not between white people and black people. The tension is, at bottom, between justice and injustice, between the forces of light and the forces of darkness." and on the anniversary of Bloody Sunday, we marched, arm-in-arm, across the Edmund Pettus Bridge.

On the way back, a reporter asked why I had made the trip, and I told him I thought everyone should come to Birmingham and Selma. Everyone should know the Edmund Pettus Bridge as well as Concord Bridge in Massachusetts; and everyone should know what happened in Kelly-Ingram Park as well as what happened on Lexington Green.

If you fast forward thirty-five years from LBJ's speech, you have to say we have come a long way. Dr. King's mission is far from finished; but that doesn't make the accomplishments of the civil rights movement any less momentous. We should not let ourselves or our children diminish what was achieved in the 50's, 60's, and 70's, or say that race relations are no better now than then. We grew up in the segregated South. We know better.

And besides, we have to remember how far we've come because it inspires us to keep going. We should remember Philip Randolph, telling the Judiciary Committee that "when Negro Americans travel the highways of this country, we are stalked by humiliation." And remember how Rosa Parks, a seamstress in Montgomery, helped put an end to that indignity. When we think there is little we as ordinary citizens can do, heroines like Rosa Parks remind us we are wrong.

They remind us also that Martin Luther King, Jr. would have accomplished little or nothing, but for those who stood behind him and those who charged ahead, as shock troops of the movement. They were ordinary Americans like Dub Massey and Jim Wells and the Friendship Nine. But it was, in Dr. King's words, "their sublime courage, their willingness to suffer, their amazing discipline in the midst of almost inhuman provocation" that gave us the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Among the early protesters was a young woman named Diane Nash, an organizer of SNCC. At the time of the Rock Hill sit-ins, SNCC was in dire financial straits, and meeting to discuss how they could keep going. One of the Friendship protesters, Tom Gaither, used the single phone call allowed him at the jail to call SNCC collect in Atlanta. Gaither called to tell SNCC that the Friendship students didn't want bail and wouldn't be asking SNCC for bond money. They were going to serve out their thirty days in jail. This became a precedent for the whole movement, and so inspired SNCC that four of those at the meeting in Atlanta drove to Rock Hill, sat-in at McCrory's, and joined the Friendship Nine in the county jail.

Diane Nash was among them, and today, she issues us a caveat. She says that "the movement made Martin rather than Martin making the movement." She says this not to

diminish Dr. King, but so that "young people will not think that this was his movement, and say 'I wish we had a Martin Luther King today to lead us . . . If people know how the movement started and why it succeeded,'" says Diane Nash, "they will be more likely to ask the right question, which is: 'What can I do?'"

Every community needs stories of sublime courage, discipline, and principle like these. These are our epic poems, and we should be telling them and teaching them because they build respect; they show us we are stronger than we think; they inspire our better selves.

Those who want to keep the Confederate flag flying over our Capitol claim it as their heritage. But Confederate veterans served in the General Assembly from 1866 to the early 1920s, and never resolved to raise their old battle flag over the dome of the Capitol. If we want to preserve our heritage, what about the motherlode of heritage in the civil rights movement? In a country where there is too much violence in the home, in the schools, on the streets, here is a rich history of non-violence worth our study.

Every school child in South Carolina should know stories like these. They should know the story of those black children in Clarendon County who walked miles to school every day, as busses full of white children passed them by. They should not study South Carolina history without learning the name of Levi Briggs and those brave parents who put their lives on the line to correct this inequity, and went on to the Supreme Court with Briggs v. Elliott. They should know the twisted road to school integration and the quiet heroes, like Matthew Perry and Judge Waring, who helped clear the way.

We should teach character, teach it by telling the stories of Rosa Parks and Levi Briggs, John Lewis, and the Friendship Nine. And while we are at it, we should preach persistence, to our children and ourselves. For one of our country's virtues has been our capacity to struggle endlessly with our problems, and never be completely satisfied with our solutions. We have to keep seeking solutions; and even if we never see closure, never give up in the search for a society that matches our ideals and principles. In the realm of racial justice and equality, progress has been slow, and it has been uneven, but we have not just been spinning our wheels in a rut of racism. We have made progress.

Look, for instance, at the difference the Voting Rights Act has made. Take the Congress. In 1965, John Lewis was spearheading SNCC, in the streets protesting. Today he is in the Congress, Chief Deputy Whip on the Democratic side. He serves there alongside 38 other African-Americans, Jim Clyburn among them, the first black elected to Congress from South Carolina since 1896. Charlie Rangel of New York is another; if Democrats gain control of the House in the next election, Charlie will take the chair of the House Ways and Means Committee, the most powerful committee in Congress.

America is better for all Americans, but it is still not what it ought to be; and old symbols, like the flag flying over our Capitol, are too much to be dismissed as mere "vestiges of the past." We stand on the doorstep of America's fourth century, three hundred years from the day the first African slave set foot on this soil, and we cannot say this is the country we want it to be.

Dr. King liked to say that he wanted more than "just physical proximity with no spiritual affinity." He wanted a country where "not only elbows but hearts rub together." We cannot say that we are such a society, nor can we say that we will become one by laissez-faire policies, benign neglect, or mere evolution. Martin Luther King, Jr. warned us years ago from his cell in the Birmingham

jail that "human progress never rolls in on wheels of inevitability. It comes from the tireless, persistent efforts of men willing to be co-workers with God."

Now that we have reached certain goals, I think we need a higher goal. Americans have always believed that we have, in the words of Franklin D. Roosevelt, a rendezvous with destiny. At a time when most people in the world lived barely above the level of animals, Americans showed that government of the people is the only government for the people. We showed that when church and state are separated, both fare better. We showed that when people from countries like Ireland are liberated from strife and prejudice, they thrive in a tolerant land. We showed that free education, made available to all, is like a rising tide; it lifts all the boats in a society. We showed that people can come from the simplest backgrounds, like Martin Luther King, Jr., the grandson of slaves and sharecroppers, and give birth to great things.

Now that the barriers that segregated us have been removed, our challenge, and I think God's purpose for us, is to show the world—from Belfast to Bosnia, from Cape Town to East Timor, that different races and ethnic groups need not cripple and debilitate a country; they can make a country richer and stronger; that we can not only co-exist, but thrive on our differences.

This is our heritage, and it should be our mission, our creed, our high calling. If as a people we can embrace this goal, we can make our country that shining city on a hill that the Puritans set out to build three hundred years ago. We can make our country the country Martin Luther King, Jr. dreamed of, "where justice rolls down like waters and righteousness like a mighty stream."

Our goal does not have to be a completely color-blind, totally homogenized society. That's too utopian, and frankly, I think, too bland. I think our richness as a people derives from our differences. I think it is enough to strive for a plural, multi-racial society, where the visible differences of race, color, and culture no longer carry the stigma of somehow not being a full-fledged American.

If we make this our goal, we can put the flag flying over our State Capitol in perspective. It's a wedge issue, and we need to be rid of it, so that we can get on with far more important tasks, because time is running short. Halfway through this new century, our population is expected to hit 400 million. Fifty-three percent will be white. Twenty-five percent will be Hispanic, 14 percent will be black, 9 percent Asian, and one percent American Indian. Our existence as a people is moving toward a level of complexity the world has never seen before. In the 21st Century, the United States will be the world's nation; the American canvass will be painted with colors from every shade of the earth.

Surely, we do not want this racially more diverse America to be a racially more divided America.

Surely, we want the world to look to America in this century, as it did in the last, and see that future works, see many races not only surviving but thriving, richer as a culture and as a country because of our differences.

Two years ago, I went to Bosnia to visit our troops in a forlorn place, ripped asunder by ethnic warfare. When I landed at Tuzla, I was met by Major General Morgan, an African-American, who commanded our troops there. When I went to Sarajevo, I was met by General Shinseki, a Japanese-American, who commanded the entire NATO mission. I doubt that any racial message was intended by the assignment of these two officers. But I have to tell you, I was proud to see my

country making that statement in that ethnic-torn part of the world. And I believe that America can cast that beacon, that sign of hope, that message of racial harmony, all over the world.

How do we plot the route to an interracial society over the next fifty years? Well, there are lots of ways. But on the map of racial progress, education is the name of almost every road. Almost all studies come to one conclusion: education is our best solution and our greatest challenge.

For one thing, the public schools right now have a racial or ethnic composition comparable to what the whole nation will look like in 2020. The school age population is 66 percent white, 15 percent black, 14 percent Hispanic, and 4 percent Asian. The future of diversity in this country will depend heavily on how well the schools work out the issues of full and equal inclusion.

In saying this, I am not shifting the burden onto teachers and school administrators. I am speaking to all of us as parents, to churches, to people, to the whole community. All of us have to pitch in and make our public schools second to none, up to the challenge of educating every child to the limit of his potential.

Which brings me to my last point. Americans need to realize that though we came over here on different ships, we are all in the same boat now. The burden of change should not rest on African-Americans alone. The burden should rest on all of us if we believe our creed.

In that connection, let me commend the City of Rock Hill, the Council, and Mayor Doug Echols, in particular, for sponsoring "No Room for Racism," and for your resolution on the Flag.

No Room for Racism may be mostly dialogue, but I believe it is dialogue that we need I believe that efforts like this can blossom, so that one day, ours is country where all sing America. And I believe it is God's purpose, Dr. King's dream, and our duty to make it just that.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Black History Month. I thank my colleagues of the Congressional Black Caucus very much for their leadership on this very special order and tribute to black history and appreciate tremendously these members who have joined me on the floor of the House to acknowledge this very special month.

I am thrilled to stand here on the House floor as an American and as an African-American Member of Congress. In the 211 years of congressional history there have been only 105 African-American Members of Congress. 101 African-Americans have been elected to the House of Representatives, and only 4 have been elected to the Senate. I am boldly able to stand here today, Madam Speaker, because other courageous and brave African-American pioneers stood valiantly before me. During Black History Week, but most importantly throughout the year, I am reminded of the legendary achievements that have paved the way for my colleagues and I.

This year marks the first Black History Month celebration of the 21st Century. Appropriately, the Association for the Study of African American Life and History has labeled "Heritage and Horizon—The African American Legacy and Contributions of the 21st Century" as the theme for this year's celebration. I think you will agree, African-Americans have played an integral part in the development and prosperity of our nation. Tonight, I would like my remarks to reflect the rich legacy of the Afri-

can-American experience, and its relationship to American history.

Seventy-four years ago, a bold and daring scholar had a vision to honor the Legacy of African-Americans. As you know, this legendary scholar, Carter G. Woodson founded what was then called "Black History Week." Now, our nation celebrates the entire month of February as Black History Month. And if I might quote my 14-year-old son Jason Lee, "we should not be regulated even by a 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 on the last day of this month, my colleagues will join me in additional days in which 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 America. As we recall African-American history, 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.

African-American history is rightfully recounting the contributions of great Americans. Americans who dared to change not only their individual community, but also their surrounding nation. As I recall the legacy of African-Americans, I remember the brave and bold leaders of our past. There is no shortage of articulate, influential African-American leaders in our nation's history. These individuals influenced both the African-American community and our society at large in powerful ways as they fought to win freedom, fair treatment, and better lives for all of America. For example, brave men like Nat Turner, Gabriel Prosser, and Denmark Vesey, who organized and led doomed but valiant slave rebellions against brutal slave owners. Abolitionists like Frederick Douglas and Sojourner Truth, who undermined the institution of slavery by speaking, writing, and lobbying against it—at considerable personal risk. And brave individuals like Harriet Tubman, who risked her life and her hard-won freedom to return to slave-holding states to lead other African-Americans north to freedom along the Underground Railroad. And the Civil War, where over 200,000 African-American men fought in the Union Army and Navy—to free their enslaved brethren, and prove that African-Americans too were committed to Democracy and the preservation of America.

And in the early 1900s, African-Americans like Booker T. Washington, W.E.B. DuBois, and Mary Church Terrell shaped attitudes within the African-American community and won the respect of all Americans across the country. Also, Marcus Garvey led what was labeled the Black Nationalist movement and fought institutional racism in the United States.

In the 1920s, '30s, and '40s, A. Philip Randolph worked to organize African-American workers and end the division of the labor movement along racial lines. He also worked diligently to end discrimination in the military and the government.

And after World War II, African-American leaders like Charles Hamilton Houston, William Henry Hastie, A. Leon Higginbotham, Jr., Thurgood Marshall, Martin Luther King, Adam

Clayton Powell, Jr., and Malcolm X made significant marks on American history—in our courts, our schools, our government, our politics, and in foreign affairs. African-American women like Fannie Lou Hamer, Shirley Chisholm, and Barbara Jordan, one of my personal heroes, broke old barriers and won the respect of millions of Americans for integrity, their intelligence, their dedication, and their professional accomplishments.

This recitation of African-American leaders is by no means all-inclusive! In fact, it touches upon only a few of the vast amount of African-American leaders who have shaped this country's history and added to the legacy of African-American accomplishments in America. I mention these names to merely observe the fact that African-Americans have always played an integral part in the history of the United States.

As part of this annual observation of Black History Month, it is vital to remind America that in the face of racism, discrimination, and violence, many African-Americans have changed the very fabric of this nation. I would like to stress that all of America can draw great satisfaction and strength from this history. It is important, because as we embrace this history, it provides not only inspiration for African-Americans, but also all of America on the dawn of the 21st Century.

Madam Speaker, I believe that we must speak about African-American history throughout the year, because there are still many barriers that America has yet to hurdle and face at the dawn of the 21st century. America has not accepted in a collective and collaborative fashion that African American history is a history of America. Issues that impact our communities such as increased funding for nutrition programs, affirmative action, the Voter's Rights Act, reparations for African-Americans, racial profiling, equitable funding for Historically Black College and Universities, equitable training and funds to children for access to the Internet, and a multitude of other critical issues are concerns that Americans must join together and combat. If America embraces African American History as American History, we would go so much further in solving these problems and many other critical problems.

In closing, I strongly feel that all Americans must have a better understanding of each other. Our rich diversity has been (at the same time) the reason for our continued struggles and progress. We must learn each other's history! African-American history must be the kind of history that is living; that is accepted; that is widespread; and that all people can understand. This great nation must embrace this rich history of the past and the present, and use it as a guide for reshaping America's future.

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleagues for this opportunity to present issues with regard to Black History Month this year. Our theme again was Heritage, Horizons, Accepting the Challenges of the 21st Century.

#### ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND LEGISLATIVE AGENDA OF REPUBLICAN CONGRESS REGARDING EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the

gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee for the majority leader.

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Speaker, I rise today to talk about the accomplishments of the Republican Congress with respect to education and to address areas where we believe the administration is simply wrong in the proposals that they put forward for improving education in this country.

The recent budget submission by the President included the same old pattern of creating new programs where Washington is in control and the people who know best at the State and local level are left out of the decision-making process. Before I came to the Congress of the United States, I was a high school principal and then a superintendent of schools, and I was both during the time when the well-intentioned programs of the 1960s, coming from the Federal Government, back to local educators, were supposed to have closed the achievement gap.

It was very obvious that it was not going to happen. So when I came to the Congress, I knew what was wrong, I thought I knew how to fix it, but it was very, very difficult to talk about quality. It was very difficult to talk about giving flexibility to local districts who knew better how to make the changes than we did in Washington. And so for 20 years, not very much changed. Even though in the first 10 years, every Head Start study indicated that it was not doing what we had intended it to do. Instead of being a program to have preschoolers become reading ready and school ready, it turned out to be a poverty jobs program, it turned out to be a baby-sitting program. And it was so obvious because we were talking about quantity, how many children could we cover rather than quality, and every time I would say, "But if you're covering those children with mediocrity, you're not helping them at all."

First let me talk a little bit about what all Americans can agree upon in relationship to a basic education policy. All Americans agree that a high quality education for their children is important. All Americans agree that safe schools, good discipline, high academic standards, parental involvement and responsibility, well-prepared teachers, appropriate school buildings, access to higher education and training and assistance for children with special needs are certainly worthy objectives.

Most Americans agree that decisions on local school policy should be determined locally. Most Americans agree that equitable funding for our schools is ideal. Most Americans agree that the role of the Federal Government is limited but necessary. Now, where do we, the Republican majority, disagree with the administration? The problem begins when we talk about you how do we achieve these goals.

The President believes that the Federal Government should create a new program for every identifiable education problem. So in his State of the

Union address, he said, hire more teachers. This is the Federal Government speaking. Establish Federal accountability measures. End social promotion, provide afterschool and summer school support. Shut down schools that do not perform, require teachers to have majors in the subjects they teach, require local school report cards, offer parents a choice of public schools their children attend. It took him a long time to get to that point. Support more charter schools. Require consistent discipline policies, and provide funds to build or modernize local schools.

Now, we agree with many of the goals that the President has outlined. Where we disagree is that creating a new program every time you think you have an identifiable problem will not solve the problem, particularly if it is coming from Washington, D.C. with a one size fits all for the local school districts. So we agree with many of the goals the President has outlined, but we do disagree with the need to create new programs every year to address these goals.

Why do we disagree? First of all, we have to understand that States and local communities are so far ahead of us when it comes to school reform, way ahead of anything that we can even think about on the Federal level. So States and local communities are already taking action to build new schools, repair old ones, hire new teachers, close schools that do not work, raise standards for teachers, offer public school choice, open charter schools, hold schools accountable for academic progress. We believe that the best way to support local schools and communities is by providing flexibility in how States and local governments use Federal funds, increasing funding for special education and sending more Federal dollars directly to the classroom.

□ 1530

When we became the majority, we set seven key goals, and those seven key goals are reflected in every piece of legislation that we have put forward. Those goals are on this chart.

First of all, hopefully we have everyone now talking about quality instead of quantity; and as I said, it took 20 years to get that message across. The important thing was the quality of the program. It was very obvious in Head Start that you could not hire early childhood people, because there are not many, first of all, who are early-childhood prepared, at \$10,000. But the idea was let us see how many students we can get there, and we will use all the money to get the children there; and we will not worry about the quality of the program. In our last two reauthorizations of Head Start, with help from the Democrats, we have changed that; and we moved the programs toward quality.

Better teaching. I have tried to impress upon the President over and over

again, I do not care what he says about 100,000 new teachers. First of all, there are about 14,000 school districts, there are about 1 million school buildings, so 100,000 does not go very far. But it does not matter whether your pupil-teacher ratio is 30 to 1, 20 to 1, 10 to 1, or this famous figure, and I don't know where they got it, of 18 to 1. That does not matter unless there is a quality teacher in the classroom.

They went through this exercise in California, spent billions of dollars as a matter of fact, and what happened? They reduced the class size in the early grades; and in Los Angeles alone, 33 percent of all the new people they had to hire in order to put somebody in with these new classrooms they just created had no qualifications whatsoever to be teaching.

Local control. If you do not have the local people very much involved, that includes parents, that includes administrator, school boards, I will guarantee you, there is nothing from the Federal level that we will do to reform and improve education on the local level. That has to be done on the local level.

Accountability. Again, when I got two pennies from Washington D.C. as a school administrator, I had to make sure that even though it did not help at all it had to be spent according to the way the Federal Government said it had to be spent. So if I got \$15 for this program and \$1,000 for that program, do not ever commingle one of those programs or you are in real trouble with the Federal Government. Even though combining some of those programs would have produced outstanding programs, you just could not do it.

Accountability. The auditors did not come to see whether as a matter of fact anything good was happening. They came to see where you were spending the dollars. I thought well, gee, we ought to be able to do something about that. But, do you realize, I found for those 20 years the most important thing was the money is going to the right place. It did not matter whether we were accomplishing anything.

So accountability is one of our key goals. If we give you the flexibility in the local level, you have to show us that every child has improved academically. That is what it should be all about.

Dollars to the classroom. Again, every time we create a Federal program, we create a Federal bureaucracy; and then that goes out, and they must create a State bureaucracy; and by the time the money gets down to the local school district, there is not much left. So, of course, we have been saying over and over again that 95 percent of all dollars should get down to that classroom.

Then basic academics. We got carried away with so many fads, it was unbelievable, and got far away from basic academics. Now every piece of legislation that we bring forth to this floor includes the fact that we must return to basic academics.

Parental involvement and responsibility. The first and most important teacher has to be some adult in that child's home, whether it is a mother, a father, an aunt, an uncle. That is where it all begins, and that parent must be the child's first and most important teacher.

So we seek effectiveness; we seek results in all Federal education programs. Federal programs should result in increased student achievement, or they should be eliminated. The whole purpose of Title I, and we have already spent \$120 billion on Title I, the whole purpose of Title I was to close the achievement gap; and every study shows we have made no headway, after \$120 billion and all these years.

Let me then move on to what we have done in the 105th Congress and what we are trying to do in the 106th Congress. Of the many legislative accomplishments that occurred during the 105th Congress, I am proud of several bills that address those seven basic goals. Let me point those out.

First of all, in a bipartisan and bicameral fashion, as a matter of fact, we dealt with the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act, the amendments of 1997. Here again, we were so overly prescriptive that it was very difficult for the local districts to really do the kind of thing that they needed to do to help the children with special needs.

What we basically did as a matter of fact was take most of the other money that they had for all the other students and cause them to have to spend it on a program that we mandated and a program that we said we would send 40 percent of the excess costs, and we sent 6 percent by the time I became chairman. We will be up to about 15 or 16 percent this year. All that other money has to be raised locally and taken from every other program.

First of all, let me indicate what we have done with the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act. In that reauthorization, schools were made safer for all students by improving the procedure for quickly removing dangerous students from the classroom. Parent participation in key decision-making meetings was strengthened. Mediation was offered to resolve disputes. Sometimes millions of dollars were spent on attorney fees with nothing accomplished as far as giving the child a better education.

Costly referrals to special education were cut. Over-identification is a major problem. We will never get to 40 percent if they keep over-identifying special education students. It is a disaster for the child who is over-identified and put into a special education class, many times with a mere reading difficulty that could be handled without becoming a special education student for life. Costly referrals to special education were cut, schools were given more flexibility, and most importantly, education programs for children with disabilities were improved.

The Higher Education Act Amendments of 1998, I am very proud of those. With that enactment, students received the lowest interest rate on student loans in 17 years. The maximum student award under the Pell Grant Program was authorized at the highest level in history. The Work Study Program was expanded to address the literacy needs of the community. The Work Study Program would have been the ideal program without getting into AmeriCorp, which had to turn right around and set up a bureaucracy in Washington and several bureaucracies in every State, when all you had to do was say if you are going to get any work-study money, you will do community service and you will determine what the percentage of that community service will be. That bureaucracy is already set up. You did not need to create anything new in order to do that.

A performance-based organization was created within the Department of Education in order to improve, simplify, and streamline the cumbersome student aid process. This administration decided that 100 percent of student aid should be done through the Federal Government. Now, you tell me one program that we have done very well. I cannot name one, and I doubt whether you can.

Well, obviously we could not become the biggest bank in the world; and of course, they got into all sorts of trouble with only having about 30 percent of the loans. So we tried to improve that, because we indicated that this body will move in that department and see whether they cannot straighten out the problems that are there, people who know how to deal with student aid.

The enactment of the Head Start Amendments of 1998 I mentioned earlier. We spent \$53 billion, and we never expected quality in the program. So for year after year after year, the children most in need who needed an early childhood program, who needed a program to help them become reading ready, did not get it. Not only did they not get it, but we left the parent out altogether, and in many instances we had to improve the parent's parenting skill, we had to improve the parent's literacy skills so they could be the child's first and most important teacher.

We changed that with our Head Start bill. The first reauthorization 5 or 6 years ago, I was only able to get 25 percent of any new money going to quality. The last reauthorization, with the help of the Secretary downtown, we got up to 60 percent, saying that these programs must improve. The Secretary has also closed a lot of programs that, as a matter of fact, were not doing the job. We adopted new performance standards and new measures by which we determined whether they are meeting those performance standards, and we required that the majority of Head Start teachers have a college degree.

One of the problems we found in Title I, for instance, was that in one State, they used I think something like 60 percent of all that money to hire teacher aides, and that is no problem if they are doing things teacher aides would normally do. But do you realize that they did not even have to have a high school diploma? They did not even have to have a GED. In many instances they were actually doing the teaching.

The enactment of charter school legislation has been very important, because it gives some parents choice in the public education of their children. I can take you two blocks from the Capitol and show you an outstanding charter school. But in that charter school, everybody knows what the rules and regulations are, parents included. Everybody knows that you are going to be well disciplined, everyone knows you are going to do your homework, everyone knows that the parent must be involved. And it has changed things completely for all of those children, and they have a long waiting list.

Charter schools legislation signed into law increased the authorization level from \$15 million to \$100 million while curtailing the funds available to the Department of Education for national activities. We want the money to get out there where the local charter schools are. The legislation also encouraged more private capital investments into charter schools and ensured the charter schools received their fair share of the Federal education dollar.

We passed the A+ Education Savings Account legislation. Unfortunately, it got vetoed. What a tragedy. If it had become law, the legislation would have allowed parents, grandparents, friends, scholarship sponsors, companies, or charities to open an account for a child's educational needs for attendance wherever that child could get the best education. Unfortunately, it was vetoed. We will try again this year.

Prohibiting new Federal tests was very, very important. Again, it was a fast track effort put on by the administration to come up with a Federal test, which had to mean that there had to be a Federal program of what it is you are going to teach in order to use the Federal test. But where the administration was wrong, if you are going to test your students, first of all someone must determine what those standards are. If these are new, higher standards you are going to teach to, and certainly in the 21st century we have to do that, then you have to design those. Then you have to prepare the teacher to teach to the new standards. Then you have to test the teacher to see whether they are ready to teach to the new standards.

Now, after you have done all that, then you get around to testing the student. Otherwise, you spend the \$100 million that the President was talking about to tell 50 percent of our students one more time what they have heard all their lives; you are not doing very well. It would be so much better to

take \$100 million and help them do far better.

We enacted the Workforce Investment Act. The first thing I discovered was that we had at least 100 or 150 job-training programs coming from the Federal Government, from all departments, from all agencies, with no one having any idea what the other was doing.

□ 1545

So we consolidated 60 of those Federal training programs through the establishment of three block grants to the States for adult employment and training, for disadvantaged youth, and for adult education and literacy programs. We emphasized long-term academic improvement and occupational training while eliminating numerous Federal requirements, including duplicative and costly planning, paperwork, and reporting requirements.

We are not interested in the process. That is what they were interested in all the time before. We are interested in outcome. We are interested in accomplishments. We are interested in achievement. We are interested in results, not process.

We enacted the Vocational Technical Education Act, that provides approximately 7 to 10 percent of the funding for vocational technical education programs for secondary students, with more dollars going directly to the local level. Again, we emphasized strong academics and State and local flexibility in the use of funds.

Every time we talk about flexibility, we say to the local and State, show us how every child is going to improve academically and prove to us, and then we give them the flexibility to design the program to meet their specific needs at their local level.

Passing the Dollars to the Classroom Act, this legislation consolidated 31 programs top down from Washington down to the State and then to the local government, and we consolidated 31 of those top-down, Washington-based Federal education programs into a single grant to States, giving State and local decision-makers authority in how to distribute the money within each State. And we said, 95 percent of it must get to the classroom.

In the 106th Congress, as we started this 106th Congress, we began by reviewing the programs under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. For more than three decades, the Federal government has spent in excess of \$185 billion to the States through scores of Washington-based education programs. Has the enormous investment helped improvement student achievement? Unfortunately, we have no evidence that it has. After 30 years and more than \$128 billion, Title I has not had the desired effect of closing achievement gaps between those who have and those who do not.

That is why we must continue our commitment to quality teaching, greater respect for local control and in-

creased flexibility, bolstering basic academics, sending more dollars to the classroom, and fostering parent responsibility and involvement.

Our commitment to these goals was most clearly evident early in 1999, with the successful enactment of the Education Partnership Flexibility Act, known as Ed-Flex. Thanks to our efforts and with help from 50 Governors, the President decided that it was a good idea, after objecting to it early on.

Ed-Flex gives schools and school districts more freedom to tailor Federal education programs to meet their needs and remove obstructions to reform. It is designed to make categorical Federal programs work better at the local level. One size does not fit all. The local government knows best. But States will have to follow Federal priorities and requirements that may or may not address the needs of children in their State unless they have that flexibility.

It is time to modernize the Federal education funding mechanism investment so it reflects the needs of schools and school districts in the 21st century. With the passage of Ed-Flex, we turned our attention to teacher quality.

Let me just indicate that Ed-Flex was a possibility for 12 States for many years. When we passed a reauthorization years ago, we said to 12 States, if they can prove to us that they can have the flexibility to get waivers from the Federal requirements and use those Federal dollars and improve the academic achievement of all their students, they may have that flexibility.

A couple of the States really took advantage of that and did an outstanding job. Unfortunately, not all 12 took advantage, because it really takes a lot of ingenuity on the State and local level. They have to do the planning. No one is doing it for them. They have to determine how they are going to have every child improve their academic standing.

The State of Texas I believe got more than 4,000 waivers. They now can show that their Hispanic and black students are above the average of all their students because they made that commitment. They said, give us the flexibility and we will show you that we can improve the academic achievement of all of our students.

We all know that after parents, the most important factor in a child's academic success is the quality of the teacher in the classroom. We have passed the Teacher Empowerment Act, and it allows schools to find the right balance for teacher class size, not us, for teacher quality, not us, by giving schools flexibility in deciding how best to meet the needs of their teacher corps and enhance their professional skills.

With the first group of the 100,000 teachers, no requirements were made that they had to have anything other than the ability, I suppose, to get up in the morning and go and report to the

school, nothing else. So what they found in those first hirings, as a matter of fact, they found an awful lot of people who went into that classroom with no qualifications whatsoever.

This act allows schools to find that right balance, whether they need in-depth in service training, and not some of the nonsense that goes on where they take an afternoon off or an evening off and somehow or other they are going to improve the quality of teaching, but in depth.

I can give an example of how that works. I recently visited in Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, an advanced physics-calculus combined program. That would not have been possible several years ago because they would not have had the teacher in that classroom that could possibly have handled that assignment. But because of the opportunity for a couple of those teachers to go to an in depth program two summers in a row for the entire summer, they have one of the most outstanding combined programs I have seen in advanced calculus and physics. Again, the quality of the teacher made the difference.

I like to remind all of my Congresswomen here in the Congress that 60 percent of that class were women. Only 40 percent were men.

