United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 146 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, MARCH 6, 2000 No. 23

House of Representatives

The House met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PETRI).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 6, 2000.

I hereby appoint the Honorable THOMAS E. PETRI to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

PRAYER

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

As we breathe into our hearts and souls every new breath of life, we pray, Almighty God, that the actions of our daily lives would reflect the beauty and glory of Your majesty. As we see the brightness of Your creation, O God, may we, in our own way, reflect the fruits of Your spirit, love, joy, peace, patience, kindness, goodness, faithfulness, gentleness, and self-control. May these virtues encourage us to be the people You would have us be this day and evermore. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. NETHERCUTT led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

S. 1794. An act to designate the Federal courthouse at 145 East Simpson Avenue in Jackson, Wyoming, as the ''Clifford P. Hansen Federal Courthouse.''

S. Con. Res. 89. Concurrent resolution to establish the Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies for the inauguration of the President-elect and Vice President-elect of the United States on January 20, 2001.

S. Con. Res. 90. Concurrent resolution to authorize the use of the rotunda of the Capitol by the Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies in connection with the proceedings and ceremonies conducted for the inauguration of the President-elect and the Vice President-elect of the United States.

S. Con. Res. 91. 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.

The message also announced that the Senate agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 376), ''An Act to amend the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 to promote competition and privatization in satellite communications, and for other purposes.''

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair desires to announce pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the Speaker signed the following enrolled bills on Thursday, March 2, 2000:

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

H.R. 3557, to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to John Cardinal O'Connor, Archbishop of New York, in recognition of his accomplishments as a priest, a chaplain, and a humanitarian.

APPOINTMENT OF INDIVIDUALS TO THE ADVISORY BOARD FOR THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CHILDCARE CENTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to section 312(b)(1)(A) of Public Law 102–90 (40 U.S.C. 184(g)(b)), the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following individuals to the Advisory Board for the House of Representatives Childcare Center:

Mr. Ron Haskins, Rockville, Maryland;

Ms. Linda Bachus, Birmingham, Alabama;

Mr. Lee Harrington, Alexandria, Virginia;

Ms. Patricia Law, Chevy Chase, Maryland;

Ms. Barbara Morris Lent, Arlington, Virginia;

Ms. Leisha Pickering, Washington, D.C.;

Ms. Nancy Piper, Alexandria, Virginia;

Mr. Christopher Smith, Bethesda, Maryland.

And upon the recommendation of the Minority Leader:

Ms. Paula Swift, Alexandria, Virginia;

Ms. Sara Davis, Falls Church, Virginia;

Ms. Debbie Dingell, Arlington, Virginia;

Printed on recycled paper.

Mr. Donnald Anderson, Washington, D.C.;

Ms. Tamra Bentsen, Washington, D.C.;

Mr. Jeff Mendelsohn, Washington, D.C.;

Ms. Sylvia Sabo, Vienna, Virginia.

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 2, 2000.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on March 2, 2000 at 11:37 a.m. and said to contain a message from the President whereby he transmits a 6-month periodic report on the national emergency with regard to Iraq.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

JEFF TRANDAHL,
Clerk of the House.

PERIODIC REPORT ON THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO IRAQ—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 106–204)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c) and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA), 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), I transmit herewith a 6-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Iraq that was declared in Executive Order 12722 of August 2, 1990.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 1, 2000.*

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 2, 2000.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on March 2, 2000 at 11:37 a.m. and said to contain a message from the President whereby he transmits the 2000 Trade Policy Agenda and the 1999 Annual Report on the Trade Agreements Program.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

JEFF TRANDAHL,
Clerk of the House.

2000 TRADE POLICY AGENDA AND 1999 ANNUAL REPORT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 106–205)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 163 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended (19 U.S.C. 2213), I transmit herewith the 2000 Trade Policy Agenda and 1999 Annual Report on the Trade Agreements Program. The Report, as required by sections 122, 124, and 125 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act, includes the Annual Report on the World Trade Organization and a 5-year assessment of the U.S. participation in the World Trade Organization.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 1, 2000.*

SPECIAL ORDERS

THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES INJECTS HIMSELF INTO THE DIALLO VERDICT

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

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, I noticed in yesterday's newspaper reports that President Clinton has now seen fit to inject himself into the case surrounding the Diallo verdict in New York. He has done so in a fashion which perpetuates his reputation for political opportunism.

The obligation of any President is to uphold the rule of law in this country, which obligation includes respect for and affirmation of our broader justice system. The President also has an obligation to unify the disparate peoples and views in our country by calling on ''our better angels,'' as Abraham Lincoln once said, seeking to heal the wounds that are too often inflicted by citizens and groups against each other in the history of our country.

Mr. Speaker, the President has an obligation to respect our jury system, as sometimes imperfect in hindsight it might be, for, to do otherwise, enhances cynicism and diminishes the natural conflict in criminal cases between the strength of a prosecutor's claim and the ability of a defense team to defend prosecutions that lack evidence and proof.

Finally, a President's personal stake in the outcome of a broader political contest should not be used as a weapon to gain political advantage in order to benefit a political ally and indict the law enforcement team of a political opponent in the process.

Yet, that is exactly what we see being done in creating a racial divide by second guessing a jury decision that was litigated as provided in our justice system in this country. By such statements, the entire police force of New York has been unfairly besmirched, when, in fact, the jury foreman happened to be of African American descent and publicly stated that racial prejudice had no bearing on the jury verdict, but instead, the prosecution was weak.

Missing an opportunity for judicious comment or healing words or affirmation of the rule of law and the verdicts of juries and the opportunity for all Americans to recognize that all defendants are presumed innocent was something that happened in this case. Their criminal guilt must be proved by the high standard of guilt beyond a reasonable doubt, not just tipping the scales, but putting the scales all the way down.

Mr. Speaker, I was not at the trial and listened to the evidence; obviously, our President was not either. I fear that carelessness in this case may prove to be reckless, that those who would divide New York on improper grounds have already seized upon the President's words.

It is clear that the President has attempted to exert his personal undue influence on the political fortunes of his wife in New York in her Senate campaign and give justification for the Justice Department to exert itself in a case that was, by all accounts, fairly litigated, even though a very difficult outcome, knowing what we know now about the facts of the case. However, the jury in this case was the one charged with making this decision.

Had the President used the opportunity to speak against racial division in favor of responsible and unbiased police work, in favor of respect for all human beings in our country, regardless of religion or race or ethnic background, in favor of enhanced police training regarding racial sensitivity and restraint in cases of law enforcement apprehension so that all criminal suspects are accorded their constitutional rights, then this would be a day of admiration and respect for this particular Presidential proclamation.

Mr. Speaker, the risk posed by Mr. Clinton's declarations are not worth any political contest in any State, for any candidate, and certainly not for the racial and social harmony which is the common goal of our country. It is something we ought to strive to reach, not seek to divide.

SENATE BILL AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A bill and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1794. An act to designate the Federal courthouse at 145 East Simpson Avenue in Jackson, Wyoming, as the ''Clifford P. Hansen Federal Courthouse''; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

S. Con. Res. 91. 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.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

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.

H.R. 3557. An act to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to John Cardinal O'Connor, Archbishop of New York, in recognition of his accomplishments as a priest, a chaplain, and a humanitarian.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following date present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

On Thursday, March 2, 2000.

H.R. 3557. To authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to John Cardinal O'Connor, Archbishop of New York, in recognition of his accomplishments as a priest, a chaplain, and a humanitarian.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Wednesday, March 8, 2000, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6439. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Imidacloprid; Time-Limited Pesticide Tolerance [OPP–300980; FRL–6493–2] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received March 1, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6440. A letter from the Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Fenpropathrin; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP–300981; FRL–6492–6] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received March 1, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6441. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Imidacloprid; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [OPP–300969; FRL–6490–5] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6442. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Emamectin Benzoate; Pesticide Tolerance Technical Correction [OPP–300958A; FRL–6489–4] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6443. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting request and availability of appropriations for the Department of Health and Human Services' Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program; (H. Doc. No. 106–206); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

6444. A letter from the Alternate OSD Federal Register Liason Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Screening the Ready Reserve [DoD Directive 1200.7] (RIN: 0790–AF57) received January 3, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6445. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report on assistance provided by the Department of Defense to civilian sporting events in support of essential security and safety at such events; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6446. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Labor-Management Standards, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule—Labor Organization Annual Financial Reports (RIN: 1215–AB29) received January 3, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6447. A letter from the Attorney, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Anthropomorphic Test Dummy; Occupant Crash Protection [Docket No. NHTSA–99–6714] (RIN: 2127–AG76) received January 6, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

6448. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Delegation of National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Source Categories; State of Arizona; Arizona Department of Environmental Quality; Maricopa County Environmental Services Department [FRL–6545–2] received March 1, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

6449. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Reasonably Available Control Technology for Major Stationary Sources of Nitrogen Oxides for the Houston/Galveston and Beaumont/Port Arthur Ozone Nonattainment Areas [TX–102–1–7440; FRL–6543–1] received March 1, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

6450. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans Commonwealth of Kentucky State Implementation Plan [KY–105–9946a; FRL–6545–5] received March 1, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

6451. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri [MO 092–1092; FRL–6528–7] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

6452. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California State Implementation Plan Revision; South Coast Air Quality Management District [CA–266–0172a; FRL–6534–2] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

6453. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Rhode Island: Determination of Adequacy for the State's Municipal Solid Waste Permit Program [FRL–6535–8] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

6454. 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; Approval under Section 112(l) of the Clean Air Act; West Virginia; Permits for Construction, Modification, Relocation and Operation of Stationary Sources of Air Pollutants [SIPTRAX No. WV026–6012; FRL–6505–1] received January 7, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

6455. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Preliminary Assessment Information and Health and Safety Data Reporting; Addition and Removal of Certain Chemicals and Removal of Stay [OPPTS–82050; FRL–5777–2] (RIN: 2070–AB08 and 2070–AB11) received January 7, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

6456. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Standards of Performance for New Stationary Sources; Supplemental Delegation of Authority to the State of Wyoming [WY–001–0005; FRL–6521–1] received January 7, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

6457. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Commonwealth of Virginia; Oxygenated Gasoline Program [VA103–5047a; FRL–6534–7] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

6458. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Commonwealth of Virginia;

Oxygenated Gasoline Program [VA103–5047a; FRL–6534–7] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

6459. A letter from the Lieutenant General, USA Director, Department of Defense, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Navy's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to Germany for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 00–30), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

6460. A letter from the Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—National Reconnaissance Office Freedom of Information Act Program Regulation—received January 3, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6461. A letter from the Air Force Freedom of Information Act Manager, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Freedom of Information Act Program (RIN: 0701–AA–61) received January 3, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6462. A letter from the Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—National Security Agency/Central Security Service (NSA/CSS) Freedom of Information Act Program (RIN: 0790–AG59) received January 3, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6463. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Atlantic Highly Migratory Species (HMS) Fisheries; Large Coastal Shark Species [I.D. 111899C] received January 7, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6464. A letter from the Boy Scouts of America, transmitting the Boy Scouts of America 1999 report to the Nation, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 28; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6465. 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 6, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6466. 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 [CGD01–99–2061] received January 6, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6467. A letter from the Attorney, Research and Special Programs Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Hazardous Materials Transportation; Regulation and Fee Assessment Program [Docket No. RSPA–99–5137 (HM–208C)] (RIN: 2137–AD17) received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6468. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Establishment of 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.

6469. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 29920; Amdt. No. 1974] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6470. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 29919; Amdt. No. 1973] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6471. A letter from the Attorney, Research and Special Programs Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Hazardous Materials: Hazardous Substances—Revisions [Docket No. RSPA–2000–6744(HM–145)] (RIN: 2137–AD39) received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6472. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revisions to Digital Flight Data Recorder Requirements for Airbus Airplanes; Correction [Docket No. FAA–1999–6140; Amendment Nos. 121–271 and 125–32] (RIN: 2120–AG88) received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6473. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Flight Plan Requirements for Helicopter Operations Under Instrument Flight Rules [Docket No. FAA–98–4390; Amendment No. 21–76, 27–39, 29–46, 91–259] (RIN: 2120–AG53) received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6474. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Licensing and Training of Pilots, Flight Instructors and Ground Instructors Outside the United States [Docket No. FAA–1998–4518–1; Amendment Nos. 61–105, 67–18, 141–11, & 141–3] (RIN: 2120–AG66) received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6475. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportion, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 29919; Amdt. No. 1973] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6476. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report that action has been taken by the United States in response to an official requests from the Government of the Republic of Cyprus and the Government of the Kingdom of Cambodia, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2602(g)(1); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6477. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Letter rulings, determination letters, and information letters issued by the Associate Chief Counsel (Domestic), Associate Chief Counsel (Employee Benefits and Exempt Organizations), Associate Chief Counsel (Enforcement Litigation), and Associate Chief Counsel (International) [Rev. Procedure 2000–1] received January 5, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6478. A letter from the Executive Director, Office of Compliance, transmitting supplementary notice of proposed rulemaking for publication in the Congressional Record, pursuant to Public Law 104–1, section 303(b) (109 Stat. 28); jointly to the Committees on House Administration and Education and the Workforce.

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. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on Science. H.R. 1743. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2000 and 2001 for the environmental and scientific and energy research, development, and demonstration and commercial application of energy technology programs, projects, and activities of the Office of Air and Radiation of the Environmental Protection Agency, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 106–511). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

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:

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on Science. H.R. 1742. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2000 and 2001 for the environmental and scientific research, development, and demonstration programs, projects, and activities of the Office of Research and Development and Science Advisory Board of the Environmental Protection Agency, and for other purposes, with an amendment; referred to the Committee on Commerce for a period ending not later than April 7, 2000, for consideration of such provisions of the bill and amendment as fall within the jurisdiction of that committee pursuant to clause 1(f), rule X. (Rept. 106–512, Pt 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:

[Omitted from the Record of March 2, 2000]

H.R. 1070. Referral to the Committee on Ways and Means extended for a period ending not later than May 26, 2000.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ARCHER:

H.R. 3832. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax benefits for small businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHIMKUS:

H.R. 3833. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to increase the minimum wage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 3834. A bill to amend the rural housing loan guarantee program under section 502(h) of the Housing Act of 1949 to provide loan guarantees for loans made to refinance existing mortgage loans guaranteed under

such section; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. ANDREWS (for himself, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 3835. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to divide New Jersey into 2 judicial districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOLEY (for himself and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts):

H.R. 3836. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit for modifications to inter-city buses required under the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCNULTY:

H.R. 3837. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on ortho-cumyl-octylphenol (OCOP); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 3838. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain polyamides; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETRI:

H.R. 3839. A bill to establish a commission to study and make recommendations on marginal tax rates for the working poor; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. METCALF, and Mr. HUNTER):

H.J. Res. 90. A joint resolution withdrawing the approval of the United States from the Agreement establishing the World Trade Organization; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAXTON (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. PICKETT, and Mr. DELAHUNT):

H. Con. Res. 264. Concurrent resolution applauding the individuals who were instrumental to the program of partnerships for oceanographic and scientific research between the Federal Government and academic institutions during the period beginning before World War II and continuing through the end of the Cold War, supporting efforts by the Office of Naval Research to honor those individuals, and expressing appreciation for the ongoing efforts of the Office of Naval Research; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. KING, Mr. OLVER, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. HOYER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. PORTER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. WOLF, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. FROST):

H. Con. Res. 265. Concurrent resolution condemning the continued detention of Kosovar Albanians removed to Serbia at the end of the 1999 Kosova conflict and calling for their release; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. MCINTOSH (for himself, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. KUCINICH, and Mrs. ROUKEMA):

H. Con. Res. 266. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding the benefits of music education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

MEMORIALS

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

298. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois, relative to House Resolution No. 440 memorializing the United States Congress to enact legislation requiring all governmental posts to fly the flag of the United States at half staff to honor all those individuals who died as the result of their service at Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941 and urging all Americans to do likewise; to the Committee on Government Reform.

299. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Puerto Rico, relative to House Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to pass legislation to require that tickets issued to a child for travel by any means of transportation, shall bear his/her full name, and that he/she be duly identified before boarding; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 59: Mr. STUMP.

H.R. 912: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 1021: Mrs. JONES of Ohio.

H.R. 1071: Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 1139: Mr. STUPAK.

H.R. 1399: Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 1413: Mr. MCINNIS.

H.R. 1443: Mr. HOBSON.

H.R. 1459: Mr. NORWOOD.

H.R. 1705: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1885: Mr. KING, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. MINGE.

H.R. 2096: Mr. MCNULTY.

H.R. 2288: Mr. OWENS, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H.R. 2289: Mrs. THURMAN.

H.R. 2776: Mr. BONIOR, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Ms. CARSON.

H.R. 2816: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 2914: Mr. KUYKENDALL.

H.R. 3007: Mr. KUYKENDALL.

H.R. 3087: Ms. CARSON.

H.R. 3144: Mr. WATT of North Carolina.

H.R. 3180: Mr. KUYKENDALL.

H.R. 3185: Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 3193: Mr. POMEROY, Mr. WHITFIELD, and Mr. ISAKSON.

H.R. 3235: Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 3256: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia and Ms. STABENOW.

H.R. 3294: Mr. FROST, Mr. NEY, and Mr. STENHOLM.

H.R. 3388: Mr. MATSUI.

H.R. 3439: Mr. BUYER, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. EVANS, Mr. DICKS, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. FROST, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. GANSKE, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mr. ISTOOK.

H.R. 3485: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 3519: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 3525: Mr. CAMP and Mr. BARTON of Texas.

H.R. 3536: Mr. ENGLISH.

H.R. 3544: Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 3573: Mr. BISHOP, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. LAFALCE, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. SHAW, and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.

H.R. 3575: Mrs. MYRICK and Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 3582: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 3639: Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, and Ms. CARSON.

H.R. 3677: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. COBURN, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. TANCREDO.

H.R. 3826: Mr. LANTOS and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H. Con. Res. 133: Mr. LANTOS, Mr. CALVERT, Ms. LEE, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H. Con. Res. 220: Ms. MCKINNEY.

H. Con. Res. 240: Mr. PICKETT.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 146 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, MARCH 6, 2000 No. 23

Senate

The Senate met at 12:02 p.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, sovereign of our beloved Nation and gracious Lord of our lives, in the ongoing schedule of Senate business, we tend to lose one of the most precious gifts You offer us: a sense of expectancy. As we begin this new week, help us to expect great things from You and to attempt great things for You. We will perform the same old duties differently because You will have made us different people filled with Your love, joy, peace, and patience. We commit to You the challenges and opportunities of the week ahead, expecting Your surprises—serendipities of Your interventions—to work things out. Give us freedom to cooperate with You. Give us a positive attitude towards life because we know You will maximize our efforts, assist us when dealing with difficult people, and help us to care for those in need. Bring on life, Lord; filled with Your spirit, we are expecting wonderful things to happen. In Your all-powerful name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable JEFF SESSIONS, a Senator from the State of Alabama, led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The able majority leader is recognized.