The Teacher Empowerment Act holds schools accountable by ensuring that these funds are used to increase student achievement through high quality teaching, and ensures that parents are given information on the quality of their child's teacher.

When I was negotiating with the administration at the end of last year, as we were going through this budget process and got into this 100,000 teacher business, the very day we began negotiating a New York newspaper, the entire front page said, "Parents, you are being cheated. Do you recognize 50 percent of all the teachers are not qualified to teach in the subject area in which they are teaching?" That made it a little bit easier to get my point across when I was trying to make them understand that it is the quality of the teacher in the classroom, not necessarily the pupil-teacher ratio.

Most importantly, the Teacher Empowerment Act is not a Washington-knows-best program because it allows schools to spend these funds on what meets their individual needs.

The third piece of legislation that successfully passed the House was the Student Results Act. This legislation authorizes and reforms Title I. We are working at the present time on the whole reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Unlike the way we have done it in the past, in the past we usually said, we will just take this whole lump and just give it more money, and somehow something is going to happen that is going to be better. We said, we are going to look at each individual program in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. We are going to see how

well it is doing. If it is not doing well, we are going to get rid of it, or find a way to improve it so it does well.

In the Student Results Act, we reformed Title I education for the disadvantaged and many of the other categorical K through 12 programs by targeting at helping disadvantaged children.

The Student Results Act was put together with four overarching principles in mind: quality, accountability, choice, and flexibility. For too long we have maintained low expectations for Title I and the disadvantaged students it serves. We really do not expect enough from any student, unfortunately, but it is particularly true in the case of disadvantaged students.

We have spent nearly \$120 billion, as I said before, in Title I since its inception, yet it continues to be the subject of study after study pointing to its ineffectiveness. We failed to focus enough on quality reforms, and with enactment of the Student Results Act, we usher in a new era of high expectations for all children and for children served by this key program.

In many Title I schools, the most disadvantaged children are taught by the least qualified teacher and teacher aides. The Student Results Act makes it clear that disadvantaged children deserve the same high quality teachers and teacher aides as all other students.

The Student Results Act includes other quality reforms, like rewarding excellence by allowing States to reserve up to 30 percent of their new Title I funds to provide cash rewards to the schools if they are making substantial progress in closing that achievement gap.

Finally, the bill reduces bureaucratic overhead and ensures that more dollars reach the classroom than ever before. As the saying goes, we want to make sure more of this money gets into the hands of classroom teachers who actually know the names of the children in the classroom.

In order to ensure quality, we need to have accountability. We retain State and local standards and assessment provisions that are part of current law, and we applaud the efforts of States and localities to build strong standards-based systems. We build upon these important provisions by ensuring that vital information about the academic performance of Title I schools is provided to parents and the tax-paying public.

The bill does not provide for more accountability to the Federal government. It does insist upon more accountability to parents. We intend to shine a bright light on the Title I program and give parents real, understandable information about how their children and their schools are performing.

For those programs that do not meet the test of high quality and increased accountability, we have included new and innovative public school choice provisions in the bill. Why should chil-

dren have to go to a failing school when everybody is reporting that it is a failing school? The Student Results Act says that children attending schools classified as low-performing must be given the opportunity to attend a higher quality public school in their area. This enshrines in law a very simple commonsense concept: Children should not be forced to attend failing schools.

The Student Results Act sends a powerful message to failing schools throughout this Nation that enough is enough, they must improve or their children will leave to attend another school.

Finally, on October 21 the House passed a far-reaching education reform bill called the Straight A's Act. For those States or school districts that choose to participate, it is not a mandate, but if they choose to participate, Straight A's will fundamentally change the relationship between the Federal government and the State. Straight A's will untie the hands of those States that have strong accountability systems in place in exchange for meeting student performance improvement targets.

This sort of accountability for performance does not exist in current law. States must improve achievement to participate in Straight A's, and if their scores go down for the first 3 years, they get kicked out before the 5-year agreement that they thought they made with the Federal government. We are not going to wait 5 years. Currently, nothing happens to States that decline for 3 years.

Straight A's frees States to target all of their Federal dollars on disadvantaged students and narrowing achievement gaps. Under current law, States could not target more Federal dollars for this purpose. They could not combine any of the funds coming from the Federal level for different programs. This legislation will reward those States that significantly narrow achievement gaps with a 5 percent reward, an incentive that does not exist under current law.

With the enactment of Straight A's, all students, especially the disadvantaged students who were the focus of Federal legislation in 1965, may finally receive effective instruction and be held to high standards.

□ 1600

For too long, States and schools have been able to hide behind average test scores and to show they are helping disadvantaged children, merely by spending more money in the right places, and that must come to an end when States participate in Straight A's, if they so choose to participate.

States and school districts must focus on the most effective way of improving achievement, not on just complying with how the Federal Government says they have to spend their money. Schools should be free to focus on improving teacher quality, imple-

menting research-based instruction and operating effective after-school programs.

Federal process requirements have huge amounts of paperwork for people at the local level and distract from improving student learning. Madam Speaker, as I said before, we want to hear about results. We are not interested in process.

I would encourage everyone to listen carefully when people talk about accountability. Are they talking about accountability for process, making sure States and districts meet Federal guidelines and priorities, the checkoff system, or are they talking about accountability for real gains in academic achievement? Will achievement gaps close as a result, or will States just have to fill out a lot of paperwork about numbers of children served without any mention of improvements?

By giving States a choice to do so, the opportunity to build on their successes and improve the achievement of all of their students, the Federal Government can lend a helping hand rather than a stranglehold.

We started the year with Ed-Flex, which passed with overwhelming bipartisan majorities of both houses and is now law. As I said, Ed-Flex provides for flexibility to all 50 States to control how they design Federal programs and help them adapt to their own unique needs.

Next, we followed up with the Teacher Empowerment Act, which passed the House with bipartisan support. And the bill emphasizes the single most important factor in improving education in this Nation, which is the quality of the teaching force.

We then moved to the Student Results Act, a bill to extend Title I and other programs targeted at the disadvantaged, which also passed the House with overwhelming bipartisan support. That bill emphasized quality, accountability, school choice and increases local control and flexibility.

Finally, the House passed our Straight A's bill, that gives States and localities unprecedented flexibility in return for accountability.

How about the rest of the 106th Congress? Well, we will have to conclude our reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act with bills targeted at improving some of the major education programs beyond Title I; school technology, drug free school, impact aid and the Title VI block grant and a bill to improve the literary skills of all Americans.

One of the problems we have had over the years is we have not thought in terms of family literacy. We sort of put an adult literacy over here and a children's literacy over here. I will guarantee you we have learned you cannot break the cycle of illiteracy or functional illiteracy, unless you deal with the entire family. And you see, functional illiteracy today is not what it was 10, 15 years ago. Functional illiteracy today in our society in this 21st

century is if you cannot read, write, comprehend on a 12th grade level, and that is a functional illiterate.

We have to do much more, and we have to do it jointly with the entire family. Family literacy is what we need to talk about. Priority will be given to proposals that increase flexibility and the operation of Federal education programs.

We will attach a higher priority to support local schools in their effort to make their schools safe, drug free and orderly, as we streamline technology needs and applications.

Madam Speaker, we will work to promote literacy for children and their parents. We will expect quality research that will benefit local schools and improve the quality of education for all children. At the end of the reauthorization process, we will have a much improved Elementary Secondary Education Act. The programs we include will be those that ensure that our children will receive a quality education by, again, emphasizing those seven key goals that I originally outlined: Quality, better teaching, local control, accountability, dollars to the classroom, basic academic, parental involvement and responsibility.

Let me take a quick look at the President's budget. I have it up here. We have some real differences. Here on my chart is what we believe. Here is the President's side of this chart. I want to talk very briefly about this.

As I indicated, the Republican-sponsored Teacher Empowerment Act, which got bipartisan support, compared to the President's teaching to a higher standards initiative is the best example of our fundamental difference in philosophy.

We say quality first, highly qualified teachers in every classroom. The administration says quantity before quality, put more teachers in classrooms, no matter whether they are qualified or not.

We say flexibility with accountability. We give you the freedom if you show us that you produce results. The administration says reduce freedom, increase requirements. We say State-design standards and assessments. The administration says federally-designed, one-size-fits-all; the national test as an example.

We say State and local schools design school discipline standards. The administration says, discipline standards determined by Washington bureaucrats who probably were never in a classroom as an adult beyond higher education.

We say increase IDEA funding. As I mentioned before, when the Individuals for Disability Education Act was passed, the local school districts were led to believe that if they participate in that program and make sure that children with disabilities have an equal opportunity for a good education, the Federal Government will supply 40 percent of the excess funds to educate a special needs child.

Madam Speaker, we have to understand if a school district's average per pupil expenditure might be \$7,500, a special needs child may be \$15,000, may be \$20,000, may be \$100,000, the local school district has had to pick up most of that extra expenditure, even though we said we would send 40 percent of the excess costs.

Well, depending where you are, just in a small city, like I represent, in York, Pennsylvania, if we were sending them 40 percent of excess costs, they would get a million dollars extra every year. They could talk about teacher quality. They could talk about pupil-teacher ratio reduction. They could talk about improving their school buildings, because they would be getting what was promised.

And for 20 years I pleaded and pleaded and pleaded and pleaded and got nowhere. Finally, we started making some improvements. But not because of the President's budget, because the last 2 years he sent a budget up that reduced our spending on special education, if we consider the number of new students that come in and we include inflation.

Fortunately, by the time we were finished going through the authorization process and the appropriations process, we have dramatically increased that expenditure so that those local school districts then can get this money and spend it on the special needs children, without totally raising all of that money on the local level and taking it away from every other education program.

Our Teacher Accountability Act supports local decision-making, provides greater flexibility, reforming the tenure system, tests teachers, provides for signing bonuses or differential pay for teachers in high-needs subject areas, provides incentives to teachers with a record of success in helping low-achievement students improve their academic success, helps them recruit fully qualified teachers, rewards schools and local education agencies for reducing the number of unqualified teachers that are teaching in their schools, helps them hire quality teachers and provide quality professional development.

Now, contrast that, again, with what the administration would do. The new Washington control programs address many of the same issues that I just mentioned, but the programs will be directed by bureaucrats in Washington and not based on peculiar needs of each local school district.

Washington will decide who receives the funds. Washington will decide the amount of funds that are needed to address a specific problem. Washington will dictate how the funds must be spent.

We are moving in the right direction, and I am hopeful that by the time we finish reauthorization of the Elementary Secondary Education Act we, in the near future, will begin to see a closing of that academic achievement

gap. Something that was well intentioned with the legislation in 1965; unfortunately, it has not worked.

This is a chart indicating just what we have been able to do, what the President has said in relationship to the funding for special ed and what we were able to do in the House and the Senate in the appropriation process. Here we see 1997, and the yellow is the President's request. The orange is what we were able to do. We got up above \$3 million in 1997 for special ed money going back. In 1998, this was the President's request. This is what we were able to do in the Congress.

In 1999, we can again see we went up. And in the year 2000, the present year that we are in, we are now up to \$5 million that will go back to these local school districts.

IDEA funding is probably the most important thing we can do to help local school districts because it gives them, then, the opportunity to use the hard-earned tax money that they have to go out and get for their entire education program.

As I mentioned, my small city of York would receive a million dollars extra. Let me talk about a couple of the other areas.

Los Angeles, for instance, they actually receive \$23 million. If they got the 40 percent of excess costs, they would get \$118 million. That would free up \$95 million that they must raise locally to meet these Federal mandates.

Chicago, \$41 million. If they got their 40 percent they would get \$212 million. It would give them \$170 million. And they have taken great steps in Chicago to try to improve that school system to make sure that all of those children have an opportunity to achieve and get a piece of the American dream.

New York City, \$41 million. \$212 million, 170 million if they got the 40 percent.

In Miami, they receive \$10 million. With 40 percent, they would get \$55 million. That means a 44 million increase.

Washington, D.C., right where we are, they get \$3 million. If they got the 40 percent, they would get \$15 million. \$12 million locally in order to improve the academic achievement of all their students.

In St. Louis, they get \$2 million. If they got 40 percent, they would get \$10 million, and that is again a dramatic increase for them to use to improve their schools locally.

So large cities across this country would see a dramatic increase; and, therefore, we do not have to go out and tell them we want them to reduce the pupil-teacher ratio, we want them to have a qualified teacher, we want them to improve their school building. They would have the money to do it. We take that money from them with our mandate because we do not send what we promised we would send.

Again, I hope by the time we finish the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in the

near future, we will see that gap closed. It is tragic to see as many as 50 percent of our students not receiving the education they will need to compete in the 21st century.

□ 1615

Last year I had to cast one of the worst votes I had to cast. We needed to change our immigration laws so that we could bring qualified people in to do the jobs that exist in this country, in this high-tech 21st Century. What a tragedy. What a tragedy. I hope no one will ever have to cast a vote of that nature in the future, because I hope we will do something about making sure that that 50 percent that are not getting an opportunity to get a part of this 21st Century American dream will get that opportunity.

The answers are at the local level with State efforts. We are here to add assistance. We should not be here to complicate the problems that they have on the State and local level. I think by the time we pass the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and it becomes law, we will be on the right road to ensure academic achievement for all students no matter where they live, who they are, no matter what their disability may be. All will have an opportunity for a quality education.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WELDON of Florida). Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6 p.m.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6 p.m.

□ 1801

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PEASE) at 6 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.

#### INDIAN TRIBAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND CONTRACT ENCOURAGEMENT ACT OF 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the Senate bill, S. 613.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 613, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 406, nays 2, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 26]

YEAS—406

Abercrombie	Dingell	Kasich
Ackerman	Dixon	Kelly
Aderholt	Doggett	Kennedy
Allen	Dooley	Kildee
Andrews	Doolittle	Kind (WI)
Archer	Doyle	King (NY)
Armey	Dreier	Kingston
Baca	Duncan	Kleczka
Bachus	Dunn	Klink
Baird	Edwards	Knollenberg
Baker	Ehlers	Kolbe
Baldacci	Emerson	Kucinich
Baldwin	Engel	Kuykendall
Ballenger	English	LaFalce
Barcia	Eshoo	LaHood
Barr	Etheridge	Lampson
Barrett (NE)	Evans	Lantos
Barrett (WI)	Everett	Largent
Bartlett	Ewing	Larson
Bass	Farr	Latham
Bateman	Fattah	LaTourette
Becerra	Filner	Lazio
Bentsen	Fletcher	Leach
Bereuter	Foley	Lee
Berkley	Forbes	Levin
Berman	Ford	Lewis (CA)
Berry	Fossella	Lewis (GA)
Biggert	Fowler	Lewis (KY)
Bilbray	Frank (MA)	Linder
Bilirakis	Franks (NJ)	Lipinski
Bishop	Frelinghuysen	LoBiondo
Blagojevich	Frost	LoBiondo
Bliley	Gallegly	Lowey
Blumenauer	Ganske	Lucas (KY)
Blunt	Gejdenson	Lucas (OK)
Boehkert	Gekas	Luther
Boehner	Gephardt	Maloney (CT)
Bonilla	Gilchrest	Maloney (NY)
Bonior	Gillmor	Manzullo
Bono	Gilman	Markey
Borski	Gonzalez	Martinez
Boswell	Goode	Mascara
Boucher	Goodlatte	Matsui
Boyd	Goodling	McCarthy (MO)
Brady (PA)	Gordon	McCarthy (NY)
Brady (TX)	Goss	McCollum
Brown (FL)	Graham	McCrery
Bryant	Granger	McDermott
Burr	Green (TX)	McGovern
Burton	Green (WI)	McHugh
Buyer	Greenwood	McInnis
Callahan	Gutierrez	McIntosh
Calvert	Gutknecht	McIntyre
Camp	Hall (OH)	McKeon
Canady	Hall (TX)	McKinney
Cannon	Hansen	McNulty
Capuano	Hastings (FL)	Meehan
Carson	Hastings (WA)	Meek (FL)
Castle	Hayes	Meeks (NY)
Chabot	Hayworth	Menendez
Chambliss	Hefley	Metcalf
Clay	Heger	Mica
Clayton	Hill (IN)	Miller (FL)
Clement	Hill (MT)	Miller, George
Clyburn	Hilleary	Minge
Coble	Hilliard	Mink
Coburn	Hinchee	Moakley
Collins	Hinojosa	Mollohan
Combest	Hobson	Moore
Condit	Hoeffel	Moran (KS)
Conyers	Hoekstra	Moran (VA)
Cooksey	Holden	Morella
Costello	Holt	Myrick
Cox	Hooley	Nadler
Coyne	Horn	Napolitano
Cramer	Hostettler	Neal
Crane	Houghton	Nethercutt
Crowley	Hoyer	Ney
Cubin	Hunter	Northup
Cummings	Hutchinson	Norwood
Cunningham	Hyde	Nussle
Danner	Inslee	Oberstar
Davis (FL)	Isakson	Obey
Davis (IL)	Istook	Olver
Davis (VA)	Jackson (IL)	Ortiz
Deal	Jackson-Lee	Ose
DeFazio	(TX)	Packard
DeGette	Jefferson	Pallone
Delahunt	Jenkins	Pascarell
DeLauro	John	Pastor
DeLay	Johnson (CT)	Payne
DeMint	Johnson, E. B.	Pease
Diaz-Balart	Johnson, Sam	Pelosi
Dickey	Jones (NC)	Peterson (MN)
Dicks	Jones (OH)	Peterson (PA)
	Kanjorski	Petri
		Phelps

Pickering	Scott	Thompson (CA)
Pickett	Sensenbrenner	Thompson (MS)
Pitts	Serrano	Thornberry
Pombo	Sessions	Thune
Pomeroy	Shadegg	Thurman
Porter	Shaw	Tiahrt
Price (NC)	Shays	Tierney
Pryce (OH)	Sherman	Toomey
Quinn	Sherwood	Towns
Radanovich	Shuster	Trafficant
Rahall	Simpson	Turner
Ramstad	Sisisky	Udall (CO)
Rangel	Skeen	Udall (NM)
Regula	Skelton	Upton
Reyes	Slaughter	Velazquez
Reynolds	Smith (MI)	Visclosky
Riley	Smith (NJ)	Vitter
Rivers	Smith (TX)	Walden
Rodriguez	Smith (WA)	Walsh
Roemer	Snyder	Wamp
Rogan	Souder	Watkins
Rogers	Spence	Watt (NC)
Rohrabacher	Spratt	Watts (OK)
Ros-Lehtinen	Stabenow	Waxman
Rothman	Stark	Weiner
Roukema	Stearns	Weldon (FL)
Royce	Stenholm	Weldon (PA)
Ryan (WI)	Stump	Weller
Ryun (KS)	Stupak	Weygand
Sabo	Sununu	Whitfield
Salmon	Sweeney	Wickler
Sanchez	Talent	Wilson
Sanders	Tancredo	Wise
Sandlin	Tanner	Wolf
Sanford	Tauscher	Woolsey
Sawyer	Tauzin	Wu
Saxton	Taylor (MS)	Wynn
Scarborough	Taylor (NC)	Young (AK)
Schaffer	Terry	Young (FL)
Schakowsky	Thomas	

NAYS—2

Chenoweth-Hage Strickland

NOT VOTING—26

Barton	Kilpatrick	Roybal-Allard
Brown (OH)	Lofgren	Rush
Campbell	Millender	Shimkus
Capps	McDonald	Shows
Cook	Miller, Gary	Vento
Deutsch	Murtha	Waters
Ehrlich	Owens	Wexler
Gibbons	Oxley	
Hulshof	Paul	
Kaptur	Portman	

□ 1825

Mr. STRICKLAND changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was not present for rollcall vote No. 26 because I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, due to a previous commitment in my district, I was absent for rollcall vote No. 26.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from the Chamber today during rollcall vote No. 26 on S. 613. Had I been present I would have voted "yea."

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, February 16, 2000, I was traveling in my district with Energy Secretary Bill Richardson, examining the devastating impact that high fuel and heating oil prices are having on Maine people. As a result, I missed four

votes. Had I been present, I would have voted in the following way:

Rollcall vote 22, yea; rollcall vote 23, nay; rollcall vote 24, aye; and rollcall vote 25, no.

#### GIL HODGES BELONGS IN BASEBALL HALL OF FAME

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

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month the Bay News in Brooklyn had this headline on their newspaper. It says, "Get Gil In. Brooklynites Demand, Put Hodges in the Hall of Fame."

Well, today, the veterans committee of major league baseball announced, once again, that Gil Hodges had been passed over. This is an outrage.

In fact, we all know that Gil Hodges was the first major league player to ever hit four home runs in a game. And those of us who are Met fans know that he was the first Met to ever hit a home run and, of course, the manager of the "Miracle Mets" of 1969.

But even the casual baseball fan knows that Gil Hodges deserves to be in the Hall of Fame. They know that he ranks 38 in home runs, with over 370; six seasons with 30-plus home runs. He hit twice, more than 40 home runs. He had a lifetime slugging percentage of nearly 500, and nine times he exceeded a 500 slugging percentage. He was a Gold Glove winner. He played on seven pennant winners and two World Series champions.

He was a hero to the people of Brooklyn and a baseball player that deserves to be in the Hall of Fame.

The Bay News said, "Get Gil In." All Brooklynites agree. The Committee on Veterans Affairs' should heed that call.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). 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.

#### U.S., INDIA, AND CHINA: TIME FOR NEW RELATIONSHIP

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. Mr. Speaker, in the latter part of March, President Clinton is scheduled to travel to India. His trip will mark the first visit by an American President to the world's largest democracy since 1978. I would say that a visit to India by the leader of the free world is long overdue, and I want to express my appreciation to the President for making this historic trip.

Mr. Speaker, my purpose this evening is to suggest that the Presi-

dent devote significant time during the trip to developing closer bilateral cooperation on defense and security issues to respond to common threats and challenges. This is an area where the need for a U.S.-India partnership is growing increasingly urgent. For years we have seen how many of the same forces of international terrorism that threaten American interests also pose a direct threat to India's security.

Another common threat faced by India and the United States emanates from the People's Republic of China. In the last week, we have seen China threatening Taiwan with military force, belying Beijing's claims to favor peaceful reunification. This is, unfortunately, a familiar pattern. U.S. naval officials in the Pacific are currently trying to defuse the situation, and the administration is obviously concerned about the implications that Beijing's saber-rattling will have in a variety of areas. In this House just a few weeks ago, we passed the Taiwan Security Enhancement Act, which I supported.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is time for the United States to stop basing so much of our Asia policy on the hope of achieving a strategic partnership with China. Instead, I believe we should recognize the benefits of closer defense ties with India, a country which, unlike China, is a democracy and which, also in contrast to China, does not threaten its neighbors with the kinds of rhetoric and actions that Beijing has most recently demonstrated with regard to Taiwan.

Toward this end, President Clinton's upcoming trip to India offers an opportunity to embark upon a new direction in U.S. policy in Asia. It is an opportunity to confront the threat posed by China to regional and independent national security and to make responses to this threat a higher priority.

Mr. Speaker, India faces a very serious threat from China. The two countries share a border of approximately a thousand miles. In the 1960s, China initiated a border war against India and continues to occupy Indian territory. More recently, we have seen China providing missile development and nuclear technology assistance to Pakistan as well as other unstable regimes. Pakistan, a country currently ruled by military dictatorship, launched a border conflict against India last year in Kashmir and continues to threaten India in a number of ways, including by providing support and a base for terrorist movements active in Kashmir. By aiding Pakistan, China is indirectly, but in a very real sense, threatening its neighbor India.

India, on the other hand, Mr. Speaker, does not engage in proliferation activities. India has developed its own indigenous nuclear weapon and missile systems, but it does not share the sensitive technology with other nations, much less with unstable regimes that support international terrorism. India does not seek to promote tensions among neighboring countries, as China

has cynically done in the India-Pakistan dispute.

Given Chinese behavior and the common threat it poses to the United States and India, I believe that President Clinton should use his trip to India as the occasion to launch a new Indo-U.S. defense partnership. I will be calling on the President to take this much-needed action.

While this is a bold new step, I believe we can lay the groundwork now for a far-reaching alliance between the United States and India, including greatly expanded International Military Education and Training, joint exercises and other military and political links that the U.S. currently maintains with our key democratic allies around the world. Such a partnership may take some time to fully develop, but now is the time for launching it and also pondering the details.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I maintain my view that the President should not go to Pakistan on his trip to South Asia. It is important that the administration continue to send the message to Islamabad that we are very concerned about Pakistan's role in promoting instability in Kashmir, about the links between Pakistan and terrorist organizations, and the crushing of civilian government by the military junta now in power.

Currently, Pakistan is not on the President's South Asia itinerary. Mr. Speaker, Pakistan has done nothing to deserve a visit by the President of the United States.

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.)

#### CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, Americans understand that, without campaign finance reform, attempts to restructure our healthcare system, create a prescription drug benefit, improve our communities, protect our environment will all be for naught. The big, important issues will remain trapped by the pressures of special interests and big-money politics.

The fight for campaign finance reform will not go away. I personally pledge to continue to make campaign finance reform one of Congress's most urgent priorities. However, opponents of real reform continue to create a legislative logjam. Deadlines are set and ignored.

June will mark the fifth anniversary of President Clinton and then House

Speaker Newt Gingrich shaking hands before a group of senior citizens and pledging to create a bipartisan campaign finance reform commission. As we all know, nothing ever came of it.

This last session, I was very encouraged when the Shays-Meehan bill passed the House by a large bipartisan vote. This important legislation, while not the ultimate solution, is a significant step forward. It would ban soft money contributions and deal with sham issue ads, which are so prevalent.

Despite the House's action, Shays-Meehan has met its death in the Senate. The other body was unable to terminate debate on this crucial issue. We lost the opportunity to make a real change.

I am fortunate to represent a very historic congressional district in northern New Mexico. During the winter recess, I traveled around my district and spoke to the people. In gathering after gathering, the issue of campaign finance reform kept coming up. I assured them that I would fight to put campaign finance reform on the front burner.

Voters in my State are so concerned that they are pushing for a publicly financed State system, which will be voted on in November. This constitutional amendment has solid grassroots support.

The State senator that introduced this constitutional amendment, Dede Feldman, and her colleagues in the State legislature should be applauded for having the courage to bring this issue to the forefront.

I had the opportunity today to proudly march with Granny D, the campaign finance reform champion who arrived in our Nation's capital. The determination of this 90-year-old woman and her crusade for reform is truly inspiring. I want to thank Granny D for her courageous efforts.

I honestly believe that, if our country's founders were here to witness today's campaigns, they would join us in this endeavor. Indeed, Alexander Hamilton wrote: "It will not be alleged that an election law could have been framed and inserted in the Constitution which would have been applicable to every probable change in the situation of the country; and it will not therefore not be denied that a discretionary power over elections ought to exist somewhere."

We have got to reform this system and preserve our precious democracy.

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

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

#### SACAJAWEA GOLDEN DOLLAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Washington (Mr. METCALF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, the United States Mint has done a tremendous job of accelerating the production and shipment of the new Sacajawea Golden Dollars. The new coin is golden in color, with a smooth edge; and on the face of the coin is a picture of Sacajawea, the Native American woman who helped the Lewis and Clark expedition.

The Sacajawea Golden Dollar has been a huge success with the public since its release on January 26. In fact, there has been so much demand for the new coin that the U.S. Mint has doubled their production to five million Golden Dollars a day. By the end of February, there will be 200 million Golden Dollars in circulation. And by the end of this year, there will be, are you ready for this, one billion in circulation.

This is great news for the taxpayers. For it only costs the U.S. Mint about 12 cents to make a Sacajawea Golden Dollar. Then the Mint sells the coins to banks for one full dollar. This results in a direct profit to the Treasury of 88 cents on each coin issued.

At the end of this year, when one billion Golden Dollars are in circulation, the United States Treasury will have made a profit of over \$800 million. That profit will be eligible to help reduce our \$5.7 trillion national debt. That is right, the Treasury makes its profit from issuing coins, which helps to lower the debt of the Nation. How we have allowed ourselves to accrue such an enormous debt is a story for another time.

What I want to talk about is one of the mechanisms that allowed this monstrosity to happen and to try to ensure that it does not happen again. Many people assume that when the Government runs out of money it just fires up the printing presses and prints more money. This assumption is simply not true.

When the Government runs out of money, it borrows money at interest to feed its insatiable appetite. This is the foundation of our debt money system. Yes, our money system is a debt-based money system. That is why the interest payments on our \$5.7 trillion debt was over \$215 billion last year.

Simply, the Federal Government must stop spending more than it receives in taxes. Except in wartime and dire emergencies, it is unacceptable for the Government to spend beyond its means.

One way to minimize this debt trap would be for the Federal Reserve to buy zero-interest bonds. The process would work by allowing the Federal Reserve, or its surrogate, to buy zero-interest mortgages on needed State and local government infrastructure improvements. These mortgages would be amortized over a period of up to 30 years, depending upon the nature of the improvement.

My bill, H.R. 2777, the Transportation Infrastructure and Local Government

Capital Enhancement Act, would provide the Federal Reserve Board a replacement mechanism to accommodate the needed increases in the money supply without using debt money.

□ 1845

#### CURBING AMERICA'S DEPENDENCE ON FOREIGN OIL

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, almost everyone is understandably upset about the recent rise in the price of gasoline. The really sad thing is that we could easily bring these prices down or at least keep them from going up further.

We have become far too dependent on foreign oil, with slightly over half, in fact some estimates as high as 60 percent, of our oil coming from other countries. This endangers our national security, in addition to hurting us in the pocketbook.

We are sitting on many billions of barrels of oil in Alaska and offshore other States but some extremists do not want us to drill for any oil, cut any trees or dig for any coal. In fact, one environmentalist once told me he hoped the price of gas would go to 3 or \$4 a gallon so more people would be forced to use mass transit and there would be less pollution.

We could drill for oil on less than 1 percent of the Arctic Wildlife Refuge in Alaska and potentially get billions of barrels of oil and billions more offshore from other States.

In 1998, the U.S. geologic survey estimated that the coastal plain of this Arctic Wildlife Refuge, an area set aside by Congress for evaluation of its oil and gas potential, could have up to 16 billion barrels of recoverable oil. This is equivalent to 30 years of Saudi oil imports.

The House Resources Committee web page states that "ANWR consists of 19 million acres in the northeastern corner of the State, of which 8 million has been designated as wilderness. The coastal plain of ANWR, designated as a study area for possible oil development in 1980, comprises 1.5 million acres, or 0.4 percent of the total acreage of Alaska. This debate centers on development which would affect only 2,000 acres within that 1.5 million acres with the potential to produce the largest unexplored onshore geologic structures known in the United States."