Mr. LOTT. I thank the President pro tempore.

THANKING THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE AND THE CHAPLAIN

Mr. LOTT. We thank you for the job you do as the President pro tempore and the fact that you keep us on time. ''In time and on time,'' that is the motto for STROM THURMOND. We thank the Chaplain for his beautiful prayer as always.

SCHEDULE

Mr. LOTT. Today, the Senate will be conducting a period of morning business in order to allow Senators to make statements and introduce legislation.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

I now ask unanimous consent that the period of morning business be extended until 5 p.m. with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SESSIONS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LOTT. As announced last week, there will be no rollcall votes in today's session. In addition, as a reminder to all Members, rollcall votes may begin as early as 5 p.m. on Tuesday. Those votes may be in relation to any pending judicial nominations on the Executive Calendar. For the remainder of the week, the Senate may consider further nominations on the calendar as well as the FAA reauthorization conference report and the export administration bill.

This is the final week of Senate business prior to next week's recess, of course, and I would encourage my colleagues to remain available throughout this week for votes. They will occur each day and very likely could go into the evening, particularly on Wednesday and Thursday. Of course, we have a number of Senators who are back in their respective States today and tomorrow because we have some 13 or 15 States that are having caucuses or primaries on Tuesday, and a number of our colleagues will be prepared to vote early in their respective States tomorrow and then be here by 5 o'clock for the recorded vote.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR ROBERT C. BYRD

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, today we observe and celebrate a milestone in the life of one of our most respected colleagues. On Saturday, March 4, Senator ROBERT C. BYRD became the third longest-serving Senator in the history of this august body—surpassing the service of the venerable and beloved John Stennis of my State, who served 41 years and 2 months.

This November, Senator BYRD will surpass the service of Senator Carl Hayden which will mean that we will be novices working alongside two of the longest-serving Senators in history. Both of them are here with us now—STROM THURMOND and ROBERT BYRD. Just think about that. They will be the top two in history in tenure, and we will be serving with both of them.

It is more than about tenure, however, when you talk about STROM THURMOND or ROBERT C. BYRD. In the case of Senator BYRD, in his 41-plus years, colleagues have placed their trust in him to hold the highest offices in this institution. He was among those who were elected to the leadership positions but also at the committee level. He has been both the majority leader and the minority leader; he has been President pro tempore; and he has chaired our Committee on Appropriations. Today he is the ranking Democrat on that very important committee.

What he has brought to those positions has been more than hard work and high skills. He has brought a passion for procedures, an insistence upon order. On occasion, he has reminded me

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

what the rules are or what order requires. It is always intended to be helpful because he believes that the institution itself is more important than any one Senator.

On occasion, he has regaled the Senate with a discourse on antiquity and, more specifically, the history of Greece and Rome and, of course, the Roman Senate. Yet when Senator BYRD speaks, Senators actually come out of the Cloakroom and our offices and listen, enthralled, to the history that he knows and the quotes that he gives from memory. He has inspired us many times both in the antiquity that he talks about and also the very great personal stories that he tells and the quotations. I remember he had a quote when I had a grandson born a year and a half ago about the beauty of being a grandparent, and it was just one of the most beautiful things I have ever heard on the floor of the Senate, maybe not so much as to who had said it, or how he was saying it, but who he was saying it about. He did a beautiful job.

He speaks of great historic events and he quotes from the Bible. And yet he has spoken personally, humanly, about the wonders of life, and even to being the owner of a wonderful dog named Billy, in such a way that has brought tears to our eyes. Having seen ''My Dog, Skip'' just this past weekend, I know sometimes the beauty of an animal or dog in your family will bring tears quicker than anything perhaps.

In today's world, where anything older than a decade is considered ancient, his knowledge of the classical world is truly extraordinary, and his insistence that its somber lessons are relevant to our own times is truly sobering.

In seasons of turmoil, it is the Senate's role to give the Nation the reassurance of stability and endurance. That is what the framers of our Constitution intended when they devised an upper Chamber that would be a steady anchor against the wild winds of public passion and hasty action.

Senator BYRD's magnificent addresses on the history of the Senate chronicle the work of Senators—whether renowned or obscure—who have toiled in this body for causes larger than their own advancement, both here in this room and in the old Chamber where the Senate did its work until 1859.

Senator BYRD's personal heroes, such as Richard Russell of Georgia, have pursued duty rather than passing glory, and in the process won for themselves a lasting remembrance in the annals of representative democracy.

Because of my own southern background and because of Senator BYRD's comments over the years, things he has noted about Senator Russell, I have gone back and read some of the history of this great Senator. It was interesting to me to note that others indicated he surely could have been the majority leader. Clearly, he could have assumed any role he wanted in the Senate. But he chose not to do that. He chose instead to be chairman of the Armed Services Committee, chairman of the Appropriations Committee, to be involved in everything that happened in the Senate. He was truly a unique Senator in many ways.

Today, we celebrate and stand in respectful witness to the history that ROBERT BYRD is making as the Senator from West Virginia who, for 41 years and 2 months, has pursued duty rather than passing glory for causes larger than his own advancement.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

SENATE PROCEDURE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, before the majority leader leaves the floor, I would like to direct a couple of comments to him. I hope the majority leader saw what happened last week. After some work, we had a bill before the Senate that was almost open. The education savings bill allowed all amendments dealing with taxation, amendments dealing with education, and we threw in a few other amendments as part of the unanimous consent agreement. I might add, I think what happened last week was exemplary as how the Senate should operate.

There were no quorum calls, or if there were some, they were momentary in nature. When an amendment was offered, it was debated; there were no dilatory tactics. Even though the minority did not like the bill that was before the Senate, I think we proceeded, showing our good faith that we can work on legislation and move things along. In fact, regarding the one amendment we added, the Wellstone amendment we had a time agreement on it, and I think that amendment was the one of several amendments that was agreed to. There may have been only one other.

The point I am making to the majority leader is I hope the majority would allow more business to come before the Senate in the same manner because I think, while it wasn't necessary to show our good faith, the minority showed we can move legislation and move it quite rapidly. That bill had scores of amendments, more Democratic amendments than Republican amendments, but I repeat: We moved that bill well, and I think we showed how the Senate should really operate.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I noted late Thursday night that I was very much impressed and pleased with the way that legislation went through the Senate and that we were able to get to conclusion. I made a particular note of the fine work the Senator from Nevada did, helping keep Members focused on the issue at hand, the issue before us, and also reducing the number of amendments and helping make it possible for us to complete that bill on Thursday night.

I have to say the Senator, since he has been elected as the whip, assistant Democratic leader, has made a difference in our ability to complete important legislation. I think that was an example of how we can proceed. That was a good bill that had bipartisan support. I know a lot in the minority did not like it but several in the minority did vote for it because it wound up getting 61 votes, which means even if it got every Republican—and I didn't check to see if every one voted for it, but probably at least a half dozen Democrats also voted for it.

It is a good example of how we can proceed. Amendments were agreed to that were related to education, related to tax policy on education, and a couple of amendments such as the Wellstone amendment were not directly related, but Senators had something they wanted to offer. We were given an opportunity to take a look at the Wellstone amendment and basically said, sure, we can agree to that. But it did not become just flypaper to attach every amendment Senators could come up with. We did not get off into a lot of extraneous debate. Most of the week was spent focused on education and education tax policy, and that is the way we would like it to proceed.

It seemed to me the week before last that we were not going to be able to proceed, and we were going to have to go to cloture, which I always prefer not to do. I prefer to go forward without long debate and delay by amendments. But if I am given the impression, or told, in effect, we are going to offer all kinds of extraneous amendments, I have to look for some way to bring it to conclusion and get a final vote. That is why I filed cloture the end of the week, the previous week.

Then, on Monday morning, Senator DASCHLE called and said he thought that basically the parameters of the unanimous consent request we had offered were fair, but there were some Senators who still thought they had other issues they would like addressed. But he thought maybe we could work on it that morning—I believe it was Monday morning; it may have been Tuesday morning—but we could work through it and get a fair agreement. As a matter of fact, by noon that day we had done so.

So I hope this will be the procedure we can use in the future. We may have the opportunity to see if we can do that even this very week because I have been urging and pushing Senators to come to an agreement on how to proceed on the Export Administration Act. This is something we need to do. This is something people who are in the export business want to get clarified. We have not had an export law on the books since the one that was passed in 1979. My goodness, in this area of export of technology, for instance, it changes weekly, let alone annually. We clearly need to do this. I think the concept of this bill is something the administration generally supports. It came out of committee unanimously.

There are some legitimate concerns from members of the Armed Services Committee, the Foreign Relations Committee, the Government Affairs Committee, and the Intelligence Committee about how do we deal with national security issues; how can we carve out national security issues; how can we make sure it is not a unilateral decision made by the Commerce Department; and how are the State Department and Defense Department going to be involved.

But a lot of work is being done on that. I am hoping we can go forward on that bill Tuesday or Wednesday of this week and find a way to complete it. But we will not be able to do it unless we find cooperation on both sides of the aisle, and I hope maybe the education bill can be an example we can follow. It may even be easier in this case because I think there is actually broader bipartisan support.

So I appreciate what Senator REID had to say. I agree with it. I hope that is the example we can use as we go forward this year. We have a lot of work. In spite of distractions, in spite of elections, we still have work to do for the American people. It is important we find a way to do that for the best interests of our country.