The Arctic Wildlife Refuge is almost 19.8 million acres, 1.5 million acres of which is flat, brown tundra without a tree or bush on it and very few animals. Yet the groups opposed to drilling never show pictures of this flat, brown tundra. They almost always show pictures of the Brooks Range which is mountainous with trees and animals, but no one has ever advocated oil exploration there.

The less than 1 percent area where the oil is can be explored without cutting one tree or bush or harming a single animal. Offshore oil can now also be produced in a very environmentally safe way.

I voted several years ago to require double hulls on oil tankers and have voted for many other environmental bills. But you cannot just shut down development of natural resources without destroying jobs, driving up prices, and hurting poor and working people most of all.

Often what is behind much of what happens here is big money. Some of these environmental extremists are some of the best friends extremely big business has.

I wonder if some companies which want us to import a lot of oil, or possibly the OPEC countries themselves, or possibly oil companies with big investments elsewhere simply do not want us drilling in Alaska because they would lose big money.

Are they supporting and funding some of these environmental groups because it is to their monetary advantage to do so?

I mean, if you are talking about drilling on only a couple of thousand or a few thousand acres out of an area many millions of acres in size and you can do so in a completely safe way environmentally, why do these people keep fighting it?

Almost all of these radical environmentalists come from wealthy families. But they will be hurting the poor and working people the most if they keep these oil prices from coming down.

Mr. Speaker, we should open up this less than 1 percent area of ANWR and certain other offshore areas, get many millions barrels of oil and become less dependent on foreign oil in the process.

If we do not, gas prices in the future could go even higher or not come down and millions of poor and working people will be the ones who are hurt the most.

---

IN MEMORIAM KENNETH L.  
MADDY

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, this is a humble attempt on my part to remember the life and contributions of a great leader in California, one Ken L. Maddy.

Mr. Speaker, all of California can be proud of the favorite son Fresno sent to Sacramento three decades ago. A legislator's legislator, Ken Maddy never was far from the Central Valley district and the agricultural industry he represented. He was elected to the assembly in 1970 in a district with a little over 30 percent Republican registration. As the Democrats of Fresno loved him, the Republicans of Sacramento looked to him for leadership. Senate

Republican leader Ken Maddy became known as the "go-to guy" for both Governors Deukmejian and Pete Wilson.

Senator Maddy combined grace with good looks. He loved people, and he loved life. Few men will ever match the positive impact he had on California politics. He believed in governing and the role of compromise in legislative politics. Smart, dedicated, trustworthy, Ken Maddy simply reflected the very best that California has to offer public affairs.

His special passion for horses and racing went back to his teenage years as a groom at Hollywood Park. Among many highlights of his legislative career, which ranged from efforts to strengthen our criminal justice system, to impacting ethics standards for State legislators, to preserving private property rights, are the real highlights, the California Center for Equine Health and Performance and the Equine Analytical Chemistry Laboratory at the University of California at Davis. Senator Maddy's private pride and joy was a horse named Work the Crowd. The California-bred champion filly now grazes in green pastures in the valley. Raising a brood of California champions, Work the Crowd probably wonders where her Ken has gone.

Senator Ken Maddy was a proud graduate of Fresno State and served as a member of the President's Club and the Bulldog Club. In 1999, the Kenneth L. Maddy Institute of Public Policy was dedicated at CSU-Fresno as a vital training ground for the next generation of Valley political leaders. He graduated from UCLA Law School in 1963, and in 1998 he was recognized as one of UCLA's outstanding graduates.

Ken Maddy, one of the most respected legislators to ever grace California's capital. On February 18, 2000, this prince of a leader, who dreamed of the sport of kings, passed on to be remembered forever by those who care about politics, the profession he loved.

---

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to take a few moments along with a couple of my colleagues to talk about a very important issue that comes and goes in this institution of ours and we are hoping to be able to resurrect it again yes, even during this presidential election year, one that we hope will never go away until Congress gets it right, and that is the issue of campaign finance reform and the necessity to enact common sense reform to get the big money and the influence of money out of our political process.

There have been two very important events so far this year, Mr. Speaker, in regards to the campaign finance reform debate that we are having throughout

the Nation. One is a very important Supreme Court decision that was just handed down on January 24 of this year whereby the court basically upheld the constitutional authority of State legislatures and this body to be able to place campaign contribution limitations in the political process.

This is an important holding that the Supreme Court again resolved after the seminal case of Buckley v. Valeo during the 1970s in which the court upheld the ability of legislators to impose contribution limitations because oftentimes in this body during the course of campaign finance reform debates, one of the chief arguments against doing anything in an attempt to get the big money out, is that we have a free speech concern and a first amendment that we would be infringing upon if we start taking the big money out of the political process.

And lo and behold, now the Supreme Court this year basically said no to that argument. I think it gives new life and a breath of fresh air to the whole campaign finance reform debate. Hopefully it will provide more impetus to the cause across the country and more political courage quite frankly here in Washington to do the right thing.

The other event in regards to finance reform occurred today, actually on the steps of this Capitol where Granny D finished her long trek across the country in support of campaign finance reform. It is a marvelous story for my colleagues who have not heard about it yet. It is receiving a lot of attention nationally today since she concluded her long walk.

I brought with me today a picture that I was able to download off her Web site. It shows a picture of Granny D, a 90-year-old grandmother of eight, I believe, and a great grandmother of 12, someone who has arthritis and emphysema but felt strongly enough about the cause of campaign finance reform that she decided to make it a national issue by dedicating herself to walking across the country, starting out in Pasadena during the Rose Bowl of January 1 of 1999 last year and then traversing over 3,100 miles, traveling through 12 different States, receiving a lot of local media attention along her way, encouraging individuals to contact their representatives at the State and national level to impress upon them the urgency of campaign finance reform.

And now today she finally walked into Washington, D.C. and walked right up to the steps of this Capitol and delivered a marvelous, marvelous speech. I think a real inspiration for the cause of citizen advocacy and participation in our democratic process, especially given her own story. I will go into a little bit more detail but recognizing one of my colleagues' time constraints who would like to join in this discussion tonight, I yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN), who I came to Congress with. And we helped form a freshman bipartisan

task force on campaign finance reform that he took a real leadership role in. And he has been a strong advocate for enacting finance reform with Shays-Meehan that did pass this body last year already and then languished in the United States Senate. I am glad he is here to join us this evening.

Mr. ALLEN. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for putting together this special order. This has been an issue that you and I and others have been working on since we first came to Congress. We started, as you mentioned, with that freshman bipartisan task force, six Republicans and six Democrats; and over a period of several months, we negotiated out a bill that would ban soft money and make other changes in this system. But it would get the biggest of the big money out of politics, those soft money contributions to the national parties from wealthy individuals, corporations and labor unions.

As my colleagues will recall, in 1998, the freshmen on both sides of the aisle helped to drive that issue hard enough so the Republican leadership had to bring it up. And when it finally came up, we had a debate over several weeks and finally at last, the freshman bill did not pass but the Shays-Meehan bill did pass in 1998 and then, of course, we passed it again last year. But in 1998, if you add together those Members who voted for the freshman soft money ban with those Members who voted for the Shays-Meehan bill, some 352 Members, or 81 percent of the House, voted to ban soft money.

Unfortunately, that bill did not make it through the Senate in the 105th Congress; and so last year, in September, we did it again. In the House, we passed the Shays-Meehan bill in strong bipartisan fashion by a margin of 252-177. But to date, the other body, Members in the other body have blocked campaign finance reform from being passed.

Now, today, Granny D, Doris Had-dock, who walked from California to the steps of the Capitol in Washington, arrived in her 14-month campaign to publicize this issue and urge this Congress to act. I went down to Pennsylvania Avenue and walked with her and hundreds of others up the last stretch to get to the Capitol.

You have to admire her. When she made this commitment, made this decision, she was 88 years old. She trained for this activity to make sure that she was going to be able to walk 10 miles a day carrying a 25-pound pack on her back, and she did it. She got publicity all across this country. That kind of public determination, that kind of perseverance is what we need to help create the public energy to pass campaign finance reform in the other body. We need a law. We need a bill that will get rid of soft money once and for all. Let me just say a word about that.

□ 1900

The so-called hard money contributions are the contributions that are

limited, that go directly to campaigns, directly to individual candidates. But that system of limits is completely undermined if wealthy individuals, corporations, and labor unions can give unlimited amounts of money to the national parties, which can then be used to run TV ads in the districts of individual Members. So this system does not work; these rules do not work anymore.

Last year I warned that a failure to pass campaign finance reform would unleash a deluge of soft money contributions in this 2000 cycle, and, unfortunately, it has come true. The national political party committees raised a record \$107 million in soft money contributions during the 1999 calendar year. That is 81 percent more than the \$59 million they raised during the last comparable presidential election period in 1995.

Now, the opponents, the opponents, the big money coalition which tries to call itself the Free Speech Coalition, are always trying to argue that campaign finance reform's reasonable limitations on what individuals can give is a violation of the First Amendment, and, as the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) just pointed out, not true.

The Supreme Court, in *Nixon versus Shrink Missouri Government PAC*, reaffirmed the constitutionality of contribution limits. It reaffirmed its view that the Government has a compelling interest in enacting contribution limits in order to protect the integrity of our democratic system. The Court reaffirmed that large donations can corrupt this process or create the appearance of corruption.

It is time to change this system. We have gone too far, allowing unlimited contributions to the national parties. This has been a position almost universally supported on the Democratic side of the aisle. Fortunately, we have had enough Republicans in the House who will come over and support campaign finance reform to achieve victory here. But victory here is not enough, because victory in the House alone does not make a law. We need to have enough public support, enough public pressure, to get this through the Senate.

I believe that when you look at what Granny D has accomplished, when you look at the Supreme Court opinion in *Nixon versus Shrink Missouri Government PAC*, that we are seeing a crescendo of support for campaign finance reform. It is incumbent upon all of us here to keep working on this issue, to keep talking about this issue, to keep reminding the voters that until we get campaign finance reform, we cannot, we cannot trust this system to produce the kind of results that we expect a democratic system to produce.

There is too much money in politics; there is too much big money in this system, and we have to get the biggest of the big money out of this system so that the people can have some confidence again that we are doing the public's business, and not the business of our largest contributors.

We still have the opportunity, we have most of a year, to enact real campaign finance reform this year and to stop the flow of big money, of soft money, to the national parties. We need bipartisan support in order to do that; we need support on both the House and the Senate side in order to do that. I think this is the year.

This is an important day. Granny D has made it an important day. I want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for his leadership on this issue, for helping to push this issue, and for holding this special order tonight.

Mr. KIND. I wanted to reciprocate that and thank my good friend from Maine for the work and leadership he has brought to this Congress for the cause of campaign finance reform. In fact, the great State of Maine has really led the revolution sweeping across the country right now by passing their own public referendum, going to public financing of State campaigns. It is already being used as a model in the many other State referenda today.

Mr. ALLEN. If the gentleman would yield for a moment, what we are doing in Maine is interesting and exciting. The 2002 elections will be the first where we have what we call the Clean Elections. The bill has been upheld by the court. Candidates for the State legislature and candidates for Governor can opt, can choose, to be a Clean Elections candidate. If they get the requisite number of signatures and a certain number of \$5 contributions, that is all, \$5 contributions, they will qualify for public financing.

I hope and pray that this system will be one way to reduce the influence of money in politics. I think it is a very interesting experiment, and I hope in time other States will follow Maine's lead.

Mr. KIND. It is an exciting development. It is going to be that type of snowball effect, sweeping across the country, with State legislatures each taking their own approach to financial reform, which will hopefully put more pressure to bear on the United States Congress to act.

It seems every session of Congress we have a discussion and debate about campaign finance reform, trying to get the big money out of the political process; but for one reason or another it has always come up short, most recently in the United States Senate where we ended up eight votes short of being able to break the filibuster over there. It is almost inconceivable that we have a majority of Members in the House and even in the Senate and a President down Pennsylvania Avenue who is more than willing to sign the legislation if it can pass the Congress, but it is being held up by a small vocal minority in the Senate filibustering it. Of course, we need 60 votes in order to break the filibuster and bring the legislation to the floor.

But I am sure my friend from Maine and also my good friend from New Jersey who has joined us for tonight's discussion would concur with me if we

dedicated tonight's special order in honor of Doris Haddock, Granny D, given her marvelous triumph and achievement, what she has accomplished and brought to our doorstep here today.

I would like to recognize the freshman Member from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT), who is also serving with me on the Committee on Education and the Workforce, bringing an important perspective on education issues based on his scientific background, but also someone who has taken up the cause and has turned into a real leader in his own right on the need for finance reform.

Mr. HOLT. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin, my friend, for organizing this special order.

As a freshman Member of Congress, it is fairly recent since I campaigned for election to this august body, and I still vividly remember running for Congress, a challenging experience, but a wonderful experience. It reminds one of what a magnificent place America is, full of hard-working and talented people. It reminds you that the citizens here truly care about the important issues facing each other and that we as a society can work to solve them.

But running for Congress also reminds you, reminds me, of something else, that our campaign finance system is broken and needs to be fixed desperately. We know it; the people know it. The only 38 percent of the voters who turn out to vote are sending a message in that way.

It is a campaign system where wealthy corporations can donate millions of dollars to political parties and drown out the voice of ordinary citizens. It is a campaign system where special interests can spend an unlimited amount of money on attack ads, I know, I have seen it, to smear and distort a candidate's record; and that is wrong. It is a campaign system where we as elected representatives have to spend an inordinate amount of time raising money, instead of addressing the issues.

Campaign expenditures have just gotten out of hand. In primary and general elections combined in the year 1976, all candidates for U.S. Congress spent a total of \$115 million. Twenty-two years later, at the most recent congressional election in 1998, candidates spent \$740 million, more than six times what was spent 22 years earlier. I am sure the amount of money in this year, 2000, will be even higher.

When you look at the low voter turnout and widespread cynicism, you realize that we have to deal with this key issue that has to do with trust in the Government. How can we hope to deal with the big problems that we face, whether it is Social Security, health care, transportation issues, defense issues, international affairs, where these are solutions that we seek as a society, together? How can we hope to have solutions to these problems that the people will have faith in if they feel

that solutions are determined by special interests? People understand that their voices are being drowned out.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) spoke earlier about the recent Supreme Court decisions, and I think there is cause for hope here.

The opponents of campaign finance reform always trot out the First Amendment guarantee of free speech. Well, the Supreme Court back in 1976 under *Buckley v. Valeo* gave them some support for that line of reasoning, that speech as spending could not be restricted. But last month in *Nixon v. Shrink the court* did hold up a statutory cap on gifts and donations to campaigns. That makes sense. But although it did not formally reexamine the issue of spending, the comments of the Justices give us cause for hope that they will allow some changes in the way campaign spending is regulated.

Recently in an article in the *Washington Post*, former Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, Newton Minow, and Craig LaMay, Northwestern University journalism professor, wrote a very interesting piece, pointing out, they say, that a lawyer arguing a case in the Supreme Court is limited to 30 minutes of oral argument. Members of the House of Representatives, as we well know, are limited in the time we have available to speak. In Illinois, voters are given 5 minutes to complete their ballots. In none of these cases can the individual, no matter how well heeled, buy additional time. The process of governing ourselves is something that requires every citizen and is due to every citizen; and it should not be reapportioned according to the resources of those citizens.

So elections, say LaMay and Minow, are just as susceptible to distortion and destruction as any other institution would be if its rules allotted free speech according to one's ability to pay.

Well, it is a special pleasure to talk about this subject today, because we take some hope not only from the Supreme Court's words of a month ago, but a great deal of hope from the actions of Doris Haddock, Granny D. I, too, walked with Granny D today on her last mile, and stood with her as she gave a rousing and moving and very thoughtful speech on the steps of this Capitol. We applaud her; and I think it is appropriate, as you say, that we dedicate tonight's discussion to her.

She reminds us that we need to overhaul the current system and that it may be difficult; but step by step, we can do it. One of the best ways to do it is to start right now with what is in front of us, which is the ban on soft money. It is one of the essential steps and one of the first steps to begin restoring people's faith in government.

I would like to point out that on the day I was sworn in, the first thing I did was seek out my colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), Republican cosponsor of the Shays-

Meehan campaign finance bill, seek out the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN), and sit down with them and let them know that I take that to be the most important step we can take to restoring trust in government. So I joined with a large majority, a bipartisan majority of people here, in supporting the Shays-Meehan Campaign Finance Reform Act.

It now appears that this legislation is going to have trouble getting out of Congress this year, but we who care about government, and that is millions of people, and care that we have a government that is responsive to the people, rather than special interests, should not let up.

Granny D did not let up; and she made it clear she was not walking for Republicans; she was not walking for Democrats. She was walking for her children and her grandchildren and all of the other millions of people that they symbolize who want a government of the people.

□ 1915

I am delighted that the gentleman is doing this. I am pleased to join with the gentleman to talk about this great need to take some concrete steps to restore trust in our government. We look to the other body to finish the work that we have begun, but we cannot stop there. There are some other steps we need to take so that we have campaigns financed in a way that give everyone a voice in how they find solutions to the tough problems facing our society.

Mr. KIND. If the gentleman will yield back.

Mr. HOLT. I would be pleased to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KIND. I commend the gentleman, again, for the gentleman's work, for the gentleman's contribution to this important issue. I think what we need, and was demonstrated a little bit on the steps of the Capitol, is a Granny D revolution in the country. She started that in no small part by committing herself to a cause that she feels very strongly in.

The gentleman is absolutely right, it was not a partisan issue, the Granny D; it was an American issue. It was an issue about the future of her grandchildren and her great-grandchildren and the stake of her democratic government that she loves so well, that she was willing to, even though she has emphysema and is arthritic, walk over 3,100 miles for this cause. It is such a marvelous story.

I do not know if the gentleman had an opportunity yet to tap into her Web site, but she put together a very good Web site, a lot of neat pictures. I would like to share the Web site address with any colleagues who are listening here tonight. It is [www.GrannyD.com](http://www.GrannyD.com). Could not get any easier than that.

I would encourage those who are listening to take a little bit of time, a few minutes, and page through that Web site. It displays the beginning and the

end of her journey. What a great story it has been.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. KIND. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOLT. On that subject, this was not a stunt. She was out there with the American people. She brought with her what she learned along the way. In a particularly moving part of her speech today on the steps, she talked about finishing her walk yesterday and starting her walk today at Arlington Cemetery.

As the gentleman knows, she walked in 10-mile segments approximately all across the country. She said those spirits were with her today as she walked through Washington and as she stood on the steps of the Capitol.

These are people who had fought for American ideals. She wondered, in fact, she was quite sure that they did not fight and die for a government that goes to the highest bidder, for a government where special wealthy interests have more voice than the common people, where we have, as some say, auctions, rather than elections.

It was moving when she put it in that context and when she put it in the context of all that she had heard from people in Arizona and in New Mexico and in Texas and in Tennessee and West Virginia. It was not a stunt. This is an effort to recapture what is great about the American government.

Mr. HOLT. And I had a chance to listen to her speech and also jot down some of the factors that motivated her for embarking upon this cause. Just to recite a few of those tonight: she was concerned that government is being corrupted through campaign contributions made by the big contributors, the big money going into campaigns that results, in her words, in a quid pro quo response from elected officials.

That has been a common theme during her talks or speech today as the growing cynicism and the perception of corruption in the political process. And it is a theme that is reiterated in the recent Supreme Court decision, *Nixon v. Shrink Missouri Government*, in which the Justices in a six to three decision basically said legislators have the constitutional authority to limit the amount of money coming into campaigns, not only to combat corruption in the political process, but also to deal with the appearance of corruption in the political process.

That is an important point. Again, the opponents of reform are always quick to come down to the House floor arguing against a piece of legislation by trying to turn the issue around, by pointing to us and saying listen, RUSH HOLT, you have accepted campaign contributions. Do you feel corrupted? Do you feel like you are influenced now because of those contributions? Asking us to specifically cite instances of corruption that might be going on in the halls of this great body.

The Supreme Court says that is really beside the point. It could be one jus-

tification, a constitutional underpinning for why Congress feels the need to limit the amount flowing into campaigns. But there is also another very important reason, and that is the appearance of corruption, that all this money flowing into the campaigns have on the American people, on people like Granny D, who cited it.

It is really giving cause, I feel, to the growing cynicism that is permeating our society and why we are seeing voter participation declining election year after election year. It is because they feel a disempowerment.

A couple of other reasons that she cited, she feels that the politicians today do not give enough concern to people who do not contribute the big money, no matter how important the issue might be. She also saw an opportunity to do something about it, and she did. She felt politically powerless, this is in her words, something that no American should ever feel.

She sees the three most important things that our government must do in regards to financial reform is, A, banning the soft money; B, enacting the public financing of an election, starting at local levels and working up, just as the State of Maine has done, and we will see it play out this year for the first time during an election cycle; and, finally, the right to free political advertising on a controlled scale.

Finally, these are ideas that we have been working with in the context of finance reform, ideas that she again cited in support of her cause for finance reform.

But during the course of her travels, she was interviewed by the national media numerous times. Some of the early morning talk shows had her on, *Eyewitness*. She said she met a lot of wonderful people who would feed and house her at different times in different States. She went through four pairs of sneakers during her 3,100-mile hike.

The people around the country would come up to her and say things such as, you are walking for me, Granny. You are my voice. You are my face. God bless you. And get this, she even caught pneumonia in Arizona, of all places. She needs to come and visit my great State of Wisconsin before she gets some real pneumonia. But she recovered. After she recovered, she kept going with her walk.

Her intent was actually to conclude her walk on the steps of the Capitol on February 24, which was her 90th birthday. Unfortunately, she was a few days late in arriving, but her message was as strong arriving today as it would have been even on the 24th.

Her message focuses on getting people to contact their Federal representatives to get them to support Shays-Meehan on the House side and the McCain-Feingold bill on the Senate side. During her walk she gained increasing support from both public and national leaders.

Granny D's concern is that the government is being corrupted through

money from large contributors. Just to quote a couple of statements that she made during a New Hampshire town hall meeting last October, 1999, she said,

First, we do need to get soft money out of our elections with the Federal law. A minority of Senators did not want to take their medicine last week when they killed the McCain-Feingold bill in Washington, so we will have to make them take their pill when they come home for reelection. If they won't get soft money out of the system, and they have turned down opportunities to do so 4 years in a row, then it is simply time for us to get them out of the system.

That I think is a very important point, because in all issues such as this it ultimately becomes an election issue, and what campaigns and elections are all about: who you support for the issues that you want to see pursued and enacted in the United States Congress.

Until there are enough Americans, I feel, that feel strongly enough about the appearance of corruption or even the corruption itself in the political process and start holding their representatives' feet to the fire and make this an election year issue, I am afraid it is going to continue to languish, and it will continue to meet excuse after excuse for failing to enact it.

That is why I think good policy is making good politics, even in the presidential campaigns today. We have seen Senator McCain talking about this issue. He is the chief cosponsor, along with my Senator, Russ Feingold, from Wisconsin driving this issue in the Senate for many years already. I think that has been resonating with the American people, and why he has been receiving the support that he has during the course of the campaign season.

Vice President Al Gore has also been a champion of McCain-Feingold and Shays-Meehan, and is fully supportive of the reform bill. Senator Bill Bradley, another presidential candidate, is in strong support of campaign finance reform.

I think in this instance, in this election year, good policy is going to make for good politics.

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

Mr. KIND. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman commented a few moments ago that Granny D spoke about a feeling of powerlessness. I hope she does not feel powerless now as she sees the thousands of people who joined her on the steps of the Capitol, who are joining her on her web site, who are joining her at every stage here.

It is interesting, many of them carried signs and chanted, "Granny D speaks for me." It is perhaps ironic that a rather diminutive 90-year-old has such a powerful voice. In fact, when she stood up to the microphone she did have a powerful voice, but an even more powerful voice in her actions.

She spoke about this cynicism that people have. I hasten to say that our

colleagues here are honorable people, almost all driven by real altruism. But there is a perception out there in the country, and this is what the gentleman spoke about when he talked about the Supreme Court, a perception that is crippling, crippling our democracy, a perception that anything that comes out of Congress is determined by the wealthy special interests. We need to take action on that. I really commend the gentleman for doing this.

Some States are doing some things. In New Jersey, we have public financing of the gubernatorial campaigns. It works well. It is not a perfect solution. The soft money ban that we have been talking about this evening is not a complete solution, but it certainly is a good first step.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, with the remaining moments that we have in this special order, I would like to get into a little bit of the teeth, the meat of what the Supreme Court ruled last month in upholding the ability of legislators to impose limitations on the amount of money flowing into the campaigns. It was a 6 to 3 decision, which is a very good, decisive decision.

The opinion was written by Justice Souter. I would just like to pull out a few of the quotes that Justice Souter used within his majority opinion.

One is getting at the appearance of corruption, in which he wrote, "The prevention of corruption and the appearance of corruption was found to be a constitutionally sufficient justification". In that he was referring to *Buckley v. Valeo*, the 1970 Supreme Court decision.

He also went on to write,

In speaking of improper influence and opportunities for abuse in addition to quid pro quo arrangements, we recognize the concern, not confined to bribery of public officials, but extending to the broader threat from politicians too compliant with the wishes of large contributors. These were the obvious points behind a recognition that the Congress could constitutionally address the power of money to influence governmental action in ways less blatant and specific than bribery.

Justice Souter also went on to write, Democracy works only if the people have faith in those who govern, and that faith is bound to be shattered when high officials and their appointees engage in activities which arouse suspicions of malfeasance and corruption.

What was also interesting in the decision, Chief Justice Rehnquist joined the majority in the 6-3 decision, but also Justice Stevens' concurring opinion that he wrote. It is relatively short, and I would like to quote liberally from that concurring opinion, because I think what he had to write makes a lot of sense and is the direction that we would like to see the constitutional analysis, at least in finance reform, go in this country.

Justice Stevens wrote, "Justice Kennedy," who wrote a dissenting opinion,

Suggests that the misuse of soft money tolerated by this Court's misguided decision in *Colorado Republican Federal Campaign*

*Comm. v. Federal Election Commission* . . . demonstrates the need for a fresh examination of the constitutional issues raised by Congress' enactment of the Federal Election Campaign Acts of 1971 and 1974 and this Court's resolution of those issues in *Buckley v. Valeo*.

□ 1930

"In response to his call for a new beginning, therefore, I make one simple point." And it is a point I felt was not just simple but really gets to the heart of it, and I decided to blow it up here tonight to emphasize the importance of it in the underlying decision. "I make one simple point. Money is property; it is not speech."

Mr. Speaker, that, I think, has been the main crux of the opposition, or at least the opponents' argument to campaign finance reform, is that we cannot do this. We cannot limit the amount of money coming into campaigns. We cannot ban the soft money contributions, the unlimited unregulated millions of dollars that are flooding the parties' campaign coffers every election season, because it would be an infringement on the First Amendment freedom of speech clause. Here we have a Court basically saying, no, that argument does not hold water.

Justice Stevens got more direct to the point where he says: Money is property. Let us not fool ourselves. It is not speech.

Justice Stevens went on to write in his concurring opinion: "Speech has the power to inspire volunteers to perform a multitude of tasks on a campaign trail, on a battleground, or even on a football field." I think he was referring to Vince Lombardi on that last one.

Money, meanwhile, has the power to pay hired laborers to perform the same tasks. It does not follow, however, that the First Amendment provides the same measure of protection to the use of money to accomplish such goals as it provides to the use of ideas to achieve the same results.

Finally, he wrote,

Reliance on the First Amendment to justify the invalidation of campaign finance regulations is the functional equivalent of the Court's candid reliance on the doctrine of substantive due process as articulated in the two first prevailing opinions in *Moore versus East Cleveland*. The right to use one's own money to hire gladiators or to fund speech by proxy certainly merits significant constitutional protection. These property rights, however, are not entitled to the same protection as the right to say what one pleases.

I think it was such a strong concurring opinion that Justice Stevens wrote that I wanted to share that. But Justice Breyer also in a concurring opinion brought up another valid point. He acknowledges that speech is not money, or money is not speech, but he said, "On the one hand, a decision to contribute money to a campaign is a matter of First Amendment concern. Not because money is speech, it is not, but because it enables speech." And that is why the Court in their holding opinion said that so long as the con-

tribution limits do not get so ridiculously low that it inhibits or prevents an individual being able to communicate or get their message out, it will then withstand constitutional scrutiny by our third branch, the highest Court in the land.

So, Mr. Speaker, I thought that was a very important Supreme Court decision that hopefully will have reverberations throughout the context of campaign finance reform. And why is this important? Because the lid has just blown off any type of semblance of control or limitations in the amount of money coming into campaigns.

I brought with me a chart to illustrate what I am talking about. This chart demonstrates the amount of soft money contributions that have been flowing into the parties' campaigns over the last few presidential election years. Notice in 1987-1988 presidential campaign there was roughly \$45 million in soft money contributions. That is when the political parties first started realizing there is a huge gaping loophole that exists in campaign finance reforms, and they started taking advantage of it back in the 1988 presidential campaign.

That soon escalated to \$86 million in the 1992 campaign. It jumped to \$262 million in the 1996 presidential campaign. And according to current estimates of the amount of soft money that is being raised in the current presidential campaign, we are on pace of more than doubling the 1996 soft money contributions; anywhere from \$500 million up to \$750 million in soft money contributions.

Mr. Speaker, that is what I mean by the lid has just been blown off. They are driving truckloads of money through the loophole that exists right now with campaign financing. And if it is not creating the potential for corruption in the political process, it certainly has created already the appearance of corruption in the political process.

That, I think, is a compelling reason enough by itself to fight for campaign finance reform so we can restore a little bit of dignity and integrity to our government and hopefully instill a little bit of faith with the American people that there is not this big "for sale" sign hanging over the United States Congress and we are going to the largest contributor.

That is not what our founders intended this government to mean. It was envisioned to be a process that all Americans could feel they could participate in. But so long as there is the appearance that it is the big money contributors that are gaining access, that are controlling the agenda, and also controlling the outcome of the agenda, I think we are going to only see more and more cynicism growing throughout this country.

I yield to the gentleman, again.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend. Talking politically for a moment, the cynics say we will not do

anything, it does not poll. The opinion polls, when we ask people what do they care about, the pollsters come back and say campaign finance reform is way down the list. It does not poll. Let me tell my colleagues that certainly in my district, and certainly in all the districts that Granny D walked through, it is very much on people's minds.

It is not clear in people's minds how to deal with it, but they know we must deal with it. It is not just a political issue on a list of items. It is not just another item for a plank in a political platform. This is fundamental to our democracy. It is fundamental to our system of government and people understand that.

That is why this is of utmost importance. So that we can be able, so that we can deal with these other tough problems that we as a country face. We have got to get on with it.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, again. Again, coming back to what Justice Souter wrote in his majority opinion *Nixon v. Shrink* last month, writing for the majority perhaps he said it best, that countering the perception that politicians are being bought is a proper justification for regulating donations. Directly quoting from his opinion, he said, "Leave the perception of impropriety unanswered and the cynical assumption that large donors call the tune would jeopardize the willingness of voters to take part in democratic government."

That, I think, basically summarizes the crux of what the Supreme Court was getting at saying: Congress, hey, you have the ability under the Constitution to limit contributions. And after this recent Supreme Court decision, the chief obstacle to achieving a less corrupt campaign finance system is not the U.S. Constitution but the people hiding behind it and using that Constitution as an excuse for inaction. And that, I think, is our chief obstacle that we face today.

A willing Congress can now take action to solve the problem of big money and the influence of money in our political process. The political will, not the constitutional authority, is really the only missing ingredient that we have here today. And I feel in my analysis of the Supreme Court decision, and a lot of constitutional experts who looked at it as well, basically view this recent decision as giving us the green light for the ban on soft money contributions. All the underlying justifications for upholding spending limits in the State of Missouri I feel has the same constitutional application to what we were trying to accomplish in this session of Congress, and that is just an out-and-out ban on soft money contributions before it becomes unmanageable and before, what I think, decent people do indecent things for the sake of the money race that has come to dominate and become all-important in these type of political campaigns.

So that, I think, is really the challenge that we face today. I cannot emphasize this enough, that until the American people really start holding their representatives' feet to the fire on this issue and start making it an election issue, until they are going to go out and support people who are in favor of reform who are no longer going to try to defend the status quo, the status quo that I feel is not working the way it should for the average person back home in my district in western Wisconsin, I do not think we are going to see a strong political push then to overcome the resistance that we still encounter in the United States Senate on this issue. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I think that the gentleman's class came to Congress a couple of terms ago, including the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) and the gentleman deserves a lot of credit for this. He has gotten some reinforcement from our class, this freshman class, and this one representative from New Jersey is going to be with them all the way until we can get good sensible campaign finance reform. The people want it. We need it for the sake of our democracy.

And I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin very much for all that he is doing. I thank the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) for his efforts. And, of course, I want to thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) who have carried the banner for this here in the House of Representatives.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman again for his participation tonight and also for the work that he is doing for the sake of getting finance reform finally passed and signed and enacted into law in this country.

What I would like to do is with the remaining minutes that we have left is to cite a Time Magazine article that came out on February 7, 2000. It was a special investigation Time Magazine and it is titled "Big Money in Politics: Who Gets Hurt?"

It is very insightful, I think, investigation and review of some of the issues that we have been working on here in Congress and what the authors, at least, the investigators feel is the influence of money with these issues.

The article is entitled "How the Little Guy Gets Crunched" and they cite specific chapter and verse and list specific instances that they feel has a direct correlation between the large money contributors and the influence or outcome of legislation or access and action in Washington and the impact that it has on smaller people who do not write the big checks throughout the country.

The case that they cite, they reviewed, is the issue of the banana wars that is going on between the United States and the European Union right now. I believe it is an important WTO issue, however, where the EU has been found in violation of World Trade Orga-

nization rules by prohibiting the importation of bananas from certain areas in Central and South America. But the authors of this article point as one of the underlying causes of why the United States was quick to react and to condemn the European Union and even apply trade sanctions, which we are allowed to do when we have a violation of WTO, is because of the family ownership of the Chiquita company and their role in the political process.

In fact, they tracked the amount of contributions that the owner of Chiquita has made in the course of campaigns starting back in 1991 and continuing through 1999, and the amount of sums that have been given, which really are extraordinary from one family in this country. Just to cite a couple of years, in 1996, the owners of Chiquita contributed \$736,000 to the Republican Party, \$114,000 to the Democrats. 1997, they contributed \$460,000 to the Republican Party, \$116,000 to Democrats. 1998, they contributed \$1.1 million to the Republican Party, \$217,000 to the Democratic Party. 1999, \$555,000 to the Republican Party and \$260,000 to the Democratic Party.

Again, I think the point the authors are making in this Time Magazine article is that if this is not buying influence and access to government decision-making, the appearance sure stinks and it is giving this appearance of corruption and that the United States is not moral holy ground when it comes to our dispute with the European Union over this banana fight. And then they cite specific examples of individual entrepreneurs, small business owners in the country who have been adversely affected because of the sanctions that are now applied against the European Union because of their violation of import quotas on bananas.

One individual in particular, Timothy Dove, has a small business in Somerset, Wisconsin, Action Battery, whereby he has to import batteries from Germany in order to service his business and to keep him in business. It just so happened that the Trade Representative's designation of certain items now that we are going to be hitting with sanctions because of this banana war applies to those batteries that he needs to import in order to keep his business vibrant and strong and to keep it coming.

□ 1945

Now, here is a little guy who is trying to provide for his family with a small business back in Wisconsin, and all of a sudden he gets caught up in this gargantuan trade war between the United States and the European Union over bananas. If he would have woke up one morning and someone said that bananas were going to have a devastating and adverse impact on his health and his life, he would have thought they were crazy. But because of these effects of the sanctions now that are being applied and the designation of items that are being hit with sanctions coming

from the European Union, his business now is in jeopardy of surviving.

And Mr. Dove is not a big contributor to either of the political parties. The authors, again, in this article insinuate that the reason why he is the one getting hurt in this big banana war more than someone else is because he is not a big contributor to the political parties.

This is just a very interesting article that Time magazine reported on that the authors had investigated. Again, it gets back to what the Supreme Court in their decision in Nixon was basically saying, that if there is not reason enough not to prevent corruption from occurring in the political process to justify campaign finance reform, there is certainly enough reason because of the appearance of corruption that other people sitting back in Wisconsin, for instance, the Mr. Doves throughout the country have towards the political process that adds to the cynicism and I think disenchantment and eventually disenfranchisement of their participation in the political process.

---

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The Chair would remind all Members to refrain from characterizing the Senate action or inaction.

---

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES ON MARCH 8, 2000

Mr. SESSIONS (during special order of Mr. KIND), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-505) on the resolution (H. Res. 425) providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

---

#### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1827, GOVERNMENT WASTE CORRECTIONS ACT, 1999

Mr. SESSIONS (during special order of Mr. KIND), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-506) on the resolution (H. Res. 426) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1827) to improve the economy and efficiency of government operations by requiring the use of recovery audits by Federal agencies, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

---

#### NIGHT-SIDE CHAT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, this evening during the next hour I would

like to have a night-side chat with my colleagues in regards to a number of different issues.

The first issue that I would like to start out with is the death tax or the estate tax. Then I would like to move on and cover a few points on the marriage penalty tax, move from there to an issue that I think has become fundamentally important to the defense of this country, and that is the missile defense. In fact, tonight I intend to spend a good deal of time discussing the missile defense of the United States of America.

Then if we have an opportunity, I would like to move on to the Social Security earnings limitation repeal. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) has stepped forward. And I think tomorrow we will see a very close to a unanimous vote to lift the earnings cap for those people between 65 and 70 years old who are being unfairly penalized by the tax law.

So I do publicly want to congratulate the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), and I would also like to congratulate the gentleman from Texas (Mr. JOHNSON). Both of those gentlemen have worked very hard.

I also want to congratulate the Democrats who have finally come on board with the Republican bill to help us get rid of this unfair taxation. Then if we have a little time after that, I would like to talk about the Internet, a taxation on the Internet. So there are a number of issues tonight on our night-side chat that we can discuss.

But let us first start with the death tax. What is the death tax, number one? Number two, what property does this tax tax that has not already been taxed? In this country, there is a tax called the estate tax. If one's accumulation of property during one's lifetime, property, by the way, of which one already has paid taxes upon at least once, if that property accumulates over a certain amount of money, the Government comes in after one's death and mandates upon one's surviving members, one's family, that an additional tax be levied on this property that has already been taxed.

It is probably in our Tax Code the most unfair, punitive tax that we have got. There is no basis of justification to go and tax somebody upon their death, their estate upon their death, on property that throughout their entire lifetime they have paid taxes after taxes after taxes. It is as if the Government just did not get enough.

Now, one would ask, why is something like that in our Tax Code? Why is it not easy just to take it out? Well, I can tell you. The Clinton administration, and, frankly, most of the Democrats in the House, have opposed taking or getting rid of the estate tax. They say it is a tax for the rich.

Well, what I invite those people to do is come out, for example, to the State of Colorado or go to any State in the Union and take a look at small businesses that are now being impacted by

the death tax. Take a look at what happens to families from the personal level when the Government comes into their life after having taxed their property throughout their life and says we have got to take one more hit at the deceased. We need to go in and assess a tax simply based on the reason that they died.

This tax has devastating impacts. I will give my colleagues an example. I have a good friend of mine who is now deceased. But this friend, we will call him Mr. Joe, Mr. Joe years and years ago started out as a bookkeeper in a local construction company. He worked very, very hard in that construction company. After a while, he got an opportunity through years of hard work to buy some stock in the construction company. He was not a wealthy man. But he and his family, his wife, they scraped together a few pennies here, a few pennies there. They watched their expenses, and they invested in stock.

Well, 5 or 6 years ago, in some of his investments, he sold some of those investments, and he was hit with a tax called capital gains.

Now, most of the citizens of this country will be assessed a capital gains taxation. If one's mutual funds, if one bought property, if one owns stock outside of mutual funds, it is a gain upon property that one has made, and they give a capital tax on it.

So that is what they did when Mr. Joe sold his property. He was hit with a capital gains taxation at that time, which was around the rate of 28 percent.

So take out a pencil, figure out that Mr. Joe, who had worked throughout his entire life, had accumulated property, sold a portion of that property, and on the profit on that property, 28 percent taxation.

Unfortunately, my friend Mr. Joe became terminally ill within a month or so after the sale of this property. Even more unfortunate was that he passed away 2 or 3 months after that. The Government then came in to that family and said we realize that your father in this case has paid on time as a responsible citizen of this country taxes on the property that now belongs to the estate. But we are here for a second dip in the pot. The Government has come back, and we think it is necessary to tax the estate of the deceased person. What did they do to that estate? Exactly what they did to that estate, they hit it with taxes which, when you add it to the capital gains tax, gives it an effective tax rate of about 72 percent. Seventy-two percent on that estate is what was paid in taxation.

Now, let me tell you where the hardship comes in. Number one, 72 percent, imagine, you kind of figure out in your own mind what property you have in your home, what property you and your family has in your home that you own. Then try to determine 72 percent of it that you would like to cut out of it to give to the Government, even though you already paid taxes on it.

What happened to the estate is, of course they did not have the cash to pay for the 72 percent. They had to sell assets. They had to go out and sell more of the property to pay the 72 percent tax rate that was imposed upon them.

What happens? What happens to the death tax money? Where does it go? I will tell you exactly where it goes. It goes to the bureaucracy in Washington, D.C. That money is transferred from your communities. In this particular case, it was transferred out of a small community in Colorado in my district, the mountains of Colorado; and it was sent, transferred to Washington D.C. to be distributed amongst the bureaucrats and the agencies in Washington, D.C.

Where would that money have gone had it not been transferred to Washington, D.C. through that death tax? That is a legitimate question. Where would it have gone? Do you know where it would have gone and where it did go? Prior to the tax, prior to the Federal Government stepping into that community, prior to the Federal Government stepping into that estate and taking that money, that money stayed in the community of that small town in the mountains of Colorado.

That was the money that helped fund the local church. That was the money that helped fund the jobs for many, many people in that community. That was the money that bought property and made rental units available in that community.

Now what has happened to that money? It is no longer in that community. It has gone on to Washington, D.C. Because Washington, D.C. is here in the East, they seem to think they know better. They seem to think they need to take one more punch at you, one more punch on the estate tax.

Now we have heard a lot of rhetoric lately. In fact we have even heard some of the rhetoric from the Democrats. Let me make a note here. I compliment the Democrats tomorrow for coming over and assisting us in passing and getting rid of the earnings limitation on Social Security. I wished they would have joined us earlier, but they are joining us, and they should deserve credit for that.

I am not attempting to be partisan here, but I want to make a clear distinction on what is happening on this death tax; and that is, we are not getting help to eliminate this death tax from the Democratic leadership or from the Democratic administration. In fact, let me tell my colleagues exactly what has happened in the last couple of weeks.

I sit on the Committee on Ways and Means; and on this committee, we do all the taxation. We deal with all the taxation issues. It is probably the most powerful committee in the House of Representatives. In looking at that, we get the President's budget. We just got the President's budget a couple of weeks ago.

Do my colleagues know what the Democrats have done with the death

tax? I was in hopes that the Democrats, while I did not really expect them, their leadership to move the party to get rid of the death tax, which is the most unfair tax we have in the system. That was too good to be true to expect them to join us, the Republicans, in our effort to eliminate the tax. I expected them probably to stay neutral.

We hear a little rhetoric about how it is unfair, but they really would not change. I was very surprised. More than surprised, I was extremely disappointed that the President in his budget, the Democrats through the President in that budget, not only did not stay neutral on the death tax, they are actually increasing the death tax. That is right.

For any of you people out there that own a small farm or a ranch or a business or a home in an area where you have seen vast depreciation, hold on to your britches because the Clinton budget increases your taxes by almost \$10 billion, a \$10 billion increase in the death tax in this country.

Come on. How much more can one beat out of a person? Let us be fair to the citizens of this country. I know the bureaucracy in Washington is hungry. I know it is constantly looking for some more money to eat up, some more money to take out of our local communities and transfer out of our States to Washington, D.C. But a \$10 billion increase in the death tax, it is unfair. It is not right.

You are being unfair to the American people. You do not need that additional taxation. You do not need to go out there and seek 10 billion more dollars off the grieving families and off the estates of these families.

Let us be fair. Let us support things like eliminating that death tax. It is unfair. I can give my colleagues example after example after example. In fact, my colleagues here on the House floor can think of it in their own mind, think about their own communities. Ask the question: Is SCOTT MCINNIS in his night-side chat correct? Where is that money? Is the money in my community really going to Washington, D.C. because one of our citizens died and happened to leave an estate that the Government decided it should tax? Of course he is right. Of course that is where the money goes.

We need to have the American people be fully aware of the facts. The facts are these: Republicans will continue their fight to eliminate the death tax in this country. But the Democratic administration that we have right now will continue its efforts to increase the death tax.

For some of my colleagues on the Democratic side, if they do not believe me, look it up in the budget. It is right there: \$10 billion. \$10 billion.

Tonight is a good night to talk about some of these taxes. But, Mr. Speaker, as we go back to our districts, as most of us do every weekend, I certainly do every weekend, there is tax relief out there that I as a Republican am proud

that the Republican Party put into place.

□ 2000

Most American citizens do not realize that probably the largest tax break they have gotten in years just happened a couple of years ago thanks to the efforts of the Republicans. And, frankly, we had some conservative Democrats who came across the aisle and supported us on it as well. That is the tax on the sale of a principal residence, on a home.

Under the old law, if a person bought a home for, say, \$10, and then that home was sold for \$15 and there was a \$5 profit, that person had to pay taxes on that \$5 capital gain. That word capital gain comes back. There was an assessed tax on that capital gain unless an individual was, one, over 55 years of age; two, the amount of the gain did not exceed \$150,000; and, three, an individual only got one exemption. Once a lifetime.

Everybody out there who is a homeowner should listen up because it is important. We have seen appreciation of real property values, of homes. We have seen appreciation in this country, and we have great news, thanks to the Republican efforts on this side. And I keep coming back to this because I am proud of it and I like boasting about it. I do not mind saying it is the Republicans that did this because we did. Now, a person owning a home that sells that home for a profit, and that is the principal residence that they have lived in for the last 3 of 5 years, they get to take that amount of money, up to \$250,000 per person, \$500,000 per couple, and it is exempted from any taxes. It is exempt. That person gets to take that money and put it into their pocket.

Now, under the old law, the taxes could be deferred by buying a house of equal or greater value. That is not a requirement under the law we passed here a couple of years ago. We simply said that when an individual makes the profit, up to \$250,000 per person, they can put it in their pocket. And by the way, there is no age limitation. And by the way, we allow that individual to renew this effort. This can be done every couple of years. A person can go and get this tax break.

This is significant. And every homeowner in this country should know about it because at some point or another they will have a big smile on their face because they are going to be able to put a lot of cash, if their property has appreciated, right into their pocket without sending that money to the bureaucracy in Washington, D.C.

I want to talk about one other tax issue that I think is important and that is unfair. Marriage couples. I represent the Third Congressional District of the State of Colorado. That is the mountains. Essentially the mountains in the State of Colorado. Out there I have almost 70,000 people, in fact, 69,766 people, who live in the Third Congressional District of Colorado that have

an additional penalty on their taxes simply because they are married. Simply because they are married. I could not believe it.

This bill that we passed, that we put together on the Republican side, said, hey, Democrats, Republicans, unaffiliated, whatever, let us stand up and get rid of the marriage tax penalty in our Tax Code. We are a country whose foundation is family. We encourage family. We want our young people to have families. We want them to be married. We want to go back to the cycle of family's right; family's number one. We say that, but on the other hand our Tax Code taxes them, taxes them for being married.

Well, the Republicans in this House, with some Democrats, 40 or so Democrats, passed a bill a couple of weeks ago to eliminate the marriage penalty. Now, I think the President is probably going to veto it. I cannot imagine that he would, but he is probably going to do it. And I was frankly really surprised that some of the Democrats would vote against this. Come on, how do they go back to their districts and look somebody in the eye and say, "You're getting married? Congratulations. Time to take a little more money out of your pocket and transfer it to the bureaucracy in Washington, D.C."

It is an unfair tax. We ought to do something about it. We ought to eliminate it. And to the Democrats that voted no, they will probably have another chance this session to vote on that bill again when it comes back out of conference, and I hope they support us. I hope they stand up and vote and I hope they have the courage to say, look, it is an unfair tax.

Politics aside, election year aside, let us be fair to the taxpayers. Let us let married couples not be penalized for being married. Let us let families who have had a death in their family not get an additional death tax. We can do something. We showed that we could do something on the capital gains when a home is sold and it has not brought the government to its knees. That money has not been buried in the ground somewhere. It is recirculated in the communities. We have helped the homeowner, now we can help the married couple and now we can help the families of the deceased by revisiting these tax codes and by eliminating these unfair penalties on these people.

Now, let me cap off, before I get into something that I think is extremely serious, extremely serious, by once again to publicly commend my fine colleague, the gentleman from the State of Florida (Mr. SHAW), and my fine upstanding colleague, the gentleman from the State of Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON), on their efforts today in the Committee on Ways and Means, which passed unanimously, unanimously, the Democrats joined us, in eliminating the earnings cap for those on Social Security between the ages of 65 and 70.

Over 70 that cap was lifted, but between 65 and 70 citizens were actually

penalized if they had worked all their lives and decided they wanted to continue to work between the ages of 65 and 70. They were penalized under the Social Security System. Today, that bill passed out of the Committee on Ways and Means under the leadership of the gentleman from Florida and the gentleman from Texas. Tomorrow we will have it on the House floor, and I would expect that tomorrow we will have a strong vote.

It is not assured. I was surprised on the marriage penalty and doing away with that. I thought everybody would vote for that, but some of our colleagues on the Democratic side voted against it. But tomorrow I hope my colleagues on the Democratic side will join us and get rid of that earnings cap. I hope they will join us, put aside the election year, put aside the partisanship and join us and let us get rid of it. Let us make the Tax Code fair for everybody.

So a recap real carefully on these tax issues. Number one, we need to eliminate the death tax. It is unfair, it is unjustified, it is punitive, meaning it is a penalty. It is a penalty on the taxpayers of this country to be taxed on property they have already paid taxes on simply because they die.

Number two, we need to recognize that the Congress under the Republican leadership passed successfully for every homeowner in this country an opportunity for them to take the profit from their home and put it right into their pocket.

Number three, we need to eliminate the marriage penalty. It is unfair, fundamentally unfair, for us, as the government of this country, for the bureaucracy in Washington, D.C., to penalize a couple because they are married. It should be the policy of this Congress and every other Congress to follow that we encourage marriage in this country; that we tell people to go out and focus on that family and not worry about being penalized by the government.

And, finally, let me wrap this portion of the comments up by saying that I hope tomorrow we have uniform support on this House floor to eliminate the earnings cap on Social Security. And any of my colleagues out there who have constituents out there between the ages of 65 and 70, they know exactly what we are talking about. Tomorrow's debate should be short, it should be to the point, because the issue is right.

Let us move on. I want to visit this evening in some depth here for the next half-hour or so about missile defense. And I think really the best way to get into this, and I do not like reading a script when I speak on my night-side chats, but I think it is probably an appropriate entry or a lead or a path to follow when we talk about the missile defense of this country.

First, let me precede the reading of these articles with a very strong statement. Every other country in the

world, every nation in the world understands this message: The United States of America has the fundamental right, the fiduciary responsibility, and the obligation to defend its citizens. And we will defend our citizens. And as a part of that defense, they should not dare criticize this country for putting together a missile defense system to take down an incoming missile into this country. Not offensive, defensive.

We have an obligation. My colleagues on this floor, each and every one of us, share that responsibility to be sure that our generation, the next generation, and the generations to follow have the weapons and the tools to defend themselves from aggressors of freedom and against freedom. It is our fundamental obligation as Congressmen of the United States of America.

Let me begin. An article in the Dallas Morning News, that is where I pulled it down from, written by William Safire. Think about this, because this article is really pertinent tonight. As my colleagues know, we have several primaries going on across the country as I now speak. We have three of them, Washington, North Dakota, and Virginia. We know that in the next few months we are going to pick the next President of the United States. So this article kind of plays into that.

For a moment I want my colleagues here to imagine that they are going to be the President of the United States. Just try to put in our minds that we are going to be the President of the United States. Let us start the article.

"Imagine that you are the next United States President and this crisis arises: The starving army of North Korea launches an attack on South Korea imperilling other 30,000 troops. You threaten a massive air assault. Pyongyang counter threatens to put a nuclear missile into the State of Hawaii. You say that that would cause you to strike back and destroy North Korea. Its undeterred leaders dare you to make the trade. You decide.

"Or this crisis: Saddam Hussein invades Saudi Arabia. You warn of a Desert Storm II. He says he has a weapon of mass destruction on a ship near the United States and is ready to sacrifice Baghdad if you are ready to lose New York City. You decide.

"Or this: China, not now a rogue State, goes into an internal convulsion and an irrational warlord attacks Taiwan."

Now, let me leave the article for a minute. Did my colleagues read the paper today? In the last 48 hours, China has threatened the United States of America with a missile attack if in fact we go to the defense of Taiwan. So when this article was written it was just an "imagine yourself in that place." But, in fact, in the last 48 hours, China has made that threat to the United States. So it is fairly realistic. Let us go back to the article.

"Or this: China goes into the internal convulsion and an irrational warlord attacks Taiwan. You threaten to intervene. Within 10 minutes you threaten

to intervene. But all of a sudden you discover that China has missiles targeted on several major United States cities. You have a decision to make. Before you make the decision on North Korea, on Saddam Hussein, on China, remember this; that in 1998 the Central Intelligence Agency told your predecessor that it was highly unlikely that any rogue state, except possibly North Korea, would have a nuclear weapon capable of hitting any of the contiguous 48 States within 10 to 12 years."

□ 2015

That is some exception. Apparently, our strategic assessors are untroubled at the prospect of losing Pearl Harbor again. So we are talking about the 48 States that have no missile defense in place, no missile defense in place.

The CIA assured your predecessor you would have 5 years' warning about the other nations' weapons development before you would have to deploy a missile defense system, but the CIA's record of prediction is poor.

President George Bush was assured that Saddam would have no nuclear capability for the next 10 years. When we went in after we invaded Kuwait, we discovered it to be less than a year away. And India, despite our extensive satellite and surveillance, surprised us with its recent nuclear explosion.

Six months ago, the Congress decided to get a second opinion about how vulnerable the United States is. Donald Rumsfeld, a former Secretary of Defense, was named to lead the bipartisan commission to assess the ballistic threat to the United States. Its nine members are former high government officials, military officers, and scientists of unassailable credibility.

Clearly, forever a national secret, these men with command experience had the advantage denied to CIA analysts. The unclassified summary of this T&B's 300-page report was released recently. This report just came out and it was a shocker. The direct threat to America, it concluded, by a ballistic missile attack is broader, more mature, and evolving more rapidly than has been reported in estimates and reports by the intelligence community. Not only Iran and other terrorist states capable of producing a nuclear-tipped missile within 5 years of ordering it up, they are capable of skipping the test and fine-tuning what we have depended on as our cushion to get our defenses up.

That means the Commission concluded that the warning time the United States would have to develop and deploy a missile defense is near zero. That means, I will repeat, that the time the United States of America will have to develop and deploy a missile defense system is not 5 years, not 10 years, it is close to 0.

Let us set aside our preoccupation with executive privileges and hospital lawsuits long enough to consider the consequences of the judgment of this report. The United States no longer

has the luxury of several years to put up a missile defense. We no longer have the luxury of several years to put a missile defense system up. If we do not decide now to deploy a rudimentary shield, we run the risk of Iran or North Korea or Libya building or buying the weapon that will enable it to get them to drop it upon the United States of America.

The Commission was charged only with assessing the new threat and not about what we should do to meet the danger. Nine serious men concluded unanimously that our intelligence agencies, on which we spend \$27 billion a year, have misled us. Smiling, the director of the Central Intelligence Agency responded that we need to keep challenging our assumptions.

Wrong. We need to defend ourselves from the likely prospect of a surprise nuclear blackmail. A first step is egregious, the naval theater defense, but that requires the President to redefine a 1972 treaty with the Soviets, the anti-ballistic missile treaty that he thinks requires us to remain forever naked to all our potential enemies.

The crisis is not likely to occur as Bill Clinton's sands run out. His successor would be the one to pay, the new President will be the one to pay, in the coin of diplomatic paralysis caused by unconscionable lack of preparedness for this President's failure to heed the warning time in 1998.

Let me move on to another article and just summarize a couple parts of it. This article was written by the Columbus Dispatch. The headline was, "No Shield: The U.S. is Subject to the Threat of Missiles." A chilling paradox of U.S. defense strategies suggests that a Columbus sailor on a Navy ship in the Pacific would be safer from a North Korean missile attack than his parents who work in downtown. It talks in this article about the Rumsfeld assessment. But I like the conclusion of it.

This is the conclusion of that article: One thing is sure, while the United States debates the cost of an anti-missile defense, rogue nations are sparing no expense to make the missiles threat a reality.

Finally, let me go to the Wall Street Journal and then I will leave the articles. Tuesday, February 15, just about a couple weeks ago, under the editorial called the November Missile Defense. Let me just read a couple of paragraphs from that article.

"An influential member of the Russian Duma said this month that a compromise on the Anti-ballistic Missile Treaty was possible and would probably include steep cuts in the limits on strategic warheads and an end to the ban on MIRVs, missiles that can hit more than one target.

"It's absurd enough that the administration is asking Russia's permission for the United States to build a defense against terrorists or rogue states," a system for its citizens, asking Russia's permission to do this, but, on top of that, for the United States to build a

defense and to pay for it by agreeing with Russia to cut our nuclear arsenal.

What that paragraph said and what it refers to is there is a treaty called the Anti-ballistic Missile Treaty. Back in the 1970s, the thought for nuclear deterrent was that if the two countries, the two superpowers, which were Russia and the United States, and that is all that that treaty involved and it did not imagine a North Korea or Libya or Saddam Hussein with nuclear weapons, this treaty, when it was drafted in 1972 or so, said, hey, the best way to stop a nuclear attack is for the two superpowers, Russia and the United States, to agree not to build a defense against each other, so that Russia would have the incentive not to fire missiles upon the United States because they could not defend themselves and the United States had the incentive not to fire missiles on Russia because the United States could not defend itself.

I think it was absurd. The fact is it was signed. It has been in effect. But times have changed. Times have changed dramatically. Number one, Russia is no longer the superpower that it was. Number two, China now has the capability to deliver nuclear missiles into many of the cities of the contiguous 48 States in the United States.

We now know that several countries, including India and Pakistan, have nuclear weapons. We know that these weapons can fall into the hands of the wrong people. And yet we continue in this country to have some of our leaders who resist our country's efforts and, frankly, the Republican's efforts, to put into place a missile defense system.

How many of you have ever heard of NORAD or Colorado Springs, Cheyenne Mountain in Colorado Springs? I will give you an example of what could happen today. In Colorado Springs, Colorado, we have NORAD, the defense command system, inside our granite mountain called Cheyenne Mountain; and within that mountain, through our intelligence services, we can detect almost anywhere in the world, well, we can detect anywhere in the world a missile launch.

Within a few seconds, we can advise the military leaders and the President of the United States that, one, a missile has been launched; two, the speed of the missile; three, the direction of the missile; four, the most likely target of the missile; and five, the most likely time of arrival of the missile. We can detect all of that anywhere in the world. The United States knows it.

But then what can they tell the President? When the President says, what do I do, the answer from the military is, there is nothing we can do, Mr. President, because we do not have a missile defense system in this country.

The CIA reported this month, again from the Wall Street Journal article, that the threat of a missile attack is higher than ever as more and more terrorists and rogue states have the ability to build or buy long-range ballistic

missiles. We ought to think about that. We ought to think about the threat to this country.

Now, some people would say to you, well, we do not have the technology to defend ourselves. We do have the technology. We have come a long ways. And we had a shot, we did a test about a month ago, and the test failed. But we have discovered where the fallacies are. We have the technology available. Now remember what we are trying to do. We are trying to intercept a missile. It is like hitting a bullet with a bullet, and they are going at a combined speed of several thousand miles an hour, and you have got to bring the two of them together. But we will have the technology in a very short period of time. So we need to determine what kind of missile defense system will work for this country.