I thank Senator REID for his contribution in that effort.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I say to the leader, I think we should be given even more leeway. I think we can get a lot more done. I don't think, on legislation, there would be the disaster that the leader believes. But I think we have made some progress, and I look forward to seeing if we can make more progress. The export administration bill, as the leader said, is a bill that has wide bipartisan support, and we should move forward on this, even though we have some people concerned about it. That is what the process is all about. They should come down and talk about their concerns, vote on it, and move it on. If there were ever a high-tech issue this congressional session, it is this bill. So the high-tech industry can remain competitive and keep that business we so value in the United States, we have to pass this bill or very quickly the business will be going offshore.

I thank the leader very much, and I look forward to continued progress on legislation to help the country.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be a period for the transaction of morning business until 5 p.m. Under the previous order, the time until 1 p.m. shall be under the control of the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DURBIN, or his designee. Under the previous order, time will be under the control of the Senator from Wyoming, Mr. THOMAS, or his designee, from 1 o'clock to 2 o'clock.

The Senator from Nevada.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR ROBERT C. BYRD

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we are all very proud of Senator BYRD. I have had the good fortune over my career—in the business part of it as an attorney and as a government official—to work with people who, for lack of a better description, are very smart. I have to say I have not seen anyone who has more intellectual capacity than ROBERT BYRD.

How many people do you know who can recite poetry for 8 hours without ever reciting the same poem twice? He can do that.

How many people do you know have actually studied and read the Encyclopedia Britannica? Senator BYRD has.

How many people do you know have used a congressional break to study the dictionary and read every word in the dictionary? Senator BYRD has done that.

Those of us who serve with him in the Senate, and especially those who serve with him on the Appropriations Committee, are every day amazed at his brilliance. His congressional service has been brilliant. I look forward to his reelection this year and his continued service in the Senate. It has been a remarkable pleasure for me to serve with Senator BYRD.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

Mr. REID. Mr. President, when I was a little boy, I lived in the town of Searchlight, NV. One of my brothers, who is 10 years older than I, worked for Standard Stations. He was assigned to a place called Ashfork, AZ, which to me could have been as far away as New York City because I had never traveled anyplace.

When I was a young boy of 11 years, he allowed me to spend a week with him in Ashfork, AZ. My brother had a girlfriend. The thing I remember most about my journey to Ashfork, AZ. The girlfriend had a brother about my age, or a year or so older. We would play games. I never won a single game, not because I should not have, but because he kept changing the rules in the middle of the game. It does not matter what the game was; as I started to win, he would change the rules. So I returned from Ashfork never having won anything, even though I should have won everything.

The reason I mention that today is that is kind of what campaign finance is all about in America. The rules keep changing, not for the better, but for the worse. They are complicated. They are impossible to understand.

I was recently criticized because I did not disclose the names of people who gave to my leadership fund. Why didn't I? The reason I did not is that I did not legally have to. The most important reason, however, is that people who gave to my fund said: Do you have to disclose my name? And I said no, which was true. That is the law; I did not have to.

Over the last several weeks, there have been a number of people writing about the fact I have not disclosed who gave me the money and how much it was. I made a decision that even though it was unnecessary legally for me to do that, I would disclose those names. I could not do that, however, until I went back to the people whom I told I would not make a disclosure and got their permission to do so. I am happy to report I was able to do that. Everyone understood, and they said: Go ahead, I would rather you did not do it, but you have told me why you have to do it; go ahead and do that.

That goes right to the heart of what is wrong with the campaign finance system in America today. There is no end to what is politically correct, but yet if a person follows the legal rules, it still may not be politically correct. It is a Catch-22. No matter what one does in the system, it is wrong; people of goodwill trying to do the right thing are criticized.

We have to do something. Everything I have done with my Searchlight fund, as it is called, is totally legal. I have not done anything wrong. It has been checked with lawyers and accountants. In fact, when people came to me and said, do you have to disclose my name? I checked to make sure I was giving them the right information when I said no.

I thought it was important to follow the law, and I have done that. It was important for me to keep my word. Where I grew up, there was not a church and there was not a courthouse; everything was done based on people's word. If you shook hands with someone or you told them you were going to do something, that was the way it had to be, and that is the way I felt about disclosing these names.

It was very hard for me and somewhat embarrassing to go back to these people, and say: May I have your permission to disclose your name, even if you did not want it done? Even though they consented, it was not an easy thing to do.

I have disclosed these names and the money. The problem is the system is simply broken. There are traps set up all along the way for people who are trying to comply with the law. If we comply with the law, sometimes we lose the confidence of the public, who come to believe we are all in the grip of wealthy special interests whose cash carves out ordinary Americans from the system.

Under our current system, money is the largest single factor, some say, in winning a Federal political election, and a lot of times that is true. The dilemma we face is: Too little money,

and you may very well lose your political position; too much money, and the public thinks you are in someone's pocket, for lack of a better description.

I finished an election last year. The State of Nevada at the time of that election had a population of fewer than 2 million people. My opponent and I spent the same amount in State party money and funds from our campaigns. We each spent over $10 million for a total of $20 million in a State of less than 2 million people. That does not count all the money spent in that election because there were independent expenditures also. We do not know the amount because there is no legal reason they be disclosed, but I estimate another $3 million at least.

In the State of Nevada, a State of fewer than 2 million people, we had spent $23 million. If that is not an example of why we need campaign finance reform, there is not an example. We need to do something now.

I have talked about the State of Nevada, but there are other States in which more money is spent. It is not unusual or uncommon to hear about races costing more money than the $20 million spent in the State of Nevada. Most of those States have more population, but that is still lot of money.

We know presently there is a controversy in the election that is going to be held in New York tomorrow. Why? In the Republican primary, there has been an independent expenditure of $2.5 million berating JOHN MCCAIN for his environmental record and for not being supportive of breast cancer research.

Every candidate who is running for President of the United States is for breast cancer research. I have already given one example of how much it costs in the State of Nevada and why we need to do something about campaign finance reform. Certainly, in New York, because of independent expenditures, we need to do something. They are gross; they are absurd; they are obscene—$2.5 million to distort the record of a fine person, JOHN MCCAIN, indicating that he is opposed to breast cancer research. I am not going to belabor the point and talk about his environmental record, but if one compares it to whom he is running against, it is not that bad. These independent expenditures are wrong, and we should do something about them.

I repeat, our current system is broken and it needs to be fixed.

I have spoken many times in this chamber, going back more than 12 years, about the need to reform the system. I have sponsored and cosponsored many bills for reforming the system, including variations of the McCain-Feingold bill. These bills have never even had a decent debate in this body, let alone passed. We have never been able to invoke cloture.

Those of us who represent our States and want to accomplish good and meaningful things, who want to make this country work better, have to work within the system the way it is, not the way we wish it were.

As the example shows that I just gave, that is difficult. I follow the law; someone comes to me and says: I want to give you some money. Do you have to disclose it? I say: No. The answer is accurate legally, but I later have to go to that person and say: Well, is it OK if I disclose this?

This is a bad system and it should be changed.

The criticism that has occurred as a result of campaign finance generally should cause us to do a better job. We at least should debate the issues, and ultimately change the law. Should we have campaign ceilings? Do you only spend so much money? Shouldn't we shorten the election cycle somewhat? Can't we do better than what we have? Can't we make it easier for people to register to vote?

I repeat, for the fourth time, the system is broken. It is up to us to save it before people are totally turned off by American politics.

I yield the floor and apologize to my friends for taking so much time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Before he leaves, I commend the distinguished minority whip for speaking out on some of these excesses in campaign finance. He mentions his small State spending more than $20 million.

Mr. REID. If I can interrupt and ask the Senator to yield, in my State we only have two media markets, only two places to spend the money.

Mr. WYDEN. I think the Senator makes an extremely important point. I recall in the campaign with my friend and colleague, Senator GORDON SMITH, to succeed former Senator Packwood—we are from a small State as well, a little bigger than Nevada—Senator SMITH and I, between us, went through pretty close to $10 million in about 5 months.

Before the minority whip leaves the floor, I want to tell him I so appreciate him speaking out on this issue.

Certainly in Europe, for example, they are doing some of the things the distinguished minority whip is talking about: shortening the election cycle trying to generate interest in the elections because the campaign is over a short period of time. I think we can do that in this country and require, for example, that the campaign funds be disclosed online, which many of our colleagues have proposed on both sides of the aisle.

I want the Senator to know, before he leaves the floor, I very much appreciate his leadership in speaking out on this campaign finance issue, because we saw in Oregon much of what the Senator saw in Nevada.

Mr. REID. I say to my friend from Oregon, I think one of the things that is happening in Oregon is exemplary; that is, people can vote at home. That was an experiment in the Senator's election. We were all worried it would not work out right, but it worked out fine. But that is something we need to do: Make it easier for people to vote.

We have a Presidential election that is heating up now. But you know, people are talking about getting ready to run in the next election already. This is not good for the system. As the Senator has said, we have to do something to shorten the election cycle so people have more condensed elections.

There are many different ways to communicate now. We have all this cable, and we have to look for a better way of doing it, and making it so money is not the predominant factor in the political race.

Mr. WYDEN. What the minority whip has essentially said is: We have what amounts to a permanent campaign. You have the election the first Tuesday in November; people sleep in on Wednesday; and then the whole thing starts all over again on Thursday.

It is time, in effect, to turn off this treadmill and, heaven forbid, come to the floor and talk about issues, such as prescription drugs, which I have tried to focus on for a number of months now. Many of our colleagues, on both sides of the aisle, want to talk about that, and the Patients' Bill of Rights, and education. To the extent that campaign finance dominates so much of the American political focus, it detracts from those issues.

I commend the minority whip. I thank him for his excellent presentation.

CONGRATULATING SENATOR BYRD

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, before I go on to touch on the issue of prescription drugs for a few moments, I, too, join with the majority leader, Senator LOTT, and the minority whip, Senator REID, in congratulating Senator BYRD on the anniversary of his Senate service.

I think what is especially striking about Senator BYRD's contributions is that when so many get tired, and so many get frustrated and exasperated with public service—we all know there is plenty in which you can be frustrated about—Senator BYRD does not give up. He does not flinch from the kinds of travails of public service. He seems to get stronger and stronger.

Those of us who watch him and seek him out for his counsel very much appreciate his contributions to the Senate. But this Senator especially appreciates one of his traits, which I think is the hallmark of being successful in any field, and that is his persistence. He is persistent about public service. He is persistent about upholding the standards of the Senate.

I join with the majority leader, Senator LOTT, and the minority whip in congratulating our friend and colleague, Senator BYRD.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG AFFORDABILITY

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, since the fall, I, and other Members of the Senate, have come to the floor of this body

to talk about the need for prescription drug coverage for older people under Medicare.

As we look at this issue, I am especially pleased that Senator DASCHLE has been trying to reconcile the various legislative proposals that have been introduced on this issue. I know colleagues on the other side of the aisle have good ideas, as well.

I particularly commend my colleague, Senator SNOWE of Maine. She and I have teamed up, on a bipartisan basis, for more than a year now. Senator DASCHLE is trying to bring these bills together and make it possible for us to go forward and address this vital issue for seniors in a bipartisan way.

What I am struck by, and what I want to touch on for a moment or two this morning, is how significant the ramifications are with respect to this prescription drug issue.

For example, one issue I have not talked about in connection with this prescription drug matter is how it is directly and integrally tied to the matter of medical errors. Many of our colleagues were astounded at the end of last year when the Institute of Medicine produced a landmark study—a truly landmark study—documenting the problem of medical errors today in American health care.

These medical errors end up injuring many of our citizens, of course. They cost vast amounts of money. What is striking is how many of them are tied to problems connected with prescriptions. For example, we know when a senior cannot afford to take their prescription or ends up only taking two pills, when three of them are essentially recommended by their physician, that can constitute a breakdown in our health system or, in fact, what amounts to a medical error.

I think I have been coming to the floor of the Senate and talked on the issue of prescription drugs something like 26 times in the last few months, for example, talking about instances where folks at home in Oregon are actually breaking up their pills, their cholesterol-lowering pills, because they cannot afford to take the entire pill. They believe if they break up the pill they can stretch it.

These are the kinds of medical tragedies we are seeing across this country. They are errors that we can correct if we go forward and address this issue—prescription drug coverage—in a bipartisan way.

It seems unconscionable to think that, in a Nation as rich and good and powerful as ours, with all of these older people walking on an economic tightrope, balancing their food costs against their fuel costs, fuel costs against their medical bills, we can't go forward, as Senator DASCHLE has suggested, and reconcile these various bills that have been introduced on this issue and enact a comprehensive program to help older people with their prescription drug bills, reduce the kinds of errors the Institute of Medicine found, and help a lot of families in our country.

I think there really are three principles we ought to zero in on in terms of trying to address this issue. First, I think there is general agreement now that this program be voluntary. I think many Members of Congress remember the ill-fated catastrophic care legislation, with a lot of older people believing at that time that they were being forced to pay for catastrophic benefits they were already receiving under their existing private health coverage.

Now I believe there already is a bipartisan consensus—Senator DASCHLE has touched on this a couple of times recently—that a prescription drug program ought to be voluntary for older people and voluntary for the various providers, insurers, and pharmaceutical benefit managers who might decide to participate in the program. I think that minimizes the possibility that older people and families will believe they are being coerced by Government to pay for something they are already receiving. That voluntary aspect of such a program is one area where there already is bipartisan agreement.

Second, I think there is a general belief that rather than inventing an entirely new structure for this program, it must be integrally tied to the existing Medicare program and, in particular, fit with an agenda for Medicare reform.

What the legislation I have worked on—the Snowe-Wyden legislation—does is allow the administrative body—called the SPICE board, because our bill stands for Senior Prescription Insurance Coverage Equity or SPICE—to contract with a variety of entities, insurance companies or pharmaceutical benefit managers or nonprofit agencies—anybody who was authorized under State law to administer a program. That way, we are not creating a whole new structure for dealing with this program; we are building on Medicare as it exists today. At the same time, we are doing something else which is critical; that is, adding more choice to the Medicare program.

I personally think the effort to make this program voluntary, to build on existing Medicare coverage, which makes the benefits available to all seniors—universal coverage for those eligible for the program—and then, in addition to those principles, add new choices to the Medicare program. The reason that is so important is, providing choices is what is going to generate the competition that can help hold down the prices of medicines for our older people.

We see so many seniors who can't afford their medicine. There is a great debate going on in the country now about whether it is the research costs of these drugs that have contributed to it. There are a variety of reasons being offered for why older people cannot afford their prescription drugs. I am interested in debating those.

What I am most interested in is making sure older people have the kind of bargaining power necessary to drive down the costs of their medicine. It seems to me they can get that bargaining power through an approach based on choice, such as we have, as Members of Congress, through the Federal Employees Health Benefits system. I am very hopeful that that expanded array of choices will be a key invisible part of a bipartisan effort to go forward and address this issue in the Senate.

As we head to a period of town meetings and discussions with folks at home, I know my colleagues are going to hear accounts from older people and families about horrible, tragic instances where older people cannot afford medicine and often end up getting sicker and needing much more expensive care when they cannot get those essential prescriptions. I think we have made a lot of progress in the last 2 or 3 months, with Senator DASCHLE having taken the lead, many colleagues on the other side of the aisle trying to bring the Senate together to find the common ground. I think we made a lot of progress.

I am hopeful that when the Senate reconvenes after this break to visit with folks at home, when the Budget Committee goes forward—and Senator SNOWE and I both sit on the Budget Committee—that with the bipartisan leadership of Senator DOMENICI and Senator LAUTENBERG, we can get a generous earmark in the budget to cover prescription drugs and, in effect, continue the progress we have made towards getting a bipartisan prescription drug program enacted in this session of the Senate.

I have talked with Senator LAUTENBERG, ranking Democrat, Senator CONRAD, others who have been involved in this issue on our side, and with Senator DOMENICI on the other side of the aisle. I think there is a real openness to making sure there is a generous earmark in that budget for a prescription drug program we would enact this year. After we get over that hurdle, the challenge will be, as Senator DASCHLE has outlined, to reconcile the various approaches that have been offered. As I mentioned, Senator SNOWE and I have one we think makes sense, but we do not believe we have the last word.

We think the last word ought to belong to the American people. The American people are saying: We want you to deliver on this prescription drug issue. We want it done this session. We do not want it to go through yet another campaign season as campaign fodder through the fall. We want you to get it done this year. Take the steps necessary to provide older people the relief they need and deserve.

I look forward to being part of that effort in a bipartisan fashion.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

(The remarks of Mr. BINGAMAN pertaining to the introduction of S. 2181 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE HIGH PRICE OF OIL

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, Friday, the price of oil exceeded $30. It was close to $31.26. That is high—not necessarily an all-time high, but it is pretty close.

Back in 1973, when we had the Arab oil embargo, the prices were in that neighborhood. A lot of people don't remember 1973, or the consequences of the Arab oil embargo; but for those who do, it was a day of reckoning. It was at a time when you went to the gas station to fill up and you waited—not just a little while, but in some cases a couple of hours. You stood in line because gasoline was short in this country.

There was an indignant response from the American public that never again would we be so dependent on imported oil from other countries. As a consequence, at that time, we formed the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. The important thing to note is that in 1973 we were about 37 percent dependent on imported oil.

The idea of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve was to have a supply of oil on hand in case there was an interruption on our imports and we could have that oil available for use to meet that emergency. That was in 1973.

Today, in the year 2000, we are approximately 56 percent dependent on imported oil. The Department of Energy has indicated by the year 2015 to 2020, we will probably be dependent to the tune of about 65 percent. Now, the question, of course, from the standpoint of our national energy security interests, is: What are the implications of this? What are the ramifications of our increasing dependence on imported oil?

Clearly, the pricing structure is determined by the availability of oil from the producing countries that have an excess capacity. That is primarily in the Mideast. We have seen the efforts by both Iran and Iraq to cut production. It is interesting that between those two countries, they account for about 8 percent of the world's 75 million barrels of daily oil production. But now we see Baghdad and Teheran in a new position of power and influence to push their separate agendas in various ways.

We have OPEC. We know the significance of what that cartel controls. They decided to have a meeting to address our emergency. The irony of that is, that meeting is going to take place on March 27, which is hardly responding to our emergency.

As a matter of fact, our Secretary of Energy traveled extensively through the Mideast, meeting with the OPEC ministers, encouraging them to produce more oil so we will not see the price escalation that is currently occurring.

The results of that meeting were that we could expect some relief from Venezuela and Mexico. Both countries, of course, are outside of OPEC, but they wanted to remind us of something, and they communicated a little message. This didn't come from the Secretary of Energy, but it came from those who have had an opportunity to relate to both Mexico and Venezuela with regard to oil prices. On the manner in which we came and pled for more production, the Mexicans and the Venezuelans said: Where were you when we were going broke selling our oil at $11 and $12? Were you giving us any assistance? Were you encouraging higher prices so we could maintain our economy? Certainly not. That was not the case at all.