Now, my opinion is, although Ronald Reagan got lots of criticism and so on, I think the best missile defense system this country can deploy over a period of time is a space-generated defense. Why? Now listen. Just listen. If we have a land-based missile defense system versus a ship-based system, where you can move the system around, if we have a land-based system, you have to destroy that missile, you cannot destroy it on the launching pad.

Let us say, for example, China launches a missile, as they have threatened to do in the last 24 hours. Let us say they launch a missile. We then have to wait for that missile. We track it as it comes across the ocean; and as it gets close to the United States, we have to start taking shots to try to bring that missile down. If we hit the missile down, it explodes over the top of us.

They may have a missile headed for Cheyenne Mountain in Colorado Springs and we detonate it over the city of Los Angeles. You could have nuclear fallout. There is a danger to that. And if you miss it and you continue to miss it, it is going to hit its target.

Now a space-based system, number one, is mobile. Number two, it could move over the top of China. We could then move it over Iraq. We could move it over North Korea. We have the opportunity to move the defensive system around.

The thing I like the best about it is, with the advancing technology, we could destroy the missile on its launching pad so the missile blows up in China or over China or over the ocean as it arcs over instead of over the lands of the United States.

The facts are very simple in what we face today. Number one, we are subject to a missile attack from our countries. Do not let other people joke to you about it.

I just came back from Europe. I am a member of the parliamentary arm of NATO, and the NATO delegation just came back. I was amazed that our colleagues in NATO who are afraid of Russia who stand there and criticize the United States of America for saying we

have an obligation to build a missile defense system.

Well, let me tell you, Europe, you better get off dead center; and you better put in place a missile defense system because you are going to be subject to the same kind of threats that the United States is; and instead of criticizing the United States, you ought to step forward and say we are going to do what the United States is doing; we are going to defend our countries. And frankly, I think your citizens will feel you have an obligation to defend them from a missile attack.

Second of all, at these NATO meetings, I am surprised how many people think we ought to curry the favor of Russia. Russia does not have the best interest of the United States of America at hand. We should not let Russia drive the decision as to whether or not we will in this country deploy a missile defense system to protect the citizens of the United States. We are not one to pick a fight with Russia. In fact, we ought to tell Russia to step aside. We are not looking for a fight, but what we are saying to Russia is do not attack the United States.

We are also saying to every terrorist organization out there, at least from the ballistic missile point of view, that, if you attack the United States with a ballistic missile, we will have the capability to shoot it down. You want to know what a deterrent is? The deterrent is, if you take a shot at America, it will not work. So why take the shot? If have you got a weapon and you want to shoot your neighbor or take down your neighbor, but you cannot pierce the defense system that your neighbor has, how good is the weapon that you have?

That is what we need to do. We have an obligation to defend this country. So, again, let us come back to it. In this country, we should have no shame for being the strongest military power in the world. We should feel no shame in this country for saying that we might need to build a missile defense system to protect the people of the United States of America.

And, frankly, to our friends in Europe and to the free countries throughout the world, I have no objection whatsoever for the United States to share our technology with you so that you can defend your own countries. Join us in the battle. Join us in the effort.

□ 2030

Nothing is better for this world than peace. But peace does not come free. We have to take steps, preventative steps to preserve the peace. In doing that, the United States should proceed full speed ahead with a missile defense system. Do not buy into the argument that the technology will never be here. The technology is very close. In fact, as many of my colleagues know, two or three of the tests have been successful. The last test about a month ago was not successful but we think we know

why. We think in this country that for a relatively inexpensive price, we can defend the citizens of this country from a missile attack. We ought to do it. We have that obligation. When you talk to most citizens in the United States and you say, hey, if Russia fires an incoming missile, what do we do about it, most of our citizens think we already have a missile defense system. We do not. We need to step forward and do something to protect the borders of this country.

Let me move on and talk again, I mentioned that I have just completed a NATO trip over in the European continent. I also had the opportunity on this trip to go down to the Aviano Air Base in Italy and also to visit our intelligence and our naval base in Rota, Spain. I have got to take a minute to the American people and tell them about our armed services. I could not be more proud of the military of the United States of America. We can enjoy the freedoms we have today because we have got a lot of young men and women out there standing in harm's way, and the taxpayers of this country and the citizens of this country really truly have stepped forward and given these young people the apparatus and the kind of backing that they need to go and stand in that harm's way.

When I was at the Aviano Air Base in Italy, I was so proud of our military men and women. Those people that man those aircraft, that maintain those aircraft, that handle our community relations, that do our maintenance work, all of that team down there is exactly that. It is a team, an Air Force that works with an Army, that works with a Navy, that works with a Marine Corps.

When we went on to Rota, Spain and studied the intelligence, and by the way, the motto of that, "In God we trust, all others we monitor," I am very proud of them. Our Navy sailors out there, our intelligence-gathering operation down there, the soldiers and the sailors, the people we have in these military bases throughout the world, you have got a lot to be proud of.

Without question, the United States of America is by far the most powerful military operation in the history of the world. We are going to have some people who bash us for being strong, who criticize us for having a strong military, who say, you are trying to act like Rambo. Let me give Members an example that I gave to a classroom the other day. I went to a local high school in my district and I was talking about military and the importance for the preservation of freedom, that the best way to maintain peace is to be strong and that you have got to be number one.

I had one of the students question me, so I will use this example. There was a lady in there, I asked the young lady, I said, if you were a black belt in karate and everybody in your class knew that you were a black belt in karate and they knew that if they decided

to take your lunch or if they decided to fight you, that you would break their neck, how many fights do you think you would be in under those circumstances? The answer is pretty easy. Probably none, because you are in shape, you are strong, and they know that if they dare come after you, there will be severe consequences to pay.

Thanks to the hundreds of thousands of dedicated men and women, and thanks to the hundreds of millions of American citizens who think the United States should be militarily strong, I think our military, relatively speaking, is in good shape. And I think we have got a lot to be proud of. I know that all of my colleagues in this room have constituents, many of whom may be serving in these bases, these overseas bases, and I know that many of them on both sides of the aisle join me in patting them on the back and saying thanks for what you do for our country. You are out there on the front lines and we are going to support you, and we need to support these people, and one way we can support them is to let them know that despite the efforts of some countries that want to see the demise, see the destruction of the United States of America, we will prevail.

Freedom will always come out on top. But freedom can never survive if you do not have freedom with strength. Freedom with strength. That is what our young men and women who serve in the military, all men and women who serve in our military throughout the world are doing for this country. You are doing a task of which I could not thank you enough for. I wanted to let you all know how proud I am of you.

Let me talk just for a couple of minutes, move on in my subject here of what I would like to talk to you about in our next night-side chat, and that is, let us talk about the Internet. I want to tell you a little more about my experience with the Internet and what we are seeing in this what I would say the second industrial revolution of the world. It is absolutely incredible, and most all of us on this House floor have experienced it. I want to spend the better part of an hour in the next few nights talking about this new second industrial revolution.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude my remarks this evening by simply doing just a summary of what we discussed. Let us go in reverse order. First of all, the missile defense system. It is imperative that the United States of America prepare itself for a missile defense system. We must deploy, in the near future, a missile defense system to protect the citizens of the United States of America, and we should be prepared to share that technology with our friends around the world so that they do not face the threat of terrorists or rogue nations firing a missile into the United States. If you do not think this is serious, take a look at the headline in the Washington Times this morning which

discusses in detail the threat from China to launch a missile attack against the United States, a threat made in the last 48 hours.

We talked before the missile defense about taxes. I have urged my Democrat colleagues to come across the aisle in a nonpartisan fashion tomorrow and support the Republican bill to do away with the cap on Social Security earnings. I urge those Democrat colleagues of mine who voted against the marriage tax penalty, in other words, to go ahead and keep the marriage tax penalty, to drop your opposition, come across the aisle and join us in support of that bill, the Republican bill to eliminate the marriage tax penalty. It is unfair. It is not right for us under our tax code from the bureaucracy in Washington, D.C. to tax people simply because they are married. Help us get rid of that. We can do it this year. Let us do it this year.

We talked about the death tax. It is the most punitive, unfair tax in our system. There is no justification for the government to go to the estate of the deceased and take property over which the taxes have already been paid in several instances over and over again and taxing that property simply because there has been a death. It is ruining family farms, it is ruining ranches and small business in this country. It is transferring money from our small communities in all of our respective States, it is transferring that money to the bureaucracy in Washington, D.C.

Let us be a bureaucrat's worst nightmare. Let us cut out some of these taxes, the death tax. Let us get rid of the marriage penalty tax. It is not right. Let us get rid of that cap on Social Security earnings. It is time for us to reform some of these unfair elements of the tax code of this country. We can afford to do it. We have a surplus. Let us be fair to the taxpayers of this country. Let us be fair to every citizen in this country. Do not penalize them for being married. Do not penalize their estate because they died. Be fair to them on the Social Security earnings cap.

Mr. Speaker, I have enjoyed the evening with my colleagues and I look forward to further discussions.

#### ON BOB JONES UNIVERSITY AND HOUSE CHAPLAIN CONTROVERSIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TOOMEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, as an Iowa Republican Congressman who is Catholic and has been supported by Christian conservatives as well as moderates, I feel compelled to comment on the Bob Jones University and the House Chaplain controversies.

Mr. Speaker, I went to Catholic grade school in the 1950s and early 1960s. I remember what a big deal it was when

JFK was elected President. In those days, there were still discriminations against Catholics and terrible stories told about my faith. To be fair, Mr. Speaker, Catholics were not always tolerant, either.

My mother came from an Irish-Catholic Democrat family. Older Catholics today still have vivid memories of anti-Catholicism. Our country's anti-Catholicism history goes way back before the virulent "Know-Nothings" just before the Civil War. In the early days of my party, the GOP did not do much to reassure Catholics that the Republican Party was a place where they could be comfortable.

But times change. Along came the Ecumenical Council, Christians of all creeds became more tolerant, and now even Garrison Keillor can make jokes about the foibles of Catholics and Lutherans in Lake Wobegone.

I certainly believe that my Lutheran mother-in-law and father-in-law have every bit as good a chance to go to heaven as my Catholic relatives do, maybe better in light of all their good works, but do not let us get into good works versus faith.

So when Governor Bush spoke at Bob Jones University and its anti-Catholicism was publicized, Catholics were reminded of past discrimination and were really disappointed that he did not immediately label these views bigoted in no uncertain terms when he found out about those views.

Bob Jones University President is Bob Jones, III, and this is how he describes the one billion-member Roman Catholic Church: "A cult which calls itself Christian."

This is on the official Bob Jones University Web site: "The Roman church is not another Christian denomination. It is a satanic counterfeit, an ecclesiastic tyranny over the souls of men, not to bring them to salvation, but to hold them bound in sin and hurl them into eternal damnation. It is the old harlot in the Book of Revelation, the mother of harlots."

Calling Pope John Paul the "anti-christ," saying that the Eucharist is "cannibalism," calling my church a "harlot," is deeply hurtful and mean and insulting. I must say I find Bob Jones' racism equally offensive. Governor Bush has been rightly criticized for not calling a bigot a bigot. In the spirit of bipartisanship critique, I hasten to add that AL GORE and Bill Bradley should be roundly criticized for not condemning Al Sharpton for his anti-Jewish bigotry as well.

□ 2045

All this brings us to the current "holy war" in this House of the people over the replacement of the House chaplain.

Reverend Ford, the well-liked Lutheran current House chaplain, is retiring. A bipartisan House committee, nine Republicans and nine Democrats, recommended three candidates for chaplain to Speaker HASTERT, Majority

Leader ARMEY and Minority Leader GEPHARDT.

It is well-known that a priest had received the most votes by the bipartisan committee, only three of which on the committee were Catholic. It should be noted that there has never been a Catholic House chaplain in the 211 years there has been a House chaplain, and, for that matter, there has never been a rabbi or a woman chaplain.

The Speaker and Majority Leader rejected the priest and went further down the list and chose Reverend Wright, who is a good man. Now, I want to be very clear about my thoughts on this. I know DENNY HASTERT and DICK ARMEY personally, and they are not anti-Catholic, but there is no question that this is a mess. Coupled with the Bob Jones University fiasco, Catholics in my district and around the country are shaking their heads in dismay.

So, Mr. Speaker, here is my unsolicited advice for ending this "holy war" that belongs in a long-ago past:

First, Reverend Wright should see that to become chaplain under these circumstances would impair his ministry. He should voluntarily remove himself from consideration.

Then, Mr. Speaker, we can do one of two things: We could abolish the position and simply have a rotating voluntary ministry, or we could keep the position but start over completely.

We should start over with an entirely new committee, look at an entirely new slate of candidates, and make the committee decision final. That way, if a Catholic is chosen, no one can say that the Speaker has pandered to the Catholics; if a Catholic is not chosen, no one can say that he is anti-Catholic. But the Speaker should not, I repeat, should not ask for a party line vote.

As for myself, if Reverend Wright comes up for a vote, I will vote "present," not against Reverend Wright per se, but in disgust with the whole way this has been handled on both sides of the aisle.

Before I close, I want to say this: It is not fair to paint evangelicals and Christian conservatives with the broad brush of Bob Jones. My wife and I and our children have worshipped many times at evangelical churches and have been made welcome. The evangelical ministers that I know, like Pastor John Palmer in Des Moines, do not have a racist or bigoted bone in their bodies. To the contrary, they have reached out to minority churches, reached out to Jews and to Catholics in Des Moines.

During the Iowa caucuses I got to know and respect Gary Bauer. What he wrote today in the New York Times is true. I quote Mr. Bauer. He says, "The so-called religious right is not a mindless mob that marches in lockstep at the command of this or that organizational leader. Though some may conjure up imaginary conservative conspiracies in order to frighten voters or divert attention from presidential scandals, social and culturally conservative voters, not all of whom happen to be evangelicals or necessarily even religious, are a diverse, independent-minded bunch."

Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party I belong to is tolerant, respecting all people and all religions. I am proud to be a Republican. We are the party of Ronald Reagan and Teddy Roosevelt. We are the party of Abraham Lincoln, and we are not the party of Bob Jones.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. KILPATRICK (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and March 1 on account of a family emergency.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and the balance of the week on account of illness.

Mr. GIBBONS (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. GARY MILLER of California (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of personal reasons.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BALDACC) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, for 5 minutes, today.

The following Members (at the request of Mrs. BONO) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today and March 1.

Mr. NORWOOD, for 5 minutes, today and March 1.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, March 1.

Mr. METCALF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, for 5 minutes, March 1.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LEWIS of California, for 5 minutes, today.

#### SENATE BILL AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A bill and concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 400. An act to provide technical corrections to the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996, to improve the delivery of housing assistance to Indian tribes in a manner that recognizes the right of tribal self-governance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

S. Con. Res. 83. Concurrent resolution commending the people of Iran for their commitment to the democratic process and positive political reform on the occasion of Iran's parliamentary elections; to the Committee on International Relations.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that the committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 149. An act 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.

#### BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that the committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 764. To reduce the incidence of child abuse and neglect, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 1, 2000, at 10 a.m.

#### EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for official foreign travel during the second quarter of 1995, first, second, third, and fourth quarters of 1998 and 1999, by Committees of the U.S. House of Representatives, as well as a consolidated report of foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for speaker-authorized official travel during first quarter of 2000, pursuant to Public Law 95-384, and for miscellaneous groups in connection with official foreign travel during the calendar year 1999 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1, AND MAR. 31, 1998

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Caleb McCarry	1/21	1/30	Cuba		729.00						729.00
							969.00				969.00
Grover Joseph Rees	1/18	1/25	Peru		1,414.00						1,414.00
							2,846.00				2,846.00
Hon. Alice Hastings	2/18	2/21	Austria		528.00						528.00
Commercial airfare							3,911.69				3,911.69
Hon. Doug Bereuter	2/17	2/21	Israel		1,154.00						1,154.00
Commercial airfare							2,110.11				2,110.11
Hon. Howard Berman	2/15	2/21	Israel		1,684.00						1,684.00
Commercial airfare							6,265.00				6,265.00
Richard Kessler	2/15	2/21	Israel		1,684.00						1,684.00
Commercial airfare							4,993.00				4,993.00
Hon. Bob Clement	1/4	1/6	Italy		796.00						796.00
	1/6	1/8	Macedonia		372.00						372.00
	1/8	1/9	Azerbaijan		346.00						346.00
	1/9	1/12	Belgium		170.00						170.00
Richard Caron	1/12	1/15	Syria		750.00						750.00
Commercial airfare							3,329.22				3,329.22
Michael Van Dusen	1/12	1/15	Syria		801.00						801.00
Commercial airfare	1/15	1/16	Cyprus		146.00						146.00
							4,789.17				4,789.17
Hon. Doug Bereuter	1/7	1/11	South Korea		912.00						912.00
Commercial airfare	1/12	1/18	Australia		1,655.00						1,655.00
							2,434.00				2,434.00
	1/23	1/25	England		300.00						300.00
Commercial airfare							583.44				583.44
Mark Gage	1/3	1/7	Kazakhstan		944.00						944.00
Commercial airfare			Uzbekistan		702.00						702.00
			Turkmenistan		944.00						944.00
							6,319.00				6,319.00
Hon. Eni F.H. Faleomavaega	1/6	1/10	South Korea		912.00						912.00
Commercial airfare							3,269.00				3,269.00
Carol Reynolds	1/5	1/11	South Korea		1,153.00						1,153.00
Commercial airfare							3,825.00				3,825.00
Cliff Kupchan	1/4	1/7	Kazakhstan		1,014.00						1,014.00
Commercial airfare	1/7	1/10	Uzbekistan		772.00						772.00
	1/10	1/13	Turkmenistan		1,014.00						1,014.00
							6,319.00				6,319.00
Grover Joseph Rees	2/17	2/20	Marshall Islands		740.00						740.00
Commercial airfare							4,787.98				4,787.98
Paul Berkowitz	2/17	2/20	Marshall Islands		614.88						614.88
Commercial airfare							4,229.00				4,229.00
Deborah Bodlander	1/3	1/10	Israel		2,149.00						2,149.00
Commercial airfare							4,721.00				4,721.00
Hon. Eni F.H. Faleomavaega	1/12	1/13	Malaysia		162.00						162.00
Commercial airfare							3,957.56				3,957.56
John Mackey	1/12	1/15	Columbia		352.00						352.00
Commercial airfare							1,752.00				1,752.00
Peter Brookes	1/5	1/7	Thailand		380.00						380.00
	1/7	1/12	Vietnam		1,140.00						1,140.00
	1/12	1/15	Cambodia		620.00						620.00
	1/15	1/17	Malaysia		224.00						224.00
	1/17	1/20	Indonesia		591.00						591.00
Commercial airfare							4,888.50				4,888.50
	1/5	1/7	Thailand		380.00						380.00
	1/7	1/12	Vietnam		1,140.00						1,140.00
	1/12	1/15	Cambodia		560.00						560.00
	1/15	1/17	Malaysia		224.00						224.00
	1/17	1/20	Indonesia		591.00						591.00
Commercial airfare							4,888.50				4,888.50
Elana Bruitman	1/5	1/7	Thailand		380.00						380.00
Commercial airfare	1/7	1/9	Vietnam		382.18						382.18
							3,586.00				3,586.00
John Mackey	2/15	2/19	South Africa		635.00						635.00
Commercial airfare	2/19	2/21	Nigeria		515.00						515.00
							6,289.20				6,289.20
Cliff Kupchan	2/15	2/19	South Africa		635.00						635.00
Commercial airfare	2/19	2/21	Nigeria		515.00						515.00
							6,289.20				6,289.20
Lester Munson	2/15	2/19	South Africa		635.00						635.00
Commercial airfare	2/19	2/21	Nigeria		515.00						515.00
							6,289.20				6,289.20
Vincent Morelli	1/19	1/21	Nicaragua		297.50						297.50
Commercial airfare							1,547.00				1,547.00
Paul Bonicelli	1/19	1/21	Nicaragua		297.50						297.50
Commercial airfare	1/21	1/23	El Salvador		150.00						150.00
							1,538.00				1,538.00
David Adams	1/19	1/21	Nicaragua		297.50						297.50
Commercial airfare	1/21	1/23	El Salvador		150.00						150.00
							1,538.00				1,538.00
Michael Ennis	1/4	1/7	Sri Lanka		584.00						584.00
	1/7	1/12	India		923.00						923.00
Commercial airfare	1/12	1/15	Pakistan		555.00						555.00
							6,939.90				6,939.90
Richard Kessler	1/4	1/7	Sri Lanka		584.00						584.00
	1/7	1/12	India		1,179.004						1,179.004
Commercial airfare	1/12	1/15	Pakistan		555.00						555.00
							6,939.90				6,939.90
Robert Hathaway	1/4	1/7	Sri Lanka		584.00						584.00
	1/7	1/12	India		1,179.00						1,179.00
Commercial airfare	1/12	1/15	Pakistan		555.00						555.00
							6,939.90				6,939.90
John Walker Roberts	1/7	1/12	India		1,202.00						1,202.00
Commercial airfare	1/12	1/15	Pakistan		555.00						555.00
							6,447.90				6,447.90
Hon. Benjamin Gilman	1/15	1/18	Belgium		852.00						852.00
	1/18	1/20	France		598.00						598.00
	1/20	1/22	Poland		556.00						556.00
Hon. Leana Ros-Lehtinen	1/15	1/18	Belgium		852.00						852.00
Commercial airfare	1/18	1/20	France		598.00						598.00
							377.20				377.20
Hon. Kevin Brady	1/16	1/18	Belgium		568.00						568.00
Commercial airfare							5,069.21				5,069.21
Hon. Robert Wexler	1/15	1/18	Belgium		852.00						852.00



REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 1998—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Clifford Kupchan	4/16	4/19	Jordan		1,200.00						1,200.00
	4/2	4/7	Bosnia		1,505.00		4,161.00				5,666.00
	4/7	4/8	Croatia		301.00						301.00
John Mackey	4/8	4/9	Bosnia		301.00						301.00
	4/10	4/14	Serbia/Montenegro		293.00						293.00
	4/2	4/3	Colombia		271.00						271.00
	4/3	4/5	Chile		548.00						548.00
	4/5	4/7	Argentina		546.00						546.00
	4/7	4/9	Peru		612.00						612.00
	4/16	4/16	Colombia		243.00						243.00
	4/17	4/20	Chile		999.00						999.00
	5/28	5/30	Italy		516.00						516.00
	5/30	6/1	Ireland		393.30		2,295.00				2,688.30
Caleb McCarry	4/2	4/3	Colombia		271.00						271.00
	4/3	4/5	Chile		548.00						548.00
	4/5	4/7	Argentina		546.00						546.00
	4/7	4/9	Peru		612.00						612.00
Stephen Rademaker	5/7	5/9	Costa Rica		330.00						330.00
	5/24	5/26	China		514.00						514.00
	5/26	5/30	North Korea		1,016.00						1,016.00
	5/30	6/1	Japan		552.00						552.00
	6/1	6/2	South Korea		262.00						262.00
Grover Joseph Rees	5/25	5/27	Indonesia		494.00		4,549.00				5,043.00
	5/24	5/27	Japan		628.00		5,449.00				6,077.00
Francis Record	5/27	5/31	South Korea		648.00						648.00
	4/5	4/8	Taiwan		805.00		2,968.02				3,773.02
	4/8	4/14	Thailand		1,140.00						1,140.00
	4/14	4/15	Malaysia		102.00						102.00
	4/15	4/17	Philippines		198.00						198.00
Kimberly Roberts	4/2	4/3	Colombia		271.00						271.00
	4/3	4/5	Chile		548.00						548.00
	4/5	4/7	Argentina		546.00						546.00
	4/7	4/9	Peru		612.00						612.00
Hon. Marshall Sanford	4/2	4/3	Colombia		271.00						271.00
	4/3	4/5	Chile		548.00						548.00
	4/5	4/7	Argentina		546.00						546.00
Hon. Christopher Smith	4/7	4/9	Peru		612.00						612.00
	5/25	5/27	Indonesia		494.00		4,601.00				5,095.00
	5/25	5/28	Austria		483.00		5,351.84				5,834.84
Hillel Weinberg	5/28	5/30	Belgium		410.00					410.00	
Committee total					64,178.06		74,488.73				138,666.79

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

BEN GILMAN, Chairman, Feb. 8, 2000.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1998

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
David Adams	8/10	8/12	Venezuela		265.00		4,162.50				4,427.50
	8/13	8/15	Argentina		966.00						966.00
Paul Bonicelli	8/10	8/12	Venezuela		265.00		4,162.50				4,427.50
	8/13	8/15	Argentina		966.00						966.00
Hon. Matt Salmon	7/1	7/6	Israel		1,719.00		5,544.00				7,263.00
	7/1	7/8	Israel		1,087.00		5,169.99				6,256.99
Hillel Weinberg	7/6	7/8	Czech Republic		450.00						450.00
	7/8	7/11	United Kingdom		1,260.00		6,115.47				7,375.47
Kristen Gilley	6/30	7/5	Yugoslavia		747.00		5,796.00				6,543.00
	7/6	7/9	Czech Republic		393.88						393.88
	7/9	7/11	United Kingdom		1,190.00						1,190.00
	6/30	7/4	Yugoslavia		550.00		4,171.18				4,721.18
Richard Garon	6/30	7/4	Yugoslavia		550.00		4,171.18				4,721.18
	6/30	7/4	Yugoslavia		500.00		4,171.18				4,671.18
John Herzberg	8/23	8/26	South Africa		532.00		7,532.80				8,064.80
	8/26	8/28	Zimbabwe		368.00						368.00
Lester Munson	8/23	8/26	South Africa		434.00		7,454.93				7,888.93
	8/26	8/29	Zimbabwe		552.00						552.00
Peter Mamacos	6/27	7/3	French Polynesia		105.45		3,163.52				3,268.97
	8/11	8/13	Haiti				907.00				907.00
Hon. Eni Faleomavaega	8/12	8/16	Cuba		375.00		1,387.39				1,762.39
	8/16	8/20	Mexico		1,027.00						1,027.00
Caleb McCarry	8/9	8/15	South Korea		1,484.00		3,999.00				5,483.00
	8/9	8/15	South Korea		1,484.00		4,087.00				5,571.00
Denis McDonough	8/9	8/12	Jordan		829.00						829.00
	8/13	8/14	Turkey		452.00						452.00
Hon. Jay Kim	8/15	8/16	Kyrgyzstan		558.00						558.00
	8/17	8/18	Mongolia		354.00						354.00
Ronald Crump	8/19	8/20	China		552.00						552.00
	8/21	8/23	South Korea		524.00						524.00
Hon. Alcee Hastings	8/9	8/12	Jordan		779.00						779.00
	8/13	8/14	Turkey		422.00						422.00
Mark Gage	8/15	8/16	Kyrgyzstan		478.00						478.00
	8/17	8/18	Mongolia		329.00						329.00
Stephen Rademaker	8/19	8/20	China		261.00						261.00
	8/21	8/23	South Korea		484.00						484.00
Elana Broitman	6/28	7/2	Ukraine		613.00		4,736.18				5,349.18
	7/2	7/6	Moldova		613.00						613.00
Clifford Kupchan	6/29	7/2	Ukraine		700.00		4,509.17				5,209.17
	6/28	7/2	Ukraine		680.00		4,736.18				5,416.18
Paul Berkowitz	7/2	7/6	Moldova		680.00						680.00
	7/18	7/21	Germany		600.00		5,511.11				6,111.11
Stephen Rademaker	8/10	8/18	India		2,201.00		5,850.52				8,051.52
	8/19	8/20	Nepal								
Stephen Rademaker	8/20	8/21	Thailand		190.00						190.00
	7/8	7/10	Panama		334.00		1,323.00				1,657.00
	8/3	8/4	Canada		184.00		293.61				477.61

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1998—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
John Mackey	7/8	7/10	Panama		334.00		1,323.00				1,657.00
Thomas Sheehy	6/28	7/4	Congo		1,240.00		7,179.77				8,419.77
	7/4	7/6	Uganda		310.00						310.00
Gregory Simpkins	6/28	7/4	Congo		1,240.00		7,179.77				8,419.77
	7/4	7/6	Uganda		310.00						310.00
Amos Hochstein	6/28	7/4	Congo		1,240.00		7,179.77				8,419.77
	7/4	7/6	Uganda		310.00						310.00
Jodi Christiansen	6/28	7/4	Congo		1,240.00		7,179.77				8,419.77
	7/4	7/6	Uganda		310.00						310.00
Hon. Christopher Smith	8/12	8/16	Thailand		760.00		4,638.00				5,398.00
Joseph Rees	7/7	7/9	Czech Republic		355.00		4,988.22				5,343.22
	7/9	7/11	Switzerland		440.00						440.00
	8/13	8/18	Thailand		760.00		3,858.00				4,618.00
	8/18	8/21	Philippines		594.00						594.00
Robert King	7/4	7/7	Germany		916.00		1,203.11				2,119.11
	7/7	7/10	Czech Republic		846.00				716.52		1,562.52
	7/10	7/14	Poland		1,112.00						1,112.00
Lester Munson	7/8	7/12	Morocco		447.20		4,834.25				5,281.45
	7/12	7/13	Algeria								
Celes Hughes	7/8	7/12	Morocco		447.20		4,834.25				5,281.45
	7/12	7/13	Algeria								
Maria Pica	8/10	8/13	China		718.00		4,846.00				5,564.00
	8/13	8/19	North Korea		1,028.00						1,028.00
	8/19	8/24	China		408.00						408.00
Mark Kirk	8/10	8/13	China		828.00		4,846.00				5,674.00
	8/13	8/19	North Korea		1,428.00						1,428.00
	8/19	8/24	China		408.00						408.00
Peter Brookes	8/10	8/13	China		828.00		4,846.00				5,674.00
	8/13	8/19	North Korea		1,428.00						1,428.00
	8/19	8/24	China								
Committee total					50,372.73		167,891.32		716.52		218,980.57

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

BEN GILMAN, Chairman, Feb. 8, 2000.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1998

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Cass Ballenger	11/29	12/1	Nicaragua		74.00						74.00
Paul Berkowitz	12/7	12/10	Taiwan		934.50						934.50
	12/10	12/12	Hong Kong		694.00						694.00
	12/12	12/15	Thailand		720.00						720.00
Commercial airfare							4,266.46				4,266.46
Hon. Cass Ballenger	12/1	12/2	Mexico		188.99						188.99
	12/2	12/4	El Salvador		30.00						30.00
	12/4	12/6	Nicaragua		176.25						176.25
Paul Berkowitz	12/3	12/4	India		365.25						365.25
	12/4	12/7	Nepal		712.00						712.00
	12/8	12/10	Bhutan		312.00						312.00
	12/11	12/13	India		385.00						385.00
Commercial airfare							7,408.70				7,408.70
Deborah Bedlander	11/15	11/19	Qatar		900.00						900.00
Commercial airfare							5,697.90				5,697.90
Malik Chaka	12/2	12/6	England		1,416.00						1,416.00
	12/3	12/6	Senegal		687.50						687.50
Commercial airfare							4,220.78				4,220.78
Jodi Christiansen	11/29	12/1	Nicaragua		187.50						187.50
Theodros Dagne	11/21	11/25	Cote d'Ivoire		625.00						625.00
	11/25	11/28	Ghana		634.00						634.00
	11/28	12/1	Nigeria		970.00						970.00
	12/1	12/3	Mali		250.00						250.00
	12/3	12/5	Senegal		487.50						487.50
	12/6	12/8	Rwanda		264.00						264.00
Commercial airfare							9,383.49				9,383.49
John Herzberg	11/5	11/9	Serbia-Montenegro		596.00						596.00
	11/9	11/11	Bosnia-Herzegovina		542.00						542.00
	11/11	11/13	Austria		376.00						376.00
Commercial airfare							4,517.76				4,517.76
Amos Hochstein	12/9	12/12	Turkey		443.00						443.00
	12/2	12/13	Qatar		159.00						159.00
	12/13	12/15	Saudi Arabia		72.00						72.00
Commercial airfare							6,332.54				6,332.54
Celes Hughes	12/7	12/9	Jordan		438.00						438.00
	12/9	12/12	Turkey		563.00						563.00
	12/12	12/13	Qatar		199.00						199.00
	12/13	12/15	Saudi Arabia		272.00						272.00
Commercial airfare							6,485.00				6,485.00
Kenneth Katzman	12/7	12/9	Jordan		423.00						423.00
	12/9	12/12	Turkey		513.00						513.00
	12/12	12/13	Qatar		199.00						199.00
	12/13	12/15	Saudi Arabia		272.00						272.00
Commercial airfare							6,485.00				6,485.00
Mark Kirk	11/5	11/9	Serbia-Montenegro		650.00						650.00
Commercial airfare							4,576.76				4,576.76
John Mackey	11/10	11/12	Belgium		498.00						498.00
	11/12	11/13	United Kingdom		315.00						315.00
	11/13	11/17	Ireland		892.00						892.00
Commercial airfare							4,811.48				4,811.48
Commercial airfare	12/5	12/11	Ireland		1,431.00						1,431.00
Caleb McCarty	11/11	11/13	Nicaragua		366.00						366.00
Commercial airfare							1,176.00				1,176.00
Denis McDonough	11/29	12/1	Nicaragua		137.50						137.50
Commercial airfare	11/11	11/13	Nicaragua		366.00						366.00
							1,176.00				1,176.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1998—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Robert Menendez	11/29	12/1	Nicaragua		187.50						187.50
Hon. Donald Payne	11/21	11/25	Cote d'Ivoire		625.00						625.00
	11/25	11/28	Ghana		696.00						696.00
	11/28	12/1	Nigeria		831.00						831.00
	12/1	12/3	Mali		350.00						50.00
	12/3	12/5	Senegal		100.00						100.00
Maria Pica	11/5	11/9	Serbia		596.00						596.00
	11/9	11/11	Bosnia		554.00						554.00
	11/11	11/13	Austria		376.00						376.00
Commercial airfare							4,517.76				4,517.76
Stephen Rademaker	12/7	12/9	Jordan		438.00				66.84		504.84
	12/9	12/12	Turkey		563.00						563.00
	12/12	12/13	Qatar		199.00						199.00
	12/13	12/15	Saudi Arabia		286.00						286.00
Commercial airfare							6,485.00				6,485.00
Francis Record	11/9	11/13	Kazakstan		1,100.00						1,100.00
Commercial airfare							5,443.54				5,443.54
	12/7	12/9	Jordan		388.00						388.00
	12/10	12/11	Turkey		413.00						413.00
	12/11	12/12	Qatar		149.00						149.00
	12/12	12/16	Saudi Arabia		72.00						72.00
Commercial airfare							6,485.00				6,485.00
Grover Joseph Rees	12/7	12/10	Taiwan		589.50						589.50
	12/10	12/12	Hong Kong		584.00						584.00
	12/12	12/15	Thailand		960.00						960.00
Commercial airfare							4,053.46				4,053.46
Hon. Dana Rohrabacher	11/30	12/2	Kuwait		676.00						676.00
	12/2	12/5	Taiwan		1,180.00						1,180.00
	12/5	12/11	Philippines		804.00						804.00
Commercial airfare							6,378.89				6,378.89
Committee total					33,152.99		106,507.04		66.84		139,726.87

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.  
<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.  
<sup>3</sup> Represents refund of unused per diem.

BEN GILMAN, Chairman, Feb. 8, 2000.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1999

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Gary Ackerman	1/10	1/12	Finland		568.00						568.00
	1/12	1/14	Germany		508.00						508.00
	1/14	1/16	France		502.00						502.00
Commercial airfare							1,164.00				1,164.00
Hon. Cass Ballenger	2/13	2/14	El Salvador		115.70						115.70
	2/14	2/15	Panama		149.30						149.30
	2/15	2/16	Colombia		123.00						123.00
	2/16	2/18	Venezuela		163.00						163.00
	2/18	2/21	Mexico		389.00						389.00
Hon. Doug Bereuter	1/9	1/11	South Korea		136.00						136.00
	1/11	1/14	Indonesia		699.00						699.00
	1/14	1/16	China		334.00						334.00
Paul Berkowitz	2/14	2/18	India		867.10						867.10
Commercial airfare							6,744.18				6,744.18
Deborah Bodlander	1/9	1/13	Yemen		1,132.00						1,132.00
	1/13	1/15	Egypt		417.00						417.00
	1/15	1/18	Lebanon		190.00						190.00
	1/18	1/23	Israel		1,465.00						1,465.00
Commercial airfare							6,524.00				6,524.00
Commercial airfare	3/7	3/10	Qatar		597.00						597.00
Commercial airfare							6,015.40				6,015.40
Hon. Kevin Brady	1/14	1/16	France		502.00						502.00
	1/16	1/18	Austria		480.00						480.00
Commercial airfare							3,137.20				3,137.20
Parker Brent	1/10	1/12	Finland		568.00						568.00
	1/12	1/14	Germany		508.00						508.00
	1/14	1/16	France		502.00						502.00
	1/16	1/18	Austria		480.00						480.00
Peter Brookes	1/10	1/13	Australia		517.00						517.00
	1/14	1/16	New Zealand		300.00						300.00
Commercial airfare							8,213.70				8,213.70
Hon. John Cooksey	2/12	2/14	United Kingdom		623.28						623.28
	2/14	2/16	Jerusalem		360.50						360.50
	2/16	2/17	Turkey		88.00						88.00
	2/17	2/19	Bahrain		390.64						390.64
	2/19	2/20	Turkey		181.31						181.31
	2/20	2/21	Ireland		264.00						264.00
	2/25	2/28	Colombia		386.00						386.00
Commercial airfare							1,651.40				1,651.40
Michael Ennis	1/10	1/11	South Korea		136.00						136.00
	1/11	1/14	Indonesia		661.00						661.00
	1/14	1/16	Hong Kong		334.00						334.00
	1/16	1/18	Taiwan		667.50						667.50
Richard Garon	1/10	1/12	Finland		568.00						568.00
	1/12	1/14	Germany		508.00						508.00
	1/14	1/16	France		502.00						502.00
	1/16	1/18	Austria		480.00						480.00
	1/27	1/28	Dominican Republic		161.00						161.00
Kristin Gilley	1/9	1/13	Yemen		962.00						962.00
	1/13	1/15	Egypt		452.00						452.00
	1/15	1/18	Lebanon		400.00						400.00
	1/18	1/22	Israel		1,415.00						1,415.00
Commercial airfare							6,524.16				6,524.16
Hon. Benjamin Gilman	1/10	1/12	Finland		568.00						568.00
	1/12	1/14	Germany		508.00						508.00
	1/14	1/16	France		502.00						502.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1999—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Charisse Glassman	1/16	1/18	Austria		480.00						480.00
	1/27	1/28	Dominican Republic		161.00						161.00
	2/24	3/1	Nigeria		1,532.00						1,532.00
Jason Gross	3/1	3/2	Cape Verde		75.00						75.00
	2/13	2/16	Greece		625.00						625.00
	2/16	2/17	Cyprus		200.00						200.00
	2/17	2/18	Greece		124.00						124.00
	2/18	2/20	Turkey		678.00						678.00
Commercial airfare							2,714.72				2,714.72
Commercial airfare	3/29	3/30	United Kingdom		315.00						315.00
	3/30	4/1	Ireland		412.00						412.00
	4/1	4/3	United Kingdom		520.00						520.00
Commercial airfare							5,824.23				5,824.23
John Herzberg	1/10	1/12	Finland		568.00						568.00
Commercial airfare	1/12	1/14	Germany		508.00						508.00
	1/14	1/16	France		502.00						502.00
	1/16	1/18	Austria		480.00						480.00
	1/14	1/16	Greece		626.00						626.00
Commercial airfare							2,714.72				2,714.72
Hon. Earl Hilliard	1/10	1/12	Finland		568.00						568.00
Commercial airfare	1/12	1/14	Germany		508.00						508.00
	1/14	1/16	France		502.00						502.00
	1/16	1/18	Austria		480.00						480.00
	2/24	3/1	Nigeria		1,532.00						1,532.00
Robert King	3/1	3/2	Cape Verde		117.52						117.52
	1/10	1/12	Finland		568.00						568.00
Commercial airfare	1/12	1/14	Germany		508.00						508.00
	1/14	1/16	France		502.00						502.00
	1/16	1/18	Austria		480.00						480.00
	2/24	3/1	Nigeria		1,532.00						1,532.00
Hon. Barbara Lee	1/10	1/12	Finland		568.00						568.00
	1/12	1/14	Germany		508.00						508.00
	1/14	1/16	France		502.00						502.00
	1/16	1/18	Austria		480.00						480.00
	2/25	2/27	Nigeria		1,255.00						1,255.00
Commercial airfare							3,726.60				3,726.60
John Mackey	1/10	1/12	Finland		568.00						568.00
Commercial airfare	1/12	1/14	Germany		508.00						508.00
	1/14	1/16	France		502.00						502.00
	1/16	1/18	Austria		480.00						480.00
	2/14	2/18	Colombia		950.00						950.00
Commercial airfare	2/18	2/21	Mexico		455.00						455.00
Commercial airfare	3/29	3/30	United Kingdom		315.00						315.00
	3/30	4/3	Ireland		824.00						824.00
								5,087.68			5,087.68
Caleb McCarr	1/27	1/28	Dominican Republic		111.00						111.00
Commercial airfare	2/26	2/28	Colombia		331.00						331.00
Commercial airfare								1,662.40			1,662.40
Dennis McDonough	1/27	1/28	Dominican Republic		91.00						91.00
Commercial airfare	2/26	2/28	Colombia		386.00						386.00
Commercial airfare								702.40			702.40
Hon. Cynthia McKinney	12/27	12/28	United Kingdom		365.00						365.00
Commercial airfare	1/1	1/2	Burundi		197.00						197.00
Commercial airfare	2/4	2/7	Netherlands		754.87						754.87
Commercial airfare								4,780.47			4,780.47
Hon. Gregory Meeks	2/24	3/1	Nigeria		1,532.00						1,532.00
Lester Munson	3/1	3/2	Cape Verde		117.52						117.52
	2/24	3/1	Nigeria		1,532.00						1,532.00
Hon. Donald Payne	3/1	3/2	Cape Verde		117.52						117.52
	2/24	3/1	Nigeria		1,532.00						1,532.00
Alfred Prados	3/1	3/2	Cape Verde		117.52						117.52
	1/9	1/13	Yemen		650.14						650.14
	1/13	1/15	Egypt		81.96						81.96
	1/15	1/18	Lebanon								
Commercial airfare	1/18	1/23	Israel		904.92						904.92
Commercial airfare								6,524.16			6,524.16
Joseph Rees	1/24	1/25	Taiwan		217.00						217.00
Commercial airfare	1/25	1/30	Vietnam		541.00						541.00
	1/30	1/31	Philippines		198.00						198.00
Commercial airfare								3,931.40			3,931.40
Walker Roberts	1/10	1/13	Australia		517.00						517.00
Commercial airfare	1/14	1/16	New Zealand		300.00						300.00
									8,213.70		8,213.70
Commercial airfare	2/14	2/16	Greece		626.00						626.00
	2/16	2/18	Turkey		200.00						200.00
Commercial airfare								2,714.72			2,714.72
Hon. Dana Rohrabacher	2/20	2/21	Marshall Islands		185.00						185.00
Hon. Edward Royce	2/25	3/1	Nigeria		1,532.00						1,532.00
	3/1	3/2	Cape Verde		117.52						117.52
Thomas Sheehy	2/24	3/1	Nigeria		1,532.00						1,532.00
Linda Solomon	3/1	3/2	Cape Verde		75.00						75.00
	1/10	1/12	Finland		568.00						568.00
	1/12	1/14	Germany		508.00						508.00
	1/14	1/16	France		502.00						502.00
Hillel Weinberg	1/16	1/18	Austria		480.00						480.00
	1/10	1/12	Finland		404.00						404.00
	1/12	1/14	Germany		319.00						319.00
	1/14	1/16	France		320.00						320.00
Hon. Robert Wexler	1/16	1/18	Austria		288.00						288.00
	1/17	1/21	Czech Republic		928.00						928.00
	Commercial airfare							2,201.05			2,201.05
Committee total				64,652.54		97,198.16				161,850.70	

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.  
<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

BEN GILMAN, Chairman, Feb. 8, 2000.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 1999

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Cass Ballenger	5/28	5/30	Venezuela		205.00						205.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 1999—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Paul Berkowitz	5/30	5/31	Honduras		152.00						152.00
	5/31	6/2	El Salvador		320.00						320.00
	3/29	3/30	Italy		273.00						273.00
	3/30	4/3	India		1,476.00						1,476.00
	4/3	4/4	Czech Republic		127.00						127.00
Nancy Bloomer	4/4	4/8	Switzerland		1,100.00						1,100.00
	Commercial airfare						1,898.05				1,898.05
	3/27	3/28	Italy		328.00						328.00
	3/28	3/30	Israel		658.00						658.00
	3/30	4/1	Egypt		452.00						452.00
Deborah Bodlander	4/1	4/3	Jordan		588.00						588.00
	4/3	4/5	Tunisia		358.00						358.00
	4/5	4/8	Morocco		569.00						569.00
	3/27	3/28	Italy		228.00						228.00
	3/28	3/30	Israel		578.00						578.00
Paul Bonicelli	3/30	4/1	Egypt		337.00						337.00
	4/1	4/3	Jordan		448.00						448.00
	4/3	4/5	Tunisia		238.00						238.00
	4/5	4/8	Morocco		501.00						501.00
	5/28	5/30	Venezuela		360.00						360.00
Peter Brookes	5/30	5/31	Honduras		152.00						152.00
	5/31	6/2	El Salvador		320.00						320.00
	3/28	3/30	Japan		502.00						502.00
	3/30	4/1	South Korea		476.00						476.00
	4/1	4/4	Taiwan		955.50						955.50
Malik Chaka	Commercial airfare						2,971.20				2,971.20
	6/2	6/5	Kenya		780.00						780.00
	6/5	6/7	Sudan				714.28				714.28
	6/7	6/7	Kenya								
	6/7	6/7	Amsterdam								
Marion Chambers	Commercial airfare						4,951.09				4,951.09
	3/26	3/28	Turkmenistan		382.00						382.00
	3/28	4/1	Uzbekistan		1,063.00						1,063.00
	4/1	4/2	Kazakhstan		783.00						783.00
	4/3	4/5	Kyrgystan		272.00						272.00
Mark Clack	4/5	4/6	Kazakhstan								
	Commercial airfare						6,407.59				6,407.59
	3/30	4/1	Egypt		452.00						452.00
	4/1	4/3	Jordan		588.00						588.00
	4/3	4/5	Tunisia		358.00						358.00
Michael Ennis	4/5	4/8	Morocco		661.00						661.00
	3/26	3/28	Turkmenistan		382.00						382.00
	3/28	4/1	Uzbekistan		1,063.00						1,063.00
	4/1	4/2	Kazakhstan		783.00						783.00
	4/3	4/5	Kyrgystan		272.00						272.00
Hon. Enri Faleomavaega	4/5	4/6	Kazakhstan								
	Commercial airfare						6,407.59				6,407.59
	4/3	4/5	South Korea		576.00						576.00
	4/5	4/8	Australia		354.00						354.00
	4/8	4/11	New Zealand		259.00						259.00
Hon. Sam Gejdenson	Commercial airfare						799.67				799.67
	5/28	5/30	Lithuania		397.00						397.00
	5/30	6/1	Belarus		492.00						492.00
Hon. Benjamin Gilman	Commercial airfare						4,508.58				4,508.58
	3/27	3/28	Italy		328.00						328.00
	3/28	3/30	Israel		658.00						658.00
	3/30	4/1	Egypt		452.00						452.00
	4/1	4/3	Jordan		588.00						588.00
Charisse Glassman	4/3	4/5	Tunisia		358.00						358.00
	4/5	4/8	Morocco		661.00						661.00
	6/1	6/5	Kenya		900.00						900.00
	6/5	6/7	Sudan				714.28				714.28
	6/7	6/7	Kenya								
Hon. Alcee Hastings	6/7	6/7	Amsterdam								
	Commercial airfare						5,960.25				5,960.25
	4/22	4/24	Denmark		720.25						720.25
Hon. Earl Hilliard	Commercial airfare						4,411.01				4,411.01
	6/11	6/14	Haiti		455.50						455.50
	3/27	3/28	Italy		328.00						328.00
	3/28	3/30	Israel		658.00						658.00
	3/30	4/1	Egypt		452.00						452.00
Amos Hochstein	4/1	4/3	Jordan		588.00						588.00
	4/3	4/5	Tunisia		358.00						358.00
	4/5	4/8	Morocco		661.00						661.00
	3/27	3/28	Italy		300.00						300.00
	3/28	3/30	Israel		587.00						587.00
Hon. Amo Houghton	5/28	5/30	Finland		384.00						384.00
	5/30	6/1	Belgium		438.00						438.00
	Commercial airfare						4,369.46				4,369.46
Hon. Barbara Lee	6/15	6/17	South Africa				5,559.31				5,559.31
	4/1	4/4	South Africa								
	4/5	4/7	Ghana								
John Mackey	4/8	4/10	South Africa								
	Commercial airfare						8,019.20				8,019.20
	5/27	6/1	Spain		1,347.50						1,347.50
	Commercial airfare						2,862.84				2,862.84
	5/28	5/30	Lithuania		297.00						297.00
Michelle Maynard	5/30	6/1	Belarus		342.00						342.00
	Commercial airfare						4,697.58				4,697.58
	5/29	5/30	Ecuador		325.00						325.00
	5/30	5/31	Peru		103.00						103.00
	5/31	5/31	Aruba		73.00						73.00
Denis McDonough	5/31	6/1	Curacao		177.00						177.00
	6/1	6/3	Panama		323.00						323.00
	Commercial airfare						2,109.62				2,109.62
	5/29	5/30	Ecuador		325.00						325.00
	5/30	5/31	Peru		103.00						103.00
Kathleen Moazed	5/31	6/2	Colombia		386.00						386.00
	Commercial airfare						856.20				856.20
	3/30	4/1	South Korea		476.00						476.00
	4/1	4/2	China		276.00						276.00
	4/2	4/3	Hong Kong		297.00						297.00
Lester Munson	4/3	4/5	Vietnam		456.00						456.00
	Commercial airfare						6,625.88				6,625.88
	3/27	3/28	Italy		328.00						328.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 1999—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Donald Payne	3/28	3/30	Israel		658.00						658.00
	3/30	4/1	Egypt		452.00						452.00
	4/1	4/3	Jordan		588.00						588.00
	4/3	4/5	Tunisia		350.00						350.00
	4/5	4/8	Morocco		569.00						569.00
	6/4	6/6	Kenya		750.00						750.00
	6/6	6/7	Sudan				714.28				714.28
6/7	6/7	Kenya									
6/7	6/7	Amsterdam									
Commercial airfare							5,752.00				5,752.00
Stephen Rademaker	3/28	3/30	Japan		502.00						502.00
	3/30	4/1	South Korea		476.00						476.00
	4/1	4/2	Taiwan		409.50						409.50
Commercial airfare							3,132.73				3,132.73
Commercial airfare	6/1	6/3	Panama		348.00			1,694.00			1,694.00
Grover Joseph Rees	4/3	4/5	Czech Republic		400.00						400.00
	4/5	4/8	Switzerland		900.00						900.00
Commercial airfare							4,493.73				4,493.73
John Walker Roberts	5/30	5/31	Singapore		233.00						233.00
	5/31	6/10	Indonesia		1,627.00						1,627.00
	6/10	6/11	Singapore		254.00						254.00
Commercial airfare							4,344.40				4,344.40
Kimberly Roberts	3/28	3/30	Japan		502.00						502.00
	3/30	4/1	South Korea		476.00						476.00
	4/1	4/4	Taiwan		955.50						955.50
Commercial airfare							3,864.73				3,864.73
Hon. Mark Sanford	3/27	3/28	Italy		328.00						328.00
	3/28	3/30	Israel		658.00						658.00
	3/30	4/1	Egypt		452.00						452.00
	4/1	4/3	Jordan		588.00						588.00
	4/3	4/5	Tunisia		358.00						358.00
Hon. Tom Tancredo	4/5	4/8	Morocco		569.00						569.00
	5/28	5/30	Venezuela		205.00						205.00
	5/30	5/31	Honduras		152.00						152.00
Hillel Weinberg	5/31	6/2	El Salvador		320.00						320.00
	6/2	6/2	Amsterdam		900.00						900.00
	6/2	6/5	Kenya								
	6/5	6/7	Sudan				714.28				714.28
	6/7	6/7	Kenya								
6/7	6/7	Amsterdam									
Commercial airfare							6,961.09				6,961.09
Peter Yeo	5/28	5/30	Finland		384.00						384.00
	5/30	6/1	Belgium		438.00						438.00
Commercial airfare							4,467.73				4,467.73
Hon. Carlos Romero-Barcelo <sup>2</sup>	8/28	8/30	Slovakia		589.00		60.00		52.00		701.00
	8/31	9/2	Romania		548.00		55.00		72.00		675.00
	9/2	9/4	Bulgaria		593.00		60.00		72.00		725.00
	9/4	9/6	Hungary		603.00		90.00		52.00		745.00
Hon. Lynn C. Woolsey <sup>4</sup>	9/6	9/7	Netherlands		207.00		30.00		32.00		269.00
	8/7	8/11	Armenia		600.00		( <sup>5</sup> )				600.00
Commercial airfare							3,368.10				3,368.10
Committee total					3,140.00		3,663.10		280.00		7,083.10

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.  
<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

BEN GILMAN, Chairman, Feb. 8, 2000.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1999

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Carlos Romero-Barcelo <sup>2</sup>	8/28	8/30	Slovakia		589.00		60.00		52.00		701.00
	8/31	9/2	Romania		548.00		55.00		72.00		675.00
	9/2	9/4	Bulgaria		593.00		60.00		72.00		725.00
	9/4	9/6	Hungary		603.00		90.00		52.00		745.00
	9/6	9/7	Netherlands		207.00		30.00		32.00		269.00
Hon. Lynn C. Woolsey <sup>4</sup>	8/7	8/11	Armenia		600.00		( <sup>5</sup> )				600.00
	Commercial airfare						3,368.10				3,368.10
Committee total					3,140.00		3,663.10		280.00		7,083.10

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.  
<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.  
<sup>3</sup> To participate in CODEL Mica.  
<sup>4</sup> To participate in CODEL Morella.  
<sup>5</sup> Military air transportation.

BILL GOODLING, Chairman, Feb. 2, 2000.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1999

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
David Adams	8/8	8/10	Japan		522.00						522.00
	8/10	8/11	Hong Kong		297.00						297.00
	8/11	8/14	China		621.00						621.00
	8/14	8/18	Mongolia		483.00						483.00
Commercial airfare							6,514.68				6,514.68
Hon. Cass Ballenger	8/29	8/30	Venezuela		103.65						103.65
	8/30	9/1	Colombia		108.65						108.65
	9/1	9/3	Nicaragua		402.65						402.65

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1999—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Doug Bereuter	8/31	9/3	Australia		664.00		178.02				842.02
Paul Berkowitz	7/3	7/4	Thailand		796.00						796.00
	7/5	7/6	Cambodia		472.00						472.00
	7/7	7/8	Laos								
	7/8	7/10	Thailand								
Commercial airfare						4,753.40				4,753.40	
Nancy Bloomer	8/8	8/10	Taiwan		530.00						530.00
	8/10	8/12	Thailand		498.00						498.00
	8/13	8/17	Australia		1,078.67						1,078.67
	8/17	8/20	New Zealand		713.19						713.19
	7/8	7/10	United Kingdom		766.00						766.00
Commercial airfare						534.52				534.52	
Deborah Bodlander	7/3	7/6	Syria		540.00					540.00	
Commercial airfare	7/6	7/10	Lebanon		70.00					70.00	
Paul Bonicelli	8/17	8/19	Venezuela		514.94		6,924.71			6,924.71	
Commercial airfare						1,521.40				1,521.40	
Parker Brent	8/8	8/10	Taiwan		530.00						530.00
	8/10	8/12	Thailand		498.00						498.00
	8/13	8/17	Australia		1,078.67						1,078.67
	8/17	8/20	New Zealand		713.19						713.19
	8/8	8/10	Taiwan		530.00						530.00
Peter Brookes	8/10	8/12	Thailand		498.00						498.00
	8/13	8/17	Australia		1,078.67						1,078.67
	8/17	8/20	New Zealand		713.19						713.19
	8/8	8/10	Taiwan		530.00						530.00
	8/10	8/12	Thailand		498.00						498.00
Thomas Callahan	8/13	8/17	Australia		1,078.67						1,078.67
	8/17	8/20	New Zealand		713.19						713.19
	7/8	7/11	South Africa		208.50						208.50
	Commercial airfare						7,280.11				7,280.11
	8/17	8/24	Ethiopia		1,421.00						1,421.00
Commercial airfare	8/24	8/25	Saudi Arabia		166.00						166.00
	8/25	8/28	Eritrea		524.00						524.00
							6,641.81				6,641.81
Hon. Tom Campbell	7/5	7/8	Zimbabwe		477.00					477.00	
Commercial airfare	7/8	7/11	South Africa		300.00		3,632.11			3,632.11	
Sean Carroll	8/8	8/10	Taiwan		530.00						530.00
	8/10	8/12	Thailand		498.00						498.00
	8/13	8/17	Australia		1,078.67						1,078.67
	8/17	8/20	New Zealand		713.19						713.19
	9/10	9/12	Haiti		183.00						183.00
	8/29	8/30	Venezuela		283.65						283.65
	8/30	9/1	Colombia		386.00						386.00
Malik Chaka	9/1	9/3	Nicaragua		427.50						427.50
	8/8	8/9	Guinea		1,450.00						1,450.00
	8/9	8/11	Sierra Leone								
Commercial airfare	8/11	8/16	Guinea				4,379.40			4,379.40	
Mark Clack	8/8	8/9	Guinea		1,450.00					1,450.00	
Commercial airfare	8/9	8/11	Sierra Leone								
Commercial airfare	8/11	8/16	Guinea				4,379.40			4,379.40	
Theodore Dagne	7/5	7/8	Zimbabwe		477.00					477.00	
Commercial airfare	7/8	7/11	South Africa		300.00		7,280.11			7,280.11	
Hon. William Delahunt	9/1	9/2	Nicaragua		232.50					232.50	
Commercial airfare							1,127.60			1,127.60	
Michael Ennis	8/21	8/24	Turkey		579.00						579.00
	8/24	8/25	Armenia		300.00						300.00
	8/26	8/30	Georgia		300.00						300.00
	8/30	9/2	Azerbaijan		808.00						808.00
	Commercial airfare						5,926.60				5,926.60
Hon. Eni Faleomavaega	8/9	8/10	Taiwan		265.00		2,060.76				2,325.76
	8/10	8/12	Thailand		498.00						498.00
	8/13	8/17	Australia		1,078.67						1,078.67
	8/17	8/20	New Zealand		713.19						713.19
	9/10	9/12	Haiti		183.00						183.00
Mark Gage	8/28	8/31	Slovak Republic		519.50						519.50
	8/31	9/2	Romania		492.00						492.00
	9/2	9/4	Bulgaria		190.00						190.00
	9/4	9/6	Hungary		553.00						553.00
	9/6	9/7	Netherlands		207.00						207.00
	8/8	8/10	Taiwan		530.00						530.00
	8/10	8/12	Thailand		498.00						498.00
Kristen Gilley	8/13	8/17	Australia		1,078.67						1,078.67
	8/17	8/20	New Zealand		713.19						713.19
	8/8	8/10	Taiwan		530.00						530.00
	8/10	8/12	Thailand		498.00						498.00
	8/13	8/17	Australia		1,325.43						1,325.43
Commercial airfare	8/17	8/19	New Zealand		641.14					641.14	
Commercial airfare						3,624.41				3,624.41	
Hon. Benjamin Gilman	7/8	7/10	United Kingdom		766.00					766.00	
Commercial airfare						534.52				534.52	
Charisse Glassman	8/8	8/10	Taiwan		530.00						530.00
	8/10	8/12	Thailand		498.00						498.00
	8/13	8/17	Australia		1,078.67						1,078.67
	8/17	8/20	New Zealand		713.19						713.19
	7/5	7/8	Zimbabwe		477.00						477.00
	7/8	7/11	South Africa		300.00						300.00
	Commercial airfare						6,008.17				6,008.17
Jason Gross	9/10	9/12	Haiti		183.00						183.00
	8/24	8/25	Macedonia		160.00						160.00
	8/25	8/27	Serbia		494.00						494.00
	8/27	8/28	Montenegro								
	8/28	8/31	Bosnia		602.00						602.00
Commercial airfare						4,638.40				4,638.40	
Hon. Alcee Hastings	8/8	8/10	Taiwan		530.00						530.00
	8/10	8/12	Thailand		498.00						498.00
	8/13	8/17	Australia		1,078.67						1,078.67
	8/17	8/20	New Zealand		713.19						713.19
	8/17	8/20	New Zealand		713.19						713.19
John Herzberg	8/24	8/25	Macedonia		160.00						160.00
	8/25	8/27	Serbia		238.00						238.00
	8/27	8/28	Montenegro		250.00						250.00
	8/29	8/31	Bosnia		602.00						602.00
	Commercial airfare						4,638.40				4,638.40
Amos Hochstein	7/3	7/6	Syria		612.00					612.00	
Commercial airfare	7/6	7/10	Lebanon		105.00					105.00	