Now when we see oil at $30, we go to Mexico and we go to Venezuela, and say: We need increased production. But they are reminding us that we weren't at all concerned when the price was low, and when their economy was in collapse, they couldn't count on the United States.

Those are the dangers of that kind of dependence.

Now we are seeing OPEC on March 27 perhaps responding to increased oil production. But it is a little more complex than that because there are wheels within wheels in OPEC and relationships within relationships.

Kuwait this weekend signaled its support for an agreement to boost production. Remember, it wasn't so long ago that we fought a war against Saddam Hussein. It was a war over oil to keep that country, Kuwait, from being taken over by Saddam Hussein and Iraq.

We are now seeing within Iran and Iraq a group of price hawks, if you will, within OPEC. They are going to do what is best for their country—not what is best for the United States. Teheran has said that this is not the time to increase output because demand typically declines and higher production could lead to a quick collapse of prices. They are certainly looking out for their own best interests. Iran, with 3.5 million barrels of daily production, is at about its maximum, analysts say.

Since we are talking about bedfellows, let's talk about Algeria and Libya. They also have little reason in the short term to care about the world's economy, or the United States economy specifically.

An interesting suggestion is in this report from the Wall Street Journal. If the United States wants to lower its price of gasoline, it should reduce its taxes. That is their answer. They simply want to reduce our highway taxes and our other taxes and our State taxes that are associated with the price of oil. They say that if we really care about higher prices, we should simply eliminate our taxes. That is an interesting point of view.

Saudi Arabia, the world's largest producer of oil and an OPEC shareholder, has a special interest in keeping Iran happy now because relations between those countries are at their best since the Iranian revolution in 1979.

We see countries within OPEC working for their own best interests and not necessarily what is good for the United States. The Saudis have been more responsive in the past, but not necessarily at this time because of their relationship with Iran.

OPEC producers want to continue the cartel's new-found unity because it funds the cash-flow. Wouldn't you rather produce more oil at a higher price to meet your cash-flow than a lot of oil at lower prices? That is just what they are doing.

We are seeing the role of OPEC and our neighbors in Mexico, Venezuela, and other countries evaluating the kind of response they are going to make to the United States at this time of emergency.

Over the last decade—most of it under the Clinton administration—production has decreased 17 percent and consumption has increased 14 percent. That is the reality of what has occurred in this country because we have not had an energy policy. We do not have an energy policy on coal. We do not have an energy policy on natural gas.

We just saw the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission basically kill prospects for a gas line in the Northeast corridor by making it economically unattractive for investors. We have an administration that suggests hydro is nonrenewable. It wants to take dams down in the Pacific Northwest. So we look at oil, we look at gas, we look at hydro, and we look at coal; there is no energy policy of any consequence.

Renewables are something we all support. But the reality is they contribute less than 4 percent of the total energy consumed in this country, and the prospects, while encouraging, are not going to give us the immediate relief we need.

As a consequence, we are experiencing a shock. The American public, when it drives down to the gas station to fill up the family Blazer or sports vehicle, may find itself subjected to a situation where it makes a pretty good hole in a $100 bill if it takes a 40-gallon gas tank at $2 a gallon, or thereabouts.

We also have a couple of other considerations. We have the potential for added inflation. Somebody made the interesting observation that if you consider the cost and availability of labor, if you consider the cost of money—namely, interest rates that have been going up—and the cost of energy, you have the three factors for inflation. It has been estimated that for every $10 increase in the price of oil, inflation increases one-half percent.

It is a very real threat to our economy, a very real exposure to our consumers out there, and I don't think we realize what is ahead. Not too many people know that every time they get in the airplane now, they are paying a $20 surcharge on that airline ticket, whether they go from here to Seattle or from here to Baltimore. The Northeast corridor has felt the impact of $2 a gallon for heating oil.

The question is, Is it going to get worse? The answer is, probably. When can we get relief? The question is whether we want to just depend on the Mideast or whether we want to reduce our dependence on imported oil.

There are many areas of this country over the overthrust belt of the Rocky Mountains—Utah, Montana, North Dakota, New Mexico, Wyoming, and my State of Alaska—where we have a tremendous abundance of oil and gas if given the opportunity to initiate exploration. This is not supported by President Clinton. I am glad to say it is supported by some of the Republican candidates running for President.

The point is, what are we going to learn from history? Some say not much. If the Department of Energy predicts we will be 65-percent dependent in the years 2015 to 2020, should we not be doing something about it now? We should be committed to a policy of reducing our dependence on imported energy sources by developing sources in the United States. My State of Alaska, in the ANWR area, has an estimated 16 billion barrels. That would be an amount equal to what Saudi Arabia exports to America over an estimated 30-year timeframe.

We have areas in Louisiana, in Texas, and other coastal States that want to have OCS activity, yet we have an administration that does not support that activity. That is, indeed, unfortunate.

The bottom line is, when are we going to wake up? When will we relieve our dependency on imported oil? I might add, for those who think imported oil is the answer from an environmental point of view, it is estimated that from the year 2015 to 2020, it will take more than 30 tankers, 500,000 barrels each, docking every day in the United States, to supply that increase; that would be 10,000 ships per year. If that is not an environmental risk, I suggest anyone check the registration of the ships because they will be foreign ships.

Finally, in 1990 we had 657 rigs working in this country; today we have 153. In 1990, we had 405,000 jobs in the oil industry; today we have 293,000, a 28-percent decline.

If one considers the makeup of our trade deficit, a trade deficit of $300 billion, $100 billion is the cost of imported oil.

I encourage my colleagues to recognize that it is time to move. It is time to address opportunities to relieve our dependence on imported oil with meaningful proposals on the basic premise that charity begins at home.

I ask unanimous consent an article from the Wall Street Journal be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 6, 2000]

OIL OUTPUT MAY BE HOSTAGE TO IRAN, IRAQ AGENDAS

(By Steve Liesman and Neil King, Jr.)

Iran and Iraq, the two major oil producers over which the U.S. has the least sway, are playing a crucial role in determining where oil prices are headed and are positioned to affect the world economy.

Together, the two countries account for 8% of the world's 75 million barrels of daily oil production. But tight world oil inventories, high prices and declining production capacity in the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries have given Baghdad and Tehran new power to push their separate agendas, analysts say.

OPEC members will gather in three weeks to decide whether to reverse the past year's production cutbacks, which reduced world output by about five million barrels a day. Leading producers support an increase as soon as April to cool prices that recently topped $31 a barrel for the benchmark West Texas Intermediate crude.

After initial reluctance, Kuwait during the weekend signaled its support for an agreement by Saudi Arabia, Venezuela and Mexico to boost production. Meanwhile, a strike by oil workers in Venezuela withered quickly.

Iran still leads the group of price hawks within OPEC and ''is one of the key stumbling blocks to coming out with a new decision,'' said Raad Alkadiri, an analyst with the Petroleum Finance Co., a Washington energy consultant.

Officially, Tehran says the second quarter is the wrong time to increase output because demand typically declines and higher production could lead to a quick collapse in prices. But domestic economics are at least as much of a factor. Unlike other major producers, which have extra capacity, Iran's 3.5 million barrels of daily production is about its maximum, analysts believe. Declining investments in its oil fields, as well as continued U.S. sanctions on spare parts, suggest production capacity may actually be declining. ''They don't have more capacity to make up for the price drop,'' Mr. Alkadiri said. Higher output world-wide—which could result in lower prices—would do little for the Iranian treasury at a time when payments on $11 billion of foreign debt begin to peak.

Iran, which has the backing of Algeria and Libya, also has little reason in the short term to care about the world economy. Its oil minister recently said that oil-consuming nations should lower energy taxes if they are concerned about inflation from higher oil prices.

Saudi Arabia, the world's largest exporter and OPEC's clear leader, has a special interest in keeping Iran happy. Relations between the two countries are at their best since the Iranian revolution of 1979. Their rapprochement last year was the linchpin of OPEC's ability to cut back production. ''The Saudis might have been more responsive more quickly [to world oil markets] had it not been for this relationship with Iran,'' said Amy Jaffe, senior energy analyst at the James A. Baker III Institute for Public Policy in Houston.

OPEC producers want to continue the cartel's newfound unity, fear a production free-for-all if OPEC cooperation dissolves. Of course, oil-producing countries ultimately could go ahead without Iran, as they have in the past. Venezuela's oil minister is to visit Tehran in coming weeks to lobby the government to accept higher production levels.

But the one million to two million barrels that OPEC is considering putting back on the market could be quickly removed if Iraq withheld its two million barrels a day of exports. In November, Iraqi President Saddam Hussein pushed oil prices up almost $1 a barrel in a single day when he turned off his spigots to protest United Nations sanctions. This time, ''with oil inventories very low, any interruption in crude supply could cause prices to skyrocket,'' said Gary Ross, president of PIRA Energy Group, a New York energy-consulting company.

Whether Mr. Hussein would use the opportunity is a matter of debate, but few dispute he has ample reason. Baghdad is feuding with the U.S. about Iraq's need to import spare parts for its oil industry. It could decide to use the tight oil market, analysts say, to get Washington to ease up—or to undermine U.N. sanctions altogether. ''We have seen him do this before and we would not be surprised if he resorted to the same tactics again,'' one U.S. official said.

Other OPEC producers' ability to make up for any Iraqi cutbacks would be strained in the short term. Mr. Ross said OPEC production capacity has fallen by about 500,000 barrels a day during the past year. Venezuela in particular has let its capacity dwindle as it diverted oil revenue to pay for the extensive social agenda of President Hugo Chavez. In time, however, OPEC countries should be able to make up any shortfall with their four million to five million barrels a day of excess capacity.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS). The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished chairman of our Energy Committee for the remarks. They are not new. He is not making a political statement. Chairman MURKOWSKI is here because he has spoken out for years, virtually since this administration has been in office, about discouraging—through so many rules, regulations, and taxes—the domestic production of oil and gas.

He has warned we would be at this point. Here we are. The best way by far to deal with this is to make sure we have more domestic production because it will help keep the prices down, and it will also help ease our balance of payments.

I thank the Senator for his leadership on this issue.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, Senators from the other side of the aisle made comments about the Republican Presidential primary, taking sides in those primaries. I think it is somewhat odd they would want to debate some of the issues here.

With regard to the concerns over contributions that are going to independent groups—I believe New York was complained of—to run TV ads, money was given by a small number of people who made large contributions to run those ads. It was said that this is a justification for passing the McCain-Feingold campaign finance reform legislation.

My best understanding of what that bill is all about is that this would not

be covered. Fundamentally, the McCain-Feingold bill covered contributions of larger sums of money to political parties but it did not prevent people giving large contributions to an independent environmental group, an independent pro-choice group, or an independent pro-life group so they could run ads during a campaign season and say: Candidate JEFF SESSIONS doesn't agree with our views, vote against him.

The problem I have had with campaign finance reform is it was not in this McCain-Feingold bill. Why? Because this is America, these are political campaigns. Is the Senate going to pass a law that says individual American citizens can't raise money and run an ad and express their view as to how the American public should or should not vote on an issue?

It is frustrating to have the moneys come in. I certainly believe they ought to be disclosed. I was, I believe, a victim or target of one of these ads when I ran for the Senate 3 years ago. It came under the guise of an environmental group, but I know the money came mainly to beat up on me.

How can anyone say that is wrong? How can we say a group cannot raise money and run ads during an election campaign season about issues? I am troubled by that. I am frustrated not having a lot of money myself, facing two candidates in my primary, both of whom spent over $1 million of their own money, most of it beating up on me. I was struggling with $1,000 maximum contributions per person to try to fight back. I was able to do so. Fortunately, the American people don't vote on who has the most money. There are other issues. We have seen that time and time again. They are pretty sophisticated in how to evaluate this.

I am troubled by this idea that we can, out of some sort of vision of good government, blithely walk in and say candidates are not going to be able to raise money; they are not going to be able to spend money to express their ideas during an election campaign.

When do we want to do it? They say just accept certain guidelines for 6 months prior to the election. When do we want to speak out, if it isn't when people are getting ready to vote?

MARRIAGE TAX PENALTY

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I believe all in government in Washington, DC, and in every State, need to ask ourselves: Do our legislative acts, the public policies that we create, enhance or nurture our better instincts as a people? Are we conducting activities and passing laws that further benefit the better instincts of our Nation as a people?

A payment to somebody or some institution is an incentive to them, for whatever reason, that incentivizes and encourages that activity that got them the payment.

A tax, likewise, is a penalty. It discourages, it penalizes, it hurts. It sanctions certain kinds of behavior. That is so basic as to be without dispute. Frankly, our Founding Fathers knew this.

Professor Sindell, at Harvard, has written a book. I have not read the book, but I read the article, I believe in the Atlantic Monthly, about how in the first 150 years of our Nation's history, if you look at the debate that occurred in Congress, the Senate and the House, they were constantly debating what to sign and what to veto and what bills to support; they were always debating this principle.

(Mr. KYL assumed the chair.)

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, is this going to make people better? Is it going to encourage their best instincts or will it encourage poor instincts? Will it encourage bad behavior? If they vote for or against bills on that basis, will it make us better people? That is an important issue. We ought to think about it.

We encourage a lot of activities in America through our tax policies. We encourage people to give to charitable institutions, churches, and schools by making those contributions tax deductible.

We help families raise their children by providing a deduction or a child tax credit, which we passed a few years ago.

We encourage savings by making the interest on individual retirement accounts tax free.

I have introduced a bill to make the interest that accrues on savings for prepaid college tuition plans tax free because we ought to encourage saving for education and have families and children invest in their education.

In many States—Kentucky, for example—the average contribution to those plans is $47 per month. They are middle-income people who care about their children's education. They are saving for their children's education, and we are taxing them on the interest that accrues on that savings for college education.

In my view, that is bad public policy. We discourage and penalize other activities we feel we can do without but we do not want to prohibit entirely. We tax cigarettes at a very high rate. We know that tobacco is bad for our health. It is not a good thing to do, and we have pretty high taxes, higher taxes every year it seems, and rightly so.

We tax gasoline. We can talk about the cost of gasoline. Last year in Alabama, gasoline was under $1 a gallon in a lot of places. Forty percent of the cost of that gallon of gasoline was State and Federal tax because we do not want people to use more than they need, we want to keep supplies strong. We do not want to import anymore than we have to, and we want to reduce pollution.

There are other taxes and penalties on people who pollute. That is one of the policies.

We have higher taxes on alcohol than we do a lot of other products.

We do not tax, for example, prescription drugs—most States do not. There is sales tax on all kinds of products that are sold in our grocery stores, but we do not tax prescription drugs because we know people need those drugs, and we do not want to penalize that.

Another thing we tax which I must add to that list is marriage. We are taxing and penalizing marriage to an extraordinary degree.

At church Sunday in Alabama—it was a pleasure to get back home—my minister told a story about an old man who had never been to town. His grandchildren said: Grandpa, you need to go to town. He finally agreed. He had never seen a zoo, so they wanted to take him to a zoo. They took him to a zoo, and he came upon a giraffe. He stood there and just looked at that giraffe. He walked around that giraffe, he studied that giraffe, and he spent 2 hours looking at that giraffe. He finally said: I still don't believe it.

We are at that point with the marriage penalty. Some people do not believe it is happening, that we are taxing marriage. It is very real. Talk to young people all over America today and ask them about what is going to happen to their taxes when two of them, particularly if both are working, are married. It costs them a lot of money.

We have to end this. We need to end this tax penalty. The President said he was for it. The proposal he made in his State of the Union Address and subsequently is insignificant in meeting that challenge, but it is an admission that he believes there is a problem.

Let's look at it. Soon we are going to be seeing legislation in this body to deal with it. I hope we will study it carefully and end this governmental policy of penalizing and discouraging marriage. That is wrong. We need to encourage marriage. We do not need to penalize singleness, but they ought not have a financial incentive to remain single. We should not have public policy that favors singleness over marriage. We should have a fair policy that does not favor one over the other.

I have a young staff member who married recently. He had been dating his fiancee for over four years and they finally married. He tells me they will pay over $1,000 a year more having married. They married in July of last year, and they have to pay the marriage tax for the whole year. It is $1,000. That is roughly $100 a month out of their budget simply because they quit being engaged and were married. That is not right. That is wrongheaded. We do not need to continue this.

A good friend of mine, a fine person, unfortunately went through a divorce. She divorced in January a year ago. She told me that had they divorced in December, it would have saved them $1,600 on their tax bill. That is approximately $130 a month. They gave up that much because they did not divorce

earlier. Can you imagine a governmental public policy that provides a subsidy, an incentive, a bribe almost, to divorce? That is wrong. We do not need to do this any longer. I believe in this strongly.

This is a disadvantage too often to women. Women are just now breaking through the glass ceiling and making higher incomes. Many on the other side of the aisle and the President say: We do not want to deal with this problem of higher income people; we only want to have a marriage penalty elimination for the lowest income people.

What is wrong with two people working and doing modestly well today? Here is an example. Heather's income is $33,000. Her husband Brad's income is $37,000. Their total income is $70,000. It is the American dream, to do well and make those kinds of incomes. That is not rich. You cannot buy a house, buy a car, and educate your children well if you are not making in that range. It is harder and harder to do those things if you make less than that. Everybody knows that. Those are salaries one wants to see more and more Americans achieve.

Because they are married, they may take a standard deduction of $7,100, as well as two personal exemptions of $2,700. This leaves them with a taxable income of $57,500. If they were cohabitating, living outside marriage, Heather and Brad could each take a standard deduction of $4,200. Heather's taxable income would be $26,000; Brad's would be $30,000. Their combined taxable income would be $56,000. Because they are married, Heather and Brad must pay $1,400 more than if they were cohabitating. To them, it means approximately a $40-a-month charge.

That is a policy we should end. I believe this Congress is committed to it.

We are going to continue to proceed to work through the fine details of all these tax regulations and the thousands and thousands of tax pages to make sure we are doing it right and fair. But I do not think a couple making $80,000 or $90,000 or $100,000 ought to be denied equity. Why should they be taxed more than two single individuals making $100,000 collectively? They do not have to pay the extra taxes.

We are dealing with an issue whose time has come. The marriage penalty must end. We are not against singleness. I do not think there should be any battle between people who are single, who think it is some sort of tax advantage, and those who are married. We do not believe there should be any tax advantage. We are simply trying to level the playing field. This is a move toward equity and fairness at its basic level. It is a move to encourage good public policy, good activities, such as marriage and raising a family, and not taxing them. It sets a goal for us that we ought to pursue.

We ought to quit discouraging marriage, quit taxing and penalizing it, and allow people to make their choices in this country as they choose without having the tax man sticking his nose in their financial and personal matters.

I thank the Chair for this time. I am glad to see the Senator from Wyoming here. I appreciate his leadership. I know the Presiding Officer has been a champion in eliminating a lot of inequities in the Tax Code. I thank him for his leadership in that regard.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the remarks of the Senator from Alabama. We have lots of choices when we talk about tax relief, but this is one choice that is not only good for our country economically but certainly as a fairness issue is one that each of us, I think, supports.

THE REPUBLICAN AGENDA

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, there are lots of things we can talk about and, indeed, should talk about. The Senator from Alaska talked about the problem of fuel, the problem of petroleum costs. That is a very real issue for us, of course, and one we need to deal with. We talk about the marriage tax penalty. There are all kinds of things we must talk about.

There are some basic issues—and I have talked about them before—that I believe strongly in, issues that clearly are the responsibility of this body and the responsibility of the Federal Government to deal with. Frankly, sometimes it is very difficult to do that.

Unfortunately, I suspect that Presidential election years make it even harder than usual to do some of the things that clearly need to be done. One of the reasons, of course, is that there is a great tendency to talk about the things that can be used as campaign issues as opposed to seeking solutions. Unfortunately, that does happen.

The majority party, this side of the aisle, does have an agenda. I think we have a strong agenda that reflects, at least in my State, the majority of voters. I have been back home in my State every weekend this year. We talk about those issues all the time.

I am hopeful we can focus on those issues. I know sometimes it is difficult to get those issues on the floor. It is difficult to get them out and to find some sort of solution. I believe we have a responsibility to do that. I think we have a responsibility to do that as the majority party.

There are times, of course, when, if we could pass something, the President would veto it. That is his choice. Let him veto it. I think it is our responsibility to bring those issues forward and to resolve them in a way that best fits our philosophy of what we think is good for this country.

Certainly, there are a number of things that are very high on the agenda, such as the budget, such as the spending level and for what, in fact, the taxes are spent. Social Security, I am sure, is an issue that almost everyone is concerned about. Frankly, the younger you are, the more concerned about it you ought to be.

Another issue is doing something about the debt that we still have, a substantial debt that we have incurred over the last number of years and now, apparently, are expecting somebody else to pay. Another issue is tax relief.

These are the things we really ought to focus on; and I wish we would.

We talk about the budget. It seems to me, there is probably nothing more important, in terms of gauging where we go with the Federal Government, than the budget, because the budget, after all, is sort of the limitation as to where we go. The limitation is the thing that causes us to have to establish spending priorities. Of course, if you had an endless amount of money, you would not need to have priorities; you would just spend money. I do not think many people would want to do that; certainly, most taxpayers would not.

In the budget we have to find an amount. I think one of the things we are dedicated to, as Republicans, and, hopefully, all of us in the Senate this year, is to complete the budget and, subsequently, the appropriations, at the time set forth in the law and the time set forth in our operation here.

Last year, for example, we waited too long. We were here at the very end of the session trying to complete the budget. Of course, there is always controversy at the end of the session. There are always decisions to be made when you are at the end of the session.

It is even more difficult at the end of a session because the administration—particularly with this President—has used the end of the session as a very effective leveraging tool for the President to get what he wants; otherwise, he threatens to shut down the Government. Even though the President shut the Government down in the last experience, the Congress got the blame for doing that.

We need to get this thing done. We need to get it done before the first of September, and certainly before the end of September which is the end of the fiscal year.

We need to set the amounts so that they somewhat control growth. If you believe, as many of us do, that there ought to be some limitation to the size of the Federal Government, it ought to be constitutionally limited to those things that the Constitution provides. If you believe that most of the governing ought to take place at the local level, closer to the people, in the States and in the counties, then there ought to be some limit in growth.

Last year, unfortunately—and I voted against the bill—we ended up with something like 7½ or 8 percent growth in the budget—too much, I think. That is too much. Hopefully, we can hold it this year to no more than the growth due to inflation.

Of course, there are new programs that have to be funded. But there also ought to be a termination to some of

the programs that are there. It is very difficult to do that.

Last year, we had sort of fancy footwork which allowed us to spend more than it really seemed as if we were spending. But now, finally, of course, it comes out that we spent more.

In fairness, we also did some good things last year. For the second time in about 25 years we balanced the budget in operational dollars. For the second time in about 40 years, we did not spend Social Security money for the operations of Government. That is good. That is very good. Those are two things we ought to continue to do.

One of the other things that ought to happen—there is a good opportunity this year—is to have a biennial budget so that, as is the case with most States, we can deal with the budget every other year, which then gives us a year to have oversight. One of the most important things that Congress ought to have is oversight of the agencies, oversight of the regulations, so that we can ensure that what we have done, what we have passed, what we have put into law, is, indeed, working; in fact, as the money is being spent, the accountability is there, and so on. We could do that. Hopefully we will be able to do that.

It seems to me, the budget is key to managing the Government and is something we ought to be doing. Of course, the spending ought to be within the budget. We spend something like $1.7 trillion in our budget—almost an incomprehensible amount of money. Last year I think $586 billion of that was in discretionary spending. The rest of it was already set.

This year we are dealing with the question of, if it was $586 billion last time, how much do we spend? Do we spend $600 billion? Do we spend $630 billion?

It is hard. I think it is more difficult when you have the idea of a surplus than it is when you have the idea of a deficit. When you have a surplus, everybody has ideas as to where we ought to spend all that extra money. But it isn't extra money. It belongs to the taxpayers. When we have done those things we think are essential for good Government, then the surplus money ought to be used in other ways.

It is my belief, and the belief of many, that we ought to limit the size of Government, we ought to limit the number of things we fund, and we need to have better Government. Certainly, we can do that. We can do that in our appropriations.

Social Security. Almost everyone talks about Social Security. Almost everyone would agree that Social Security is one of the most important issues that we face. Social Security, of course, is not a retirement program. It is a supplement, but it is very important. When I talk, particularly to young people, most of them say: I will never see any benefits. They are probably right. Unless there are some changes, the program will not sustain itself.

We have seen so many demographic changes. It started out at a time when almost 20 people were working for every one who was drawing benefits. Now it is about three. It will soon be two. Of course, it will be almost impossible then to provide those kinds of benefits over time. What do we do? We have to make some changes, pretty clearly.

There are several options. One is to increase taxes. Social Security taxes are the highest taxes many people pay, about 12.5 percent of their earnings when we take into account what the employer pays—a very high percentage. So that is not a very popular option. We could reduce benefits. Benefits are not especially high now. That is not really a very attractive option either. So the third option is to increase the return on the money that is in the Social Security trust fund. There are billions of dollars there, of course. Under the law they can only be invested in Government securities. So they bring a relatively small return. And up until now, they haven't even done that because they have been replacing debt for other purposes.

We have a plan that ought to be considered and put into place. The administration keeps talking about saving Social Security but doesn't have any plan to do so. I think there is a plan out there. There is a bill of which I am a cosponsor, along with others, that would, in fact, set up individual accounts and would take at least a portion, whatever portion we could decide upon, and that account would belong to you or to me. It would be there to be invested in your behalf. It could be invested in equities; it could be invested in bonds. The return would be substantially higher than it is now. Over a period of 40, 50 years, that would bring a really good return and fund the program.

Furthermore, if one was unfortunate enough not to use the program, passed away before they had the chance to get the benefits, it would belong to them. It would be part of their estate. I think that is a reasonable way to do it, one we ought to fully consider.

The other issue with which we need to deal, with regard to the budget and money, is the debt. We still have a substantial amount of debt. Part of it is privately held and part is held by Social Security dollars; part of it is publicly held. We talk all the time about reducing the debt. We did, indeed, last year put the Social Security money over there and replace publicly held debt. The fact is, when that is to be used for benefits, the taxpayers at that time will still have to bail out that money so it can be used in the trust funds.

What we would like to do is, assuming we have paid what is substantially needed for programs, set aside Social Security money. If there is still some surplus there, I think we ought to dedicate a portion of that to paying off the debt and do it in a systematic way, not just say, well, we will pay it off when we get some money, whatever, but, in fact, say, we are going to set aside enough money each year, as you would on a mortgage on your home, and say, in 15 years we will pay off this $3 trillion of debt or whatever it happens to be, publicly owned debt. Each year the payment on that will be in the budget. It will be there. It will automatically be spent for that purpose. And over a period of time we would do away with that debt that is owned by the public and earns a substantial amount of interest. I think a couple of years ago we paid about $380 billion a year on interest out of this budget of ours to do that. I think that is one of the things we clearly could do.

Finally, of course, assuming there is still some left, we could, as the Senator from Alabama has said, do something about returning these excesses to the taxpayers who paid them in in the first place and certainly deserve to have them. Obviously, there are different ideas about how that is done, whether it is marriage penalty, estate tax, whether it is an across-the-board tax. The fact is, that money should go back to the people who paid it in. It is really bad policy to keep extra money in Washington because it will be spent. Once we have met our obligations, hopefully that can be returned.

These are the things that are clearly before us. There are many other items, of course, but these are the ones we have to do. These are the ones the American people want us to do. These are the ones people in Wyoming talk about when I am there.

I have to mention one other area they talk about that is a not in this category, but it has to do with management of public lands. It has to do with the so-called land legacy this administration has been working on for some time. Apparently the President, wanting to leave some kind of a Teddy Roosevelt legacy, wants to change the legacy he has before he leaves in several months, to have it be some sort of a setting aside of public resources for singular uses. That doesn't mean a lot to people who live in States where Federal lands are not a big issue. My State of Wyoming is 50 percent owned by the Federal Government; Nevada is 85 percent owned by the Federal Government, and it varies in between.

The things that happen in those States economically and other ways are affected greatly by the management of those lands. We have seen a number of designs to set aside lands for uses different than have been in the law. The law now provides there will be wilderness set aside, or, indeed, that they be set aside