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1999—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Commercial airfare											
Mark Kirk	8/24	9/1	Yugoslavia		1,032.35		6,924.71				6,924.71
Commercial airfare							4,638.40				4,638.40
John Mackey	8/8	8/10	Taiwan		530.00						530.00
	8/10	8/12	Thailand		498.00						498.00
	8/12	8/14	Ireland		380.00						380.00
Commercial airfare							2,685.20				2,685.20
	8/30	8/31	Slovak Republic		293.50						293.50
	8/31	9/2	Romania		492.00						492.00
	9/2	9/4	Bulgaria		250.00						250.00
	9/4	9/6	Hungary		502.00						502.00
	9/6	9/7	Netherlands		207.00						207.00
Commercial airfare							2,340.85				2,340.85
Caleb McCary	8/29	8/30	Venezuela		283.65						283.65
	8/30	9/1	Colombia		386.00						386.00
	9/1	9/3	Nicaragua		427.50						427.50
	9/10	9/12	Haiti		118.00						118.00
Hon. Cynthia McKinney	8/26	8/28	Democratic Republic of Congo		579.00		197.21				776.21
Commercial airfare							6,043.40				6,043.40
Kathleen Moazed	8/23	8/26	Armenia		400.00						400.00
	8/26	8/30	Georgia		300.00						300.00
	8/30	9/2	Azerbaijan		950.00						950.00
Commercial airfare							5,924.63				5,924.63
Vince Morelli	8/17	8/19	Venezuela		541.94						541.94
Commercial airfare							1,521.40				1,521.40
Hon. Donald Payne	7/5	7/8	Zimbabwe		477.00						477.00
	7/8	7/11	South Africa		300.00						300.00
Commercial airfare							5,704.17				5,704.17
	9/10	9/12	Haiti		183.00						183.00
Joseph Rees	8/9	8/11	Switzerland		3,200.00						3,200.00
	8/11	8/14	Macedonia								
	8/14	8/18	Kosovo								
	8/18	8/19	Macedonia								
	8/19	8/24	Italy								
Commercial airfare							5,031.39				5,031.39
Matthew Reynolds	8/8	8/10	Japan		522.00						522.00
	8/10	8/11	Hong Kong		297.00						297.00
	8/11	8/14	China		621.00						621.00
	8/14	8/18	Mongolia		388.00						388.00
Commercial airfare							6,514.68				6,514.68
Hon. Dana Rohrabacher	8/28	8/31	Slovak Republic		589.50						589.50
	8/31	9/2	Romania		522.00						522.00
	9/2	9/4	Bulgaria		250.00						250.00
	9/4	9/6	Hungary		502.00						502.00
	9/6	9/7	Netherlands		207.00						207.00
Linda Solomon	8/8	8/10	Taiwan		530.00						530.00
	8/10	8/12	Thailand		498.00						498.00
	8/13	8/17	Australia		1,078.67						1,078.67
	8/17	8/20	New Zealand		713.19						713.19
Committee total					68,065.29		130,104.57				198,169.86

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

BEN GILMAN, Chairman, Feb. 8, 2000.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1999

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
FOR HOUSE COMMITTEES											
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. <input type="checkbox"/>											

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

BILL GOODLING, Chairman, Feb. 2, 2000.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1999

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Amit Sachdev	12/5	12/11	Switzerland		1,400.00		1,882.42				3,282.42
Richard Frandsen	12/7	12/14	Switzerland		1,650.00		4,953.17				6,603.17
Alison Taylor	11/28	12/6	China		2,057.00		3,161.70				5,218.70
Robert Meyers	11/28	11/6	China		2,057.00		2,172.45				4,229.45
Hon. Nathan Deal	11/20	11/21	Moldova		225.00						225.00
	11/21	11/24	Russia		1,143.00						1,143.00
Hon. Joe Barton	11/20	11/21	Moldova		225.00						225.00
	11/21	11/24	Russia		1,125.00						1,125.00
Committee total					9,882.00		12,169.74				22,051.74

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

TOM BLILEY, Chairman, Jan. 31, 2000.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1999

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Kevin Long	10/14	10/18	Spain		927.00		4,197.26				5,124.26
William O'Neill	10/14	10/18	Spain		927.00		4,197.26				5,124.26
Andrew Su	10/14	10/18	Spain		927.00		1,446.26				2,373.26
Kevin Long	11/4	11/6	Colombia		486.00		1,744.45				2,230.45
Gilbert Macklin	11/4	11/6	Colombia		486.00		1,744.45				2,230.45
Committee total					3,753.00		13,329.68				17,082.68

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DAN BURTON, Chairman, Jan. 31, 2000.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1999

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
David Abramowitz	12/14	12/17	Argentina		825.00						825.00
	12/17	12/18	Paraguay		135.00						135.00
	12/18	12/20	Brazil		474.00						474.00
Commercial airfare							4,032.45				4,032.45
Hon. Cass Ballenger	12/2	12/4	Curacao		455.06						455.06
	12/4	12/6	Aruba		353.60						353.60
	12/6	12/8	Ecuador		310.04						310.04
	12/8	12/10	Panama		295.23						295.23
Peter Brookes	12/6	12/9	Philippines		627.00						627.00
	12/9	12/11	Singapore		398.00						398.00
	12/11	12/12	Hong Kong		594.00						594.00
Commercial airfare							6,605.79				6,605.79
Hon. Tom Campbell	11/21	11/22	Thailand		747.00						747.00
	11/22	11/26	Burma		626.00						626.00
	11/26	12/1	Vietnam		1,390.00						1,390.00
	12/1	12/2	Thailand								
Commercial airfare							3,053.45				3,053.45
Maik Chaka	12/2	12/8	Cote d'Ivoire		1,027.00						1,027.00
	12/8	12/9	France		283.00						283.00
Commercial airfare							6,385.94				6,385.94
Mark Clack	11/29	12/2	Nigeria		835.00						835.00
	12/2	12/3	Ghana		200.00						200.00
Commercial airfare							5,974.20				5,974.20
David Fite	12/8	12/9	Philippines		209.00						209.00
	12/9	12/11	Singapore		398.00						398.00
	12/11	12/13	Hong Kong		594.00						594.00
	12/13	12/16	China		693.00						693.00
Commercial airfare							6,605.79				6,605.79
Mark Gage	11/29	12/3	Russia		1,450.00						1,450.00
Commercial airfare							5,003.61				5,003.61
Sam Gejdenson	11/30	12/2	Nigeria		900.00						900.00
	12/2	12/3	Ghana		200.00						200.00
Commercial airfare							6,054.45				6,054.45
Kristen Gilley	12/14	12/17	Argentina		825.00						825.00
	12/17	12/18	Paraguay		135.00						135.00
	12/18	12/20	Brazil		474.00						474.00
Commercial airfare							4,032.45				4,032.45
Charisse Glassman	11/19	11/20	Thailand		747.00						747.00
	11/21	11/26	Burma		626.00						626.00
	11/27	11/29	Vietnam		754.00						754.00
	11/30	12/1	Thailand								
Commercial airfare							5,148.45				5,148.45
Hon. Barbara Lee	11/29	12/2	Nigeria		900.00						900.00
	12/2	12/3	Ghana		200.00						200.00
Commercial airfare							6,274.20				6,274.20
John Mackey	11/4	11/6	Colombia		486.00						486.00
Commercial airfare							1,744.45				1,744.45
	12/14	12/17	Argentina		825.00						825.00
	12/17	12/18	Paraguay		135.00						135.00
	12/18	12/20	Brazil		474.00						474.00
Commercial airfare							4,032.45				4,032.45
	12/2	12/3	United Kingdom		349.00						349.00
	12/3	12/4	Ireland		311.00						311.00
Commercial airfare							5,006.55				5,006.55
Kathleen Moazed	11/13	11/17	England		1,150.00				420.00		1,570.00
Commercial airfare					5,029.66						5,029.66
Larry Nowels	11/21	11/22	Thailand		747.00						747.00
	11/22	11/26	Burma		626.00						626.00
	11/26	12/1	Vietnam		1,155.00						1,155.00
	12/1	12/2	Thailand								
Commercial airfare							4,596.45				4,596.45
Hon. Donald Payne	11/20	11/21	Thailand		249.00						249.00
	11/21	11/26	Burma		626.00						626.00
	11/27	11/28	Thailand								
Commercial airfare							10,469.20				10,469.20
Douglas Rasmussen	11/21	11/22	Thailand		747.00						747.00
	11/22	11/26	Burma		626.00						626.00
	11/26	12/1	Vietnam		1,135.00						1,135.00
	12/1	12/2	Thailand								
Commercial airfare							4,937.45				4,937.45
Grover Joseph Rees	11/22	11/25	Switzerland		833.00						833.00
Commercial airfare							4,138.24				4,138.24
	12/12	12/15	Philippines		573.00						573.00
	12/15	12/19	Vietnam		398.00						398.00
	12/20	12/20	Japan		105.00						105.00
Commercial airfare							4,214.76				4,214.76
Francis Record	10/29	10/31	Germany		602.00						602.00
Commercial airfare							5,067.01				5,067.01
John Walker Roberts	12/6	12/9	Philippines		627.00						627.00
	12/9	12/11	Singapore		398.00						398.00
	12/11	12/13	Hong Kong		594.00						594.00
	12/14	12/16	China		543.00						543.00
Commercial airfare							7,055.79				7,055.79

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1999—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Edward Royce	11/20	11/21	Moldova		225.00						225.00
	11/21	11/24	Russia		797.00						797.00
	11/24	11/25	Norway		276.00						276.00
Tanya Shamson	11/29	12/3	Russia		1,450.00						1,450.00
Commercial airfare							5,003.61				5,003.61
Thomas Sheehy	12/2	12/8	Cote d'Ivoire		1,027.00						1,027.00
Commercial airfare							4,355.13				4,355.13
Hon. Christopher Smith	11/22	11/24	Switzerland		536.00						536.00
Commercial airfare							4,138.24				4,138.24
	12/16	12/18	Vietnam		366.00						366.00
	12/19	12/19	Japan		150.00						150.00
Commercial airfare							4,045.20				4,045.20
Hillel Weinberg	10/29	10/31	Germany		434.00						434.00
Commercial airfare							4,417.01				4,417.01
	11/29	11/30	Portugal		166.00						166.00
	11/30	12/3	Belgium		826.00						826.00
Commercial airfare							4,470.00				4,470.00
Peter Yeo	12/8	12/9	Philippines		209.00						209.00
	12/9	12/11	Singapore		398.00						398.00
	12/11	12/13	Hong Kong		594.00						594.00
	12/13	12/16	China		693.00						693.00
Commercial airfare							6,605.79				6,605.79
Committee total					46,170.59		143,468.11		420.00		190,058.70

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

BEN GILMAN, Chairman.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1999

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Robert Howarth	11/12	11/24	Brazil		2,150.00		4,552.45				6,702.45
Kurt Christensen	11/24	12/5	Morocco		1,800.00		1,481.39				3,281.39
John Rishel	11/24	12/5	Morocco		1,800.00		1,481.39				3,281.39
Hon. Richard Pombo <sup>3</sup>	12/11	12/18	South Africa/Zimbabwe/Botswana/Mozambique.		400.00		( <sup>4</sup> )				400.00
Hon. James Hansen <sup>3</sup>	12/11	12/18	South Africa/Zimbabwe/Botswana/Mozambique.		400.00		( <sup>4</sup> )				400.00
Hon. Neil Abercrombie <sup>3</sup>	12/11	12/18	South Africa/Zimbabwe/Botswana/Mozambique.		400.00		( <sup>4</sup> )				400.00
Hon. John Doolittle <sup>3</sup>	12/11	12/18	South Africa/Zimbabwe/Botswana/Mozambique.		400.00		( <sup>4</sup> )				400.00
Hon. Calvin Dooley <sup>3</sup>	12/11	12/18	South Africa/Zimbabwe/Botswana/Mozambique.		400.00		( <sup>4</sup> )				400.00
Hon. Robert Underwood <sup>3</sup>	12/11	12/18	South Africa/Zimbabwe/Botswana/Mozambique.		400.00		( <sup>4</sup> )				400.00
Hon. Barbara Cubin <sup>3</sup>	12/11	12/18	South Africa/Zimbabwe/Botswana/Mozambique.		400.00		( <sup>4</sup> )				400.00
Hon. Helen Chenoweth-Hage <sup>3</sup>	12/11	12/18	South Africa/Zimbabwe/Botswana/Mozambique.		400.00		( <sup>4</sup> )				400.00
Hon. Eni Faleomavaega <sup>3</sup>	12/11	12/18	South Africa/Zimbabwe/Botswana/Mozambique.		400.00		( <sup>4</sup> )				400.00
Lloyd Jones <sup>3</sup>	12/11	12/18	South Africa/Zimbabwe/Botswana/Mozambique.		400.00		( <sup>4</sup> )				400.00
Christine Kennedy <sup>3</sup>	12/11	12/18	South Africa/Zimbabwe/Botswana/Mozambique.		400.00		( <sup>4</sup> )				400.00
Elizabeth Megginson <sup>3</sup>	12/11	12/18	South Africa/Zimbabwe/Botswana/Mozambique.		400.00		( <sup>4</sup> )				400.00
Robert Howarth <sup>3</sup>	12/11	12/18	South Africa/Zimbabwe/Botswana/Mozambique.		400.00		( <sup>4</sup> )				400.00
Todd Willens <sup>3</sup>	12/11	12/18	South Africa/Zimbabwe/Botswana/Mozambique.		400.00		( <sup>4</sup> )				400.00
Jean Flemma <sup>3</sup>	12/11	12/18	South Africa/Zimbabwe/Botswana/Mozambique.		400.00		( <sup>4</sup> )				400.00
Joycelyn Johnson <sup>3</sup>	12/11	12/18	South Africa/Zimbabwe/Botswana/Mozambique.		400.00		( <sup>4</sup> )				400.00
Committee total					12,150.00		7,515.23				19,665.23

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

<sup>3</sup> Incomplete per diem information. Totals not available from Department of State.

<sup>4</sup> Not available.

DON YOUNG, Chairman, Jan. 25, 2000.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1999

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>

FOR HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return.

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

LAMAR SMITH, Jan. 31, 2000.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1999

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>

FOR HOUSE COMMITTEES  
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return.

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.  
<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

BOB STUMP, Chairman, Jan. 30, 2000.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1999

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>

FOR HOUSE COMMITTEES  
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return.

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.  
<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

BILL ARCHER, Chairman.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1999

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Pat Murray	11/14	11/22	Europe				1,700.00				1,700.00
Commercial airfare							4,939.84				4,939.84
Jay Jakub	11/14	11/22	Europe				1,700.00				1,700.00
Commercial airfare							4,939.84				4,939.84
John Stopher	11/12	11/20	Asia				1,828.00				1,828.00
Commercial airfare							6,139.85				6,139.85
Timothy Sample	11/29	12/7	Asia				1,650.00				1,650.00
Commercial airfare							5,335.35				5,335.35
Michael Meermans	11/29	12/7	Asia				1,650.00				1,650.00
Commercial airfare							5,335.35				5,335.35
John Millis	12/7	12/15	South America				2,052.00				2,052.00
Commercial airfare							2,424.45				2,424.45
Chris Barton	12/7	12/15	South America				2,052.00				2,052.00
Commercial airfare							2,424.45				2,424.45
Tom Newcomb	12/7	12/11	South America				972.00				972.00
Commercial airfare							1,744.45				1,744.45
Committee total							46,887.58				46,887.58

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.  
<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

BILL McCOLLUM, Chairman, Feb. 8, 2000.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, HOUSE DELEGATION TO JAPAN, AUSTRALIA, AND NEW ZEALAND, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN NOV. 27 AND DEC. 7, 1999

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Hastert	11/28	11/30	Japan								
Hon. Boehlert	11/28	11/30	Japan								
Hon. Pryce	11/28	11/30	Japan								
Hon. Largent	11/28	11/30	Japan								
Hon. Coburn	11/28	11/30	Japan								
Hon. Wamp	11/28	11/30	Japan								
Hon. Doyle	11/28	11/30	Japan								
Hon. Sandford	11/28	11/30	Japan								
Hon. Stupak	11/28	11/30	Japan								
Hon. Cramer	11/28	11/30	Japan								
Hon. Blunt	11/28	11/30	Japan								
Hon. Isakson	11/28	11/30	Japan								
Scott Palmer	11/28	11/30	Japan								
John Feehery	11/28	11/30	Japan								
David Hobbs	11/28	11/30	Japan								
Bill Inglee	11/28	11/30	Japan								
Sam Lancaster	11/28	11/30	Japan								
Martha Morrison	11/28	11/30	Japan								
Shanti Ochs	11/28	11/30	Japan								
Chris Scheve	11/28	11/30	Japan								
Dwight Comedy	11/28	11/30	Japan								
Bill Livingood	11/28	11/30	Japan								
Dr. John Eisold	11/28	11/30	Japan								
Hon. Hastert	11/30	12/4	Australia		992.00						992.00
Hon. Boehlert	11/30	12/4	Australia		992.00						992.00
Hon. Pryce	11/30	12/4	Australia		992.00						992.00
Hon. Largent	11/30	12/4	Australia		992.00						992.00
Hon. Coburn	11/30	12/4	Australia		992.00						992.00
Hon. Wamp	11/30	12/4	Australia		992.00						992.00
Hon. Doyle	11/30	12/4	Australia		992.00						992.00
Hon. Sandford	11/30	12/4	Australia		992.00						992.00
Hon. Stupak	11/30	12/4	Australia		992.00						992.00
Hon. Cramer	11/30	12/4	Australia		992.00						992.00
Hon. Blunt	11/30	12/4	Australia		992.00						992.00
Hon. Isakson	11/30	12/4	Australia		992.00						992.00
Scott Palmer	11/30	12/4	Australia		992.00						992.00
John Feehery	11/30	12/4	Australia		992.00						992.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, HOUSE DELEGATION TO JAPAN, AUSTRALIA, AND NEW ZEALAND, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN NOV. 27 AND DEC. 7, 1999—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
David Hobbs	11/30	12/4	Australia		992.00						992.00
Bill Inglee	11/30	12/4	Australia		992.00						992.00
Sam Lancaster	11/30	12/4	Australia		992.00						992.00
Martha Morrison	11/30	12/4	Australia		992.00						992.00
Shanti Ochs	11/30	12/4	Australia		992.00						992.00
Chris Scheve	11/30	12/4	Australia		992.00						992.00
Dwight Comedy	11/30	12/4	Australia		992.00						992.00
Bill Livingood	11/30	12/4	Australia		992.00						992.00
Dr. John Eisold	11/30	12/4	Australia		992.00						992.00
Hon. Hastert	12/4	12/7	New Zealand		826.00						826.00
Hon. Boehlert	12/4	12/7	New Zealand		826.00						826.00
Hon. Pryce	12/4	12/7	New Zealand		826.00						826.00
Hon. Largent	12/4	12/7	New Zealand		826.00						826.00
Hon. Coburn	12/4	12/7	New Zealand		826.00						826.00
Hon. Wamp	12/4	12/7	New Zealand		826.00						826.00
Hon. Doyle	12/4	12/7	New Zealand		826.00						826.00
Hon. Sandford	12/4	12/7	New Zealand		826.00						826.00
Hon. Stupak	12/4	12/7	New Zealand		826.00						826.00
Hon. Cramer	12/4	12/7	New Zealand		826.00						826.00
Hon. Blunt	12/4	12/7	New Zealand		826.00						826.00
Hon. Isakson	12/4	12/7	New Zealand		826.00						826.00
Scott Palmer	12/4	12/7	New Zealand		826.00						826.00
John Feehery	12/4	12/7	New Zealand		826.00						826.00
David Hobbs	12/4	12/7	New Zealand		826.00						826.00
Bill Inglee	12/4	12/7	New Zealand		826.00						826.00
Sam Lancaster	12/4	12/7	New Zealand		826.00						826.00
Martha Morrison	12/4	12/7	New Zealand		826.00						826.00
Shanti Ochs	12/4	12/7	New Zealand		826.00						826.00
Chris Scheve	12/4	12/7	New Zealand		826.00						826.00
Dwight Comedy	12/4	12/7	New Zealand		826.00						826.00
Bill Livingood	12/4	12/7	New Zealand		826.00						826.00
Dr. John Eisold	12/4	12/7	New Zealand		826.00						826.00
Committee Total											

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

J. DENNIS HASTERT, Jan. 20, 2000.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, TRAVEL TO DENMARK, SWITZERLAND, BELGIUM, PORTUGAL, AND SPAIN, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 9 AND JAN. 19, 2000

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
James Ford	1/9	1/10	Denmark		358.00						358.00
	1/10	1/12	Switzerland		616.00						616.00
	1/12	1/15	Belgium		790.00						790.00
	1/15	1/17	Portugal		418.00						418.00
	1/17	1/19	Spain		518.00						518.00
Total					2,700.00						2,700.00

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JAMES FORD, Feb. 3, 2000.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, NATO PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY TO SPAIN, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN DEC. 15 AND DEC. 18, 1999

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Doug Bereuter	12/15	12/18	Spain		819.00	(3)					819.00
Hon. Tom Bliley	12/15	12/18	Spain		819.00	(3)					819.00
Hon. Porter Goss	12/15	12/18	Spain		819.00	(3)					819.00
Susan Olson	12/15	12/18	Spain		819.00	(3)					819.00
Committee total					3,276.00						3,276.00

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

<sup>3</sup> Military air transportation.

DOUGLAS BEREUTER, Feb. 1, 2000.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6249. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Walnuts Grown in California; Decreased Assessment Rate [Docket No. FV99-984-3 FIR] received Janu-

ary 14, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6250. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—N,N-diethyl-2-(4-methylbenzyloxy) ethylamine hydrochloride; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-300964; FRL-6486-2] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received January 13, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6251. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Spinosaad; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-300960; FRL-6399-7] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received January 13, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6252. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental budget request for fiscal year 2000;

(H. Doc. No. 106-198); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

6253. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the budget program revisions for the Commodity Credit Corporation for FY 2000 and FY 2001; (H. Doc. No. 106-199); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

6254. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a request for supplemental appropriations for the Department of Defense; (H. Doc. No. 106-201); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

6255. A letter from the Chairperson, Joint Committee on Judicial Administration, District of Columbia Courts, transmitting the "Planning and Budgeting Difficulties During Fiscal Year 1998"; to the Committee on Appropriations.

6256. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Installations, Logistics and Financial Management), Department of Defense, transmitting notification of munitions disposal, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1512(4); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6257. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Strategy and Threat Reduction, transmitting a report providing responses to certain questions having to do with the elimination of Russian SS-18 ICBMs, Russian contributions to the Strategic Offensive Arms Elimination program, and possible support to the elimination of Russian tactical nuclear weapons; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6258. A letter from the Captain, Judge Advocate General's Corps, Director of Legislation, Department of the Navy, transmitting the proposed transfer of the ex-NEW JERSEY; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6259. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Procurement, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Manufacturing Technology Program [DFARS Case 99-D302] received January 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6260. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Procurement, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Paid Advertisements [DFARS Case 99-D029] received January 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6261. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Procurement, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Institutions of Higher Education [DFARS Case 99-D303] received January 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6262. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Procurement, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Authority Relating to Utility Privatization [DFARS Case 99-D309] received January 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6263. A letter from the Director, Secretary of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Air Force Privacy Act Program [Air Force Instruction 37-132] received January 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6264. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—Public Housing Assessment System (PHAS) Amendments to the PHAS [Docket No. FR-4497-F-05] (RIN: 2577-AC08) received January 14, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the

Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

6265. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the 1998 Annual Report; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

6266. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting reports as required by the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and subsequently amended; to the Committee on the Budget.

6267. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting separate appropriations and pay-as-you-go reports, as required by the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended; to the Committee on the Budget.

6268. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting reports, as required by the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended; to the Committee on the Budget.

6269. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting the annual report of the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention for Fiscal Year 1998, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 5617; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6270. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the FY 1996 and 1997 reports describing the activities and accomplishments of programs for persons with developmental disabilities and their families, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 6006(c); to the Committee on Commerce.

6271. A letter from the Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule—Notice of Availability of Funds [Docket No. 981203295-9313-03] (RIN: 0660-ZA06) received January 7, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

6272. A letter from the Administrator, Energy Information Administration, Department of Energy, transmitting notification that Performance Profiles of Major Energy Producers 1998 has been completed; to the Committee on Commerce.

6273. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Secondary Direct Food Additives Permitted in Food for Human Consumption [Docket No. 99F-2907] received January 13, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

6274. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Amendments for Testing and Monitoring Provisions [FRL-6523-6] (RIN: 2060-AG21) received February 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

6275. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory and Management Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Pollution Prevention Grants and Announcement of Financial Assistance Programs Eligible for Review; Notice of Availability [OPPTS-099283; FRL-6398-8] received January 13, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

6276. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Delaware—Minor New Source Review and Federally Enforceable State Operating Permit Program [DE-031-1029; FRL-6522-6] received January 13, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

6277. A letter from the Chief Financial Officer, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the annual report of compliance activities undertaken by the Department for mixed waste streams during FY 1999, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 6965; to the Committee on Commerce.

6278. 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.

6279. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the Continuation of the National Emergency Relating to CUBA and the Emergency Authority Relating to the Regulation of the Anchorage and Movement of Vessels; (H. Doc. No. 106-202); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

6280. 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.

6281. A letter from the Chairman, Japan-United States Friendship Commission, transmitting the Commission's annual report for fiscal year 1999, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2904(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

6282. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report justifying the reasons for the extension of locality-based comparability payments to categories of positions that are in more than one executive agency, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 5304(h)(2)(C); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6283. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting Acquisition cost of surplus real or related personal property conveyed to educational institutions during the preceding fiscal year, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 484(o)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6284. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the Inspector General for the period April 1, 1999, through September 30, 1999 and the Semiannual Report on Inspector General Audit Reports for the same period, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(d); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6285. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting Semiannual report of the Inspector General, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(d); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6286. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of Transmittal of D.C. ACT 13-247, "Police Recruiting and Retention Enhancement Amendment Act of 1999" received February 25, 2000, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6287. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 13-225, "Government Employer-Assisted Housing Amendment Act of 1999" received February 23, 2000, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6288. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 13-250, "Department of Health Functions Clarification Temporary Act of 1999" received February 23, 2000, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6289. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a

copy of D.C. Act 13-254, "District of Columbia Housing Authority Act of 1999" received February 23, 2000, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6290. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 13-256, "Retail Electric Competition and Consumer Protection of 1999" received February 23, 2000, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6291. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 13-262, "Transfer of Jurisdiction over Georgetown Waterfront Park for Public Park and Recreational Purposes, S.O. 84-230, Temporary Act of 2000" received February 23, 2000, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6292. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a copy of his report for FY 1999 on each instance a Federal agency did not fully implement recommendations made by the GAO in connection with a bid protest decided during the fiscal year, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3554(e)(2); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6293. A letter from the Director, Congressional Budget Office, transmitting the report to waive deduction of pay requirement for a reemployed annuitant; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6294. A letter from the Chairman, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting the report that the U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission (CPSC) management control systems provide reasonable assurance that the agency is achieving the objectives of the Federal Managers Integrity Act (FMFIA); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6295. A letter from the Assistant Secretary—Policy, Management and Budget, Department of the Interior, transmitting the inventory of commercial activities prepared in accordance with the Federal Activities Reform (FAIR) Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6296. A letter from the Acting Deputy Associate Administrator for Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Department's final rule—Federal Acquisition Circular 97-15; Introduction—received January 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6297. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during the calendar year 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6298. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Budget and Programs, Department of Transportation, transmitting copies of the inventories of commercial positions in the Department of Transportation; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6299. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the FY1999 Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act (FMFIA) Annual Report for the Federal Communications Commission; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6300. A letter from the Managing Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the commercial inventory submission; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6301. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Housing Finance Board, transmitting the statement that the Federal Housing Finance Board's (Finance Board) management accountability and controls are adequate and

effective and that there are no material weaknesses; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6302. A letter from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting reports released in November 1999; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6303. A letter from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting the report on GAO employees detailed to congressional committees as of January 21, 2000; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6304. A letter from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting reports issued or released in October 1999; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6305. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the 6-month report in compliance with the Inspector General Act Amendments of 1988, pursuant to 5 app.; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6306. A letter from the President, Institute of Peace, transmitting the report pursuant to the Inspector General Act of 1978 and the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6307. A letter from the Acting Deputy Associate Administrator for Acquisition Policy, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Federal Acquisition Regulation; Technical Amendments [FAC 97-15; Item XI] received January 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6308. A letter from the Acting Deputy Associate Administrator for Acquisition Policy, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Federal Acquisition Regulation; Small Entity Compliance Guide—received January 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6309. A letter from the Archivist, National Archives and Records Administration, transmitting the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act (Integrity Act) report for fiscal year 1999; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6310. A letter from the Chairman, National Endowment for the Arts, transmitting the annual Integrity Act report for 1999; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6311. A letter from the Chairman and General Counsel, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting the Agency's Fiscal Year 1999 report on the adequacy of management controls and conformance of financial systems; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6312. A letter from the Chairwoman, National Mediation Board, transmitting the FY 1999 report pursuant to the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6313. A letter from the Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting a copy of the annual report of meetings in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during the calendar year 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6314. A letter from the Inspector General, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the Semiannual Report of our activities and accomplishments from April 1, 1999 through September 30, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(d); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6315. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting two Semiannual Reports for the six months ended September 30, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(d); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6316. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the the FY 1999 Annual Statement of Assurance; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6317. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the annual report for the period ending September 30, 1999 in accordance with the Inspector General Act Amendments of 1988, pursuant to 5 app.; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6318. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the revised performance goals and corporate management strategies for the Department of Transportation's fiscal year (FY) 2000 Performance Plan; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6319. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the report of compliance for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6320. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting the Merit Systems Protection Board's Annual Report to Congress regarding the Government in the Sunshine Act; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6321. A letter from the Chairman, United States Postal Service, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during the calendar year 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6322. A letter from the the Chief Administrative Officer, transmitting Statement of Disbursements of the House as Compiled by the Chief Administrative Officer from October 1, 1999 through December 31, 1999, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 104a; (H. Doc. No. 106-200); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

6323. A letter from the Deputy Chief, National Forest System, Department of Agriculture, transmitting detailed boundary maps for the following rivers added to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System by the Omnibus Oregon Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1988: Upper Deschutes and Metolius Rivers on the Deschutes National Forest; North Folk Malheur and Malheur Rivers on the Malheur National Forest; and Chetco and Elk Rivers on the Siskiyou National Forest; to the Committee on Resources.

6324. A letter from the Chief of Staff, National Indian Gaming Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Issuance of Certificates of Self Regulation to Tribes for Class II Gaming (RIN: 3141-AA04) received January 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6325. A letter from the Acting Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands; Final 2000 Harvest Specifications for Groundfish [Docket No. 000211040-0040-01; I.D. 111899B] received February 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6326. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, transmitting Operations under the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 1622 and 1622a; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6327. A letter from the Assistant Secretary and Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule—Complaints regarding Invention Promoters [Docket No. 000105007-0007-01] (RIN: 0651-AB12) received January 14, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6328. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General for Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting the fifth annual report on the Communications Assistance for Law Enforcement Act (CALEA) of 1994, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6329. A letter from the President and CEO, Little League Baseball Incorporated, transmitting the Annual Report of Little League Baseball, fiscal year ending September 30, 1999; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6330. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of the Army, transmitting a shore erosion plan for the Fire Island Inlet to Moriches Inlet reach of the Fire Island to Montauk Point, New York, project; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6331. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment of Class D Airspace; Jacksonville Whitehouse NOLF, FL [Airspace Docket No. 99-ASO-27] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6332. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of Class E Airspace; El Paso, TX [Airspace Docket No. 99-ASW-26] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6333. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of Class E Airspace; Hebronville, TX [Airspace Docket No. 99-ASW-24] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6334. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of Class E Airspace; Carrizo Springs, TX [Airspace Docket No. 99-ASW-29] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6335. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of Class E Airspace; Lake Jackson, TX [Airspace Docket No. 99-ASW-27] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6336. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment of Class D Airspace; Jacksonville Whitehouse NOLF, FL [Airspace Docket No. 99-ASO-27] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6337. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Establishment of Class E Airspace; Burlington, VT [Airspace Docket No. 99-ANE-92] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6338. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of Class E Airspace; Corpus Christi, TX [Airspace Docket No. 99-ASW-22] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6339. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; Puerto Rico, PR [Airspace Docket No. 99-ASO-17] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6340. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of Class D Airspace; Hobbs, NM [Airspace Docket No. 99-ASW-32] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6341. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; Marshall, MO [Airspace Docket No. 99-ACE-51] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6342. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; Brownsville, PA [Airspace Docket No. 99-AEA-16.FR] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6343. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of Class E Airspace; Corsicana, TX [Airspace Docket No. 2000-ASW-01] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6344. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Establishment of Class E Airspace; Stigler, OK [Airspace Docket No. 2000-ASW-02] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6345. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; Herington, KS; Correction [Airspace Docket No. 99-ACE-41] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6346. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; Malden, MO [Airspace Docket No. 99-ACE-42] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6347. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; Sikeston, MO [Airspace Docket No. 99-ACE-43] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6348. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; HUTCHINSON, KS [Airspace Docket No. 99-ACE-48] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6349. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; Emmetsburg, IA [Airspace Docket No. 99-ACE-39] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6350. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class D Airspace; Eglin AFB, FL [Airspace Docket No. 99-ASO-19] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6351. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class D Airspace; Eastover, SC [Airspace Docket No. 99-ASO-18] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6352. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class D Airspace; Jacksonville NAS Cecil Field, FL [Airspace Docket No. 99-ASO-20] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6353. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of Class E Airspace; Del Rio, TX [Airspace Docket No. 99-ASW-31] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6354. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of Class E Airspace; Artesia, NM [Airspace Docket No. 99-ASW-30] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6355. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Model F27 Mark 050 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99-NM-235-AD; Amendment 39-11484; AD 99-27-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6356. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Cessna Aircraft Company 170, 172, 175 and 177 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99-CE-24-AD; Amendment 39-11483; AD 99-27-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6357. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney JT8D-209, -217, -217A, -217C, and -219 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 98-ANE-80-AD; Amendment 39-11482; AD 99-27-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6358. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Limited Dart Series Turbo-prop Engines [Docket No. 99-NE-30-AD; Amendment 39-11485; AD 99-27-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6359. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace BAe Model ATP Airplanes [Docket No. 99-NM-201-AD; Amendment 39-11477; AD 99-26-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6360. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model

CL-600-1A11 (CL-600), CL-600-2A12(CL-601), and CL-600-2B16 (CL-601-3A, CL-601-3R, and CL-604) Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99-NM-166-AD; Amendment 39-11476; AD 99-26-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6361. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC-9-80 Series Airplanes and Model MD-88 Airplanes [Docket No. 99-NM-05-AD; Amendment 39-11428; AD 99-24-04 C1] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6362. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace Model BAe 146 and Avro 146-RJ Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99-NM-331-AD; Amendment 39-11454; AD 99-25-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6363. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A319 and A320 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99-NM-92-AD; Amendment 39-11481; AD 99-26-22] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6364. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace (Jetstream) Model 4101 Airplanes [Docket No. 99-NM-302-AD; Amendment 39-11478; AD 99-26-18] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6365. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Saab Model SAAB SF340A and SAAB 340B Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99-NM-200-AD; Amendment 39-11489; AD 99-27-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6366. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A310 and A300-600 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99-NM-222-AD; Amendment 39-11491; AD 99-27-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6367. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace Model BAC 1-11 200 and 400 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99-NM-31-AD; Amendment 39-11492; AD 99-27-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6368. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 767-200, -300, and -300F Series Airplanes [Docket No. 97-NM-241-AD; Amendment 39-11486; AD 99-27-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6369. A letter from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Anchorage Area; St. Lucie River, Stuart, Florida [CGD07-99-058] (RIN: 2115-AA98) received January 13, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6370. A letter from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Temporary Drawbridge Regulations; Mississippi River, Iowa and Illinois [CGD 08-99-077] (RIN: 2125-AE47) received January 13, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6371. A letter from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operations Regulations; Willamette River, OR [CGD13-99-008] (RIN: 2115-AE47) received January 13, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6372. A letter from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Chelsea River, MA [CGD01-00-001] received January 13, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6373. A letter from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operations Regulations; Columbia River, OR [CGD13-99-011] (RIN: 2115-AE47) received January 13, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6374. A letter from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operating Regulation; Black River, Wisconsin [CGD08-99-064] (RIN: 2115-AE47) received January 13, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6375. A letter from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Passaic River, NJ [CGD01-99-206] received January 13, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6376. A letter from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone; New York Harbor and Hudson River Fireworks [CGD01-99-130] (RIN: 2115-AA97) received January 13, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6377. A letter from the Director of Central Intelligence and Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, transmitting CDA Request from the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1998/Section 308 re Intelligence Activities of the People's Republic of China; to the Committee on Intelligence (Permanent Select).

6378. A letter from the Secretaries of Defense and Veterans Affairs, Departments of Defense and Veterans Affairs, transmitting a report on the implementation of the health resources sharing portion of the "Department of Veterans Affairs and Department of Defense Health Resources Sharing and Emergency Operations Act," pursuant to 38 U.S.C.

8111(f); jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Veterans' Affairs.

6379. A letter from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and Secretary of Defense, transmitting the report for Fiscal Year 1998 regarding the implementation of the health resources sharing portion of the "Department of Veterans Affairs and Department of Defense Health Resources Sharing and Emergency Operations Act"; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Veterans' Affairs.

6380. A letter from the Director, Congressional Budget Office, transmitting the report on "Unauthorized Appropriations and Expiring Authorizations" by the Congressional Budget Office as of January 7, 2000, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 602(f)(3); jointly to the Committees on the Budget and Appropriations.

6381. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Certification that the Resources Pledged by the United States at the November 17, 1999 Kosovo Donors Conference Shall Not Exceed 15 Percent of the Total Resources Pledged by All Donors; jointly to the Committees on International Relations and Appropriations.

6382. A letter from the Executive Director, Office of Compliance, transmitting copy of the annual report for calendar year 1999; jointly to the Committees on House Administration and Education and the Workforce.

6383. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Economic Development, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule—Requirements for Economic Adjustment Grants—Revolving Loan Fund Projects under 13 CFR Part 308 and Property under Part 314 [Docket No. 991208327-9327-01] (RIN: 0610-ZA12) received January 13, 2000; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Banking and Financial Services.

6384. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a report identifying accounts containing unvouchered expenditures that are potentially subject to audit by the Comptroller General, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3524(b); jointly to the Committees on Appropriations, the Budget, and Government Reform.

#### 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. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 1749. A bill to designate Wilson Creek in Avery and Caldwell Counties, North Carolina, as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System; with an amendment (Rept. 106-500). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. S. 613. An act to encourage Indian economic development, to provide for the disclosure of Indian tribal sovereign immunity in contracts involving Indian tribes, and for other purposes (Rept. 106-501). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 2484. A bill 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 (Rept. 106-502). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GOODLING: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 3222. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to improve literacy through family literacy projects; with amendments (Rept. 106-503). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GOODLING: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 3616. A bill to reauthorize the impact aid program under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 106-504). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REYNOLDS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 425. Resolution providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules (Rept. 106-505). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 426. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1827) to improve the economy and efficiency of Government operations by requiring the use of recovery audits by Federal agencies (Rept. 106-506). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### REPORTED BILL SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 5 of rule X, bills and reports were delivered to the Clerk for printing, and bills referred as follows:

(Omitted from the Record of February 16, 2000)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 701. A bill to provide Outer Continental Shelf Impact Assistance to State and local governments, to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Act of 1978, and the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act (commonly referred to as the Pittman-Robertson Act) to establish a fund to meet the outdoor conservation and recreation needs of the American people, and for other purposes, with an amendment; referred to the Committee on Agriculture for a period ending not later than March 17, 2000 for consideration of such provisions of the bill and amendment as fall within the jurisdiction of that committee pursuant to clause 1(a), rule X; and referred to the Committee on the Budget for a period ending not later than March 31, 2000 for consideration of such provisions of the bill and amendment as fall within the jurisdiction of that committee pursuant to clause 1(e), rule X. (Rept. 106-499, Part 1). Ordered to be printed.

#### TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

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

H.R. 1070. Referral to the Committee on Ways and Means extended for a period ending not later than March 2, 2000.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. WOLF (for himself, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. GOODE, Mr. BUCHER, Mr. PICKETT, and Mr. GOODLATTE):

H.R. 3699. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at

8409 Lee Highway in Merrifield, Virginia, as the "Joel T. Broyhill Postal Building"; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. HOUGHTON (for himself, Mr. ROEBSTAR, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. FILNER, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 3700. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit to holders of qualified bonds issued by an intercity passenger rail carrier, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLF (for himself, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. GOODE, Mr. BUCHER, Mr. PICKETT, and Mr. GOODLATTE):

H.R. 3701. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3118 Washington Boulevard in Arlington, Virginia, as the "Joseph L. Fisher Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. ALLEN (for himself, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BALDACCI, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. CARSON, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. FROST, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. OLVER, Mr. OWENS, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. WEYGAND):

H.R. 3702. A bill to ensure excellent recruitment and training of math and science teachers at institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BAKER (for himself and Mr. LEACH):

H.R. 3703. A bill to consolidate and improve the regulation of the housing-related Government-sponsored enterprises, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. BECERRA:  
H.R. 3704. A bill to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States with respect to certain toys; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLAY (for himself, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. SCOTT, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. KIND, Mr. FORD, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mr. WU):

H.R. 3705. A bill to authorize Federal financial assistance for the urgent repair and renovation of public elementary and secondary schools in high-need areas; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BEREUTER:  
H.R. 3706. A bill to amend section 520 of the Housing Act of 1949 to revise the requirements for areas to be considered as rural areas for purposes of such Act; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

H.R. 3707. A bill to authorize funds for the site selection and construction of a facility in Taipei Taiwan suitable for the mission of the American Institute in Taiwan; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. STARK, and Mr. MATSUI):

H.R. 3708. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that a part-time worker who otherwise meets the eligibility requirements for unemployment compensation not be precluded from receiving such

compensation solely because such individual is seeking only part-time work; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COX (for himself, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mrs. BONO, and Mr. CAMP):

H.R. 3709. A bill to make permanent the moratorium enacted by the Internet Tax Freedom Act as it applies to new, multiple, and discriminatory taxes on the Internet; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. DEGETTE (for herself, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. KLINK, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. STARK, Mr. FROST, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. BENTSEN, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. LAFALCE, and Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD):

H.R. 3710. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to assure preservation of safety net hospitals through maintenance of the Medicaid disproportionate share hospital program; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:  
H.R. 3711. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a 1 year moratorium on certain diesel fuel excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOUGHTON (for himself and Mrs. MEEK of Florida):

H.R. 3712. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study concerning the preservation and public use of sites in Auburn, New York, associated with Harriet Tubman, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. JENKINS:  
H.R. 3713. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to release a reversionary interest of the United States in certain real property previously conveyed to the State of Tennessee; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 3714. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on DMT; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MANZULLO:  
H.R. 3715. A bill to revise the article description for monochrome glass envelopes under the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATSUI:  
H.R. 3716. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on a certain ultraviolet dye; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCCRERY:  
H.R. 3717. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Vinclozolin; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3718. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Tepraloxymid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3719. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Pyridaben; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3720. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 2-Acetylnicotinic acid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3721. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on SAME; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3722. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Procion Crimson H-EXL; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3723. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Dispersol Crimson SF Grains; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3724. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Procion Navy H-EXL; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3725. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Procion Yellow H-EXL; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3726. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on ortho-phenyl phenol ("OPP"); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3727. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 2-Methoxypropene; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3728. A bill to reduce temporarily the duty on 3,5-Difluoroaniline; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3729. A bill to reduce temporarily the duty on Quinlorac; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3730. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Dispersol Black XF Grains; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCINTOSH:

H.R. 3731. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on fluroxypyr 1-methylheptyl ester (FME); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MINK of Hawaii:

H.R. 3732. A bill to provide for direct payment by foreign students of the information fee under section 641 of the Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1997; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H.R. 3733. A bill to reduce temporarily the duty on ethylene/tetrafluoroethylene copolymer (ETFE); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MYRICK:

H.R. 3734. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on monolite green 860; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3735. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on monolite green 952; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3736. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on solspere 17260; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3737. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on solspere 17000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3738. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on solspere 5000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3739. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on monolite blue 3R; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3740. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain TAED chemicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3741. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on a certain polymer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3742. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on isobornyl acetate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3743. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on sodium petroleum sulfonate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself and Mrs. MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 3744. A bill to require conveyance of Governors Island, New York, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Resources, 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. NUSSLE:

H.R. 3745. A bill to authorize the addition of certain parcels to the Effigy Mounds National Monument, Iowa; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. RAMSTAD:

H.R. 3746. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on 4-hexylresorcinol; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3747. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on certain sensitizing dyes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3748. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on certain organic pigments and dyes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3749. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to temporarily reduce the rates of tax on highway gasoline, diesel fuel, and kerosene by 10 cents per gallon; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAXTON:

H.R. 3750. A bill to reform the International Monetary Fund; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. SIMPSON:

H.R. 3751. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on certain semi-manufactured forms of gold; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPENCE (for himself and Mr. CLYBURN):

H.R. 3752. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 4-Nitro-o-xylene; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SWEENEY:

H.R. 3753. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain copper foils; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3754. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain activated carbon; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3755. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain buff brushes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD:

H.R. 3756. A bill to establish a standard time zone for Guam and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. WEYGAND:

H.R. 3757. A bill to temporarily suspend the duty on Solvent Blue 124; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3758. A bill to temporarily suspend the duty on Solvent Blue 104; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3759. A bill to temporarily suspend the duty on Pigment Red 176; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3760. A bill to temporarily suspend the duty on benzenesulfonamide, 4-amino-2, 5-dimethoxy-N-phenyl; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3761. A bill to temporarily suspend the duty on certain Reactive Red 180 solutions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITFIELD:

H.R. 3762. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on undecylenic acid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3763. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on n-Heptaldehyde; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 3764. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on n-Heptanoic acid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WISE:

H.R. 3765. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prevent group and individual health insurance coverage and group health plans from seeking to recover more than costs in cases of third party recoveries; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WYNN (for himself, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. DIXON, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SABO, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. FROST, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. FILNER, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HILL of Indiana, Mr. FORD, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr.

THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. DICKS, Mr. KLINK, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. SHOWS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. KIND, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. OWENS, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HILLIARD, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. EVANS, Mr. HOYER, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. CARSON, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. STUPAK):

H.R. 3766. A bill to ensure that the business of the Federal Government is conducted in the public interest and in a manner that provides for public accountability, efficient delivery of services, reasonable cost savings, and prevention of unwarranted Government expenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts:

H.J. Res. 88. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to make eligible for the Office of President a person who has been a United States citizen for twenty years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EWING (for himself, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. LEACH, Mr. WELLER, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. EVANS, Mr. TERRY, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H. Con. Res. 256. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with regard to the use of reformulated gasoline fuels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. PORTER (for himself, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HOYER, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. FORBES, Mr. WOLF, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. ROGAN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. HORN, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. MOORE, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. HINCHEY, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. VISLOSKEY, Mr. BATEMAN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. COYNE, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. FALCOMAVAEGA):

H. Con. Res. 257. Concurrent resolution concerning the emancipation of the Iranian Baha'i community; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. SHIMKUS (for himself and Mr. KUCINICH):

H. Con. Res. 258. Concurrent resolution congratulating the Republic of Lithuania on the tenth anniversary of the reestablishment of its independence from the rule of the former Soviet Union; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H. Res. 424. A resolution providing for the consideration of the bill H.R. 1753 and the Senate amendments thereto; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

H. Res. 425. A resolution providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SESSIONS:

H. Res. 426. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1827) to improve the economy and efficiency of Government

operations by requiring the use of recovery audits by Federal agencies; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BLAGOJEVICH (for himself and Mr. LAHOOD):

H. Res. 427. A resolution waiving clause 2(b) of rule XXII to permit introduction and consideration of a certain bill; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CROWLEY (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. WYNN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. WEINER, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. DINGELL, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. MEEHAN, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. FORBES, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ROTHMAN, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. BALDACCIO, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. NADLER, Mr. LARSON, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. HOLT):

H. Res. 428. A resolution condemning the discriminatory practices prevalent at Bob Jones University; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### MEMORIALS

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

296. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Maine, relative to Senate Paper Number 926 memorializing the Congress of the United States to appropriate funds to adequately maintain and preserve the grounds and monuments of Gettysburg National Military Park; to the Committee on Resources.

297. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Maine, relative to Joint Resolution H.P. 1794 memorializing the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Commerce and the Congress of the United States to reconsider the intent to include the Atlantic salmon on the Endangered Species List as it would benefit neither the Atlantic salmon nor the people of Maine and allow Maine to continue to execute its own comprehensive plan to restore the Atlantic salmon to its waters; to the Committee on Resources.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 5: Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. WALSH, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. STARK, Mr. COYNE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. BECERRA, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. WOLF, Mr. HILL of Montana, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. ROGAN, Mr. SALMON, Mr. HAYES, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. COOK, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. WAMP, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. RUSH, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. COBLE, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. STRICKLAND.

H.R. 7: Mr. BAKER, Mr. BALLENGER, and Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.

H.R. 40: Ms. RIVERS.

H.R. 59: Mr. GREEN of Texas and Mrs. ROUKEMA.

H.R. 61: Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 65: Mr. MOAKLEY and Mr. TALENT.

H.R. 73: Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 107: Mrs. FOWLER.

H.R. 218: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. BONILLA.

H.R. 303: Mr. MOAKLEY and Mr. INSOLEE.

H.R. 318: Mr. WELDON of Florida.

H.R. 329: Ms. BERKLEY and Mr. GEJDENSON.

H.R. 347: Mr. JENKINS.

H.R. 407: Mr. MASCARA.

H.R. 534: Mr. JENKINS, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. BAIRD, and Mr. HOYER.

H.R. 612: Mr. KILDEE and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 614: Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 664: Mr. MINGE and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 701: Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. RUSH, Mr. COSTELLO, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 721: Mr. BOSWELL and Mr. DICKS.  
H.R. 740: Ms. PELOSI and Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.

H.R. 742: Mr. PAUL and Mr. BARCIA.

H.R. 780: Mrs. JONES of Ohio and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 783: Mr. HUNTER and Mr. STENHOLM.

H.R. 809: Mr. GILMAN.

H.R. 827: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 829: Mr. UDALL of Colorado.

H.R. 860: Mr. BARCIA, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. HILL of Indiana.

H.R. 864: Ms. BERKLEY and Mr. TRAFICANT.  
H.R. 865: Mr. HORN and Mr. KOLBE.

H.R. 872: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 984: Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 1021: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1032: Mr. SOUDER.

H.R. 1044: Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. WOLF, Mr. GILCHREST, and Ms. STABENOW.

H.R. 1053: Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 1055: Mr. NEY.

H.R. 1057: Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 1070: Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 1082: Mr. MINGE.

H.R. 1095: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 1102: Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 1115: Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 1139: Ms. MCKINNEY and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 1163: Mr. BALDACCI.

H.R. 1179: Mr. MASCARA.

H.R. 1188: Mr. EVANS and Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 1194: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. WALDEN of Oregon.

H.R. 1217: Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. PAUL, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 1227: Mr. COSTELLO, Ms. CARSON, and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 1248: Mr. PORTER and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 1271: Ms. STABENOW, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.

H.R. 1273: Mr. CAMPBELL.

H.R. 1285: Mr. BENTSEN.

H.R. 1304: Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. ADERHOLT, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 1313: Mr. FARR of California.

H.R. 1325: Mr. STUMP, Mr. CRANE, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 1363: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 1367: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. LEACH, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, and Mr. NUSSLE.

H.R. 1371: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 1443: Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. GEJDENSON, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 1466: Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 1494: Mr. WAMP and Mr. OXLEY.

H.R. 1495: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. MINGE.

H.R. 1515: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 1592: Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. BASS, and Mr. LATOURETTE.

H.R. 1594: Mr. FARR of California and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 1617: Mr. MORAN of Kansas.

H.R. 1634: Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut.

H.R. 1684: Mr. OLVER and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 1732: Mrs. BIGGERT.

H.R. 1816: Ms. RIVERS, Mr. HOLT, Mr. COYNE, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 1824: Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Ms. KILPATRICK.

H.R. 1839: Mr. METCALF, Mr. EVANS, and Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 1876: Mr. ENGLISH, Mrs. EMERSON, and Mr. BRYANT.

H.R. 1899: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and Mr. RODRIGUEZ.

H.R. 1976: Mr. GOSS.

H.R. 1984: Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 2025: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. STARK.

H.R. 2059: Mr. HORN.

H.R. 2107: Mr. SERRANO and Ms. KILPATRICK.

H.R. 2121: Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mrs. BONO, and Mr. FORD.

H.R. 2166: Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Ms. LEE.

H.R. 2175: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. MATSUI, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, and Mr. GEJDENSON.

H.R. 2221: Mr. STEARNS.

H.R. 2228: Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 2289: Mr. GALLEGLY.

H.R. 2298: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 2308: Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. OSE.

H.R. 2340: Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. CRAMER, and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 2342: Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2356: Mr. COOK.

H.R. 2380: Mr. BONIOR.

H.R. 2402: Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky.

H.R. 2446: Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 2457: Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 2459: Mr. FOLEY, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. RILEY.

H.R. 2498: Mr. KIND, Mr. GILCHREST, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 2543: Ms. DANNER and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H.R. 2548: Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. MOLLOHAN, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H.R. 2552: Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. WYNN, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. OWENS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. SANDLIN, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 2562: Mr. COBURN, Mr. WYNN, Mr. GEJDENSON, and Mr. BALDACCIO.

H.R. 2564: Mr. STUPAK.

H.R. 2579: Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. BALDACCIO, and Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 2651: Mr. PICKERING.

H.R. 2655: Mr. RYAN of Kansas.

H.R. 2691: Mr. WEINER.

H.R. 2720: Mr. NEY.

H.R. 2738: Mrs. CAPPS and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 2765: Mr. FILNER, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. COYNE, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, and Mr. CONDIT.

H.R. 2780: Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. OWENS, Ms. MCKINNEY, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. GILMAN.

H.R. 2807: Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H.R. 2814: Mr. BILBRAY.

H.R. 2864: Ms. RIVERS.

H.R. 2865: Mrs. CLAYTON.

H.R. 2899: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 2915: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2965: Mr. BERMAN.

- H.R. 2966: Mr. COBLE, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. WALSH.  
 H.R. 2992: Mr. PAUL.  
 H.R. 3059: Mr. DELAHUNT, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. BAKER, Mr. REYES, and Mr. PICKETT.  
 H.R. 3042: Mr. WOLF.  
 H.R. 3059: Mr. CUNNINGHAM and Mr. HOLT.  
 H.R. 3115: Mr. TERRY.  
 H.R. 3135: Ms. MCKINNEY.  
 H.R. 3160: Mr. CANNON, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. TERRY, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. STUMP, Mr. THORNBERRY, and Mr. DUNCAN.  
 H.R. 3174: Mr. DUNCAN.  
 H.R. 3193: Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. OWENS, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. MCKINNEY, Mr. GOODE, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. GOSS, and Mr. STENHOLM.  
 H.R. 3195: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. REYES, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. COYNE, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. MURTHA.  
 H.R. 3222: Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska and Mr. CLEMENT.  
 H.R. 3235: Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. PELOSI, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. SHAW, Mr. MATSUI, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. SABO, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.  
 H.R. 3244: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. LOFGREN, and Ms. WOOLSEY.  
 H.R. 3249: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. CONYERS.  
 H.R. 3250: Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. OWENS, Mr. FROST, Mr. STARK, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Ms. NORTON.  
 H.R. 3256: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.  
 H.R. 3300: Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. STEARNS, and Mr. HILLEARY.  
 H.R. 3301: Mr. TIERNEY and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.  
 H.R. 3320: Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mrs. CLAYTON, and Mr. LANTOS.  
 H.R. 3439: Mr. EWING, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. FORD, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. CAMPBELL, and Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 3444: Mr. STUMP, Mr. NEY, and Mr. COOK.  
 H.R. 3514: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. HORN, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. OLVER, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Ms. MCKINNEY.  
 H.R. 3519: Mr. FILNER, Ms. WATERS, Mr. FROST, Mr. LAFALCE, and Mr. CUMMINGS.  
 H.R. 3535: Mr. FARR of California, Mr. COOK, and Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey.  
 H.R. 3536: Mr. CASTLE.  
 H.R. 3539: Mr. NORWOOD.  
 H.R. 3552: Mr. HUNTER.  
 H.R. 3571: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. STUPAK, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Mr. LIPINSKI.  
 H.R. 3573: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HOFFEL, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MCHUGH, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. OLVER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PAUL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, and Mr. WALSH.  
 H.R. 3575: Mr. FORD, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. ETHERIDGE.  
 H.R. 3580: Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SWEENEY, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. OLVER, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. HOFFEL, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. WELLER, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. KING, Mr. McNULTY, and Mr. MANZULLO.  
 H.R. 3581: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. BERMAN.  
 H.R. 3584: Mr. WALSH, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. KASICH, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. WAMP, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. HYDE, Mrs. FOWLER, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. DREIER, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. METCALF, Mr. COX, Mr. CANNON, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. RILEY, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, and Mr. GORDON.  
 H.R. 3600: Mr. FROST, Mr. GEJDENSON, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. BERMAN.  
 H.R. 3608: Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. KLINK, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. SHERWOOD, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. PASCARELL, Mr. HOLT, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. STRICKLAND, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, and Mr. EVANS.  
 H.R. 3609: Mr. SHOWS.  
 H.R. 3616: Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. OSE, Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. METCALF, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. HOFFEL, Mr. THUNE, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. HALL of Ohio.  
 H.R. 3628: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. PORTER, and Mrs. MORELLA.  
 H.R. 3634: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. FILNER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. WAXMAN.  
 H.R. 3639: Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. CLAY, Mr. HULSHOF, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. WOLF, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Ms. KILPATRICK.  
 H.R. 3650: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.  
 H.R. 3665: Mr. OLVER.  
 H.R. 3688: Mr. SHAYS, Mr. LUTHER, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, and Ms. ESHOO.  
 H.R. 3690: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York and Mr. FROST.  
 H.R. 3695: Mr. DEMINT, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. METCALF, and Mr. MCINTOSH.  
 H.J. Res. 55: Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma.  
 H.J. Res. 56: Mr. QUINN.  
 H.J. Res. 86: Mr. KANJORSKI, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. COX, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. QUINN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, and Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.  
 H. Con. Res. 38: Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Ms. PELOSI.  
 H. Con. Res. 60: Mr. BILIRAKIS.  
 H. Con. Res. 74: Mr. HOLT.  
 H. Con. Res. 77: Mr. MCCRERY.  
 H. Con. Res. 115: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. OWENS, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. QUINN, Mrs. FOWLER, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. NADLER, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. BOEHLERT.  
 H. Con. Res. 233: Mr. COOK, and Mr. LOBIONDO.  
 H. Con. Res. 240: Mr. TOWNS.  
 H. Con. Res. 250: Mr. FROST, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. FILNER.  
 H. Con. Res. 253: Mr. TIAHRT.  
 H. Res. 346: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. GOODLING, and Mr. FILNER.  
 H. Res. 396: Mr. ROEMER.  
 H. Res. 397: Mr. STABENOW, Mr. OWENS, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. WELDON of Florida, and Mr. PICKETT.  
 H. Res. 420: Mr. BOEHLERT.

#### DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

- H. Res. 396: Mr. BLUMENAUER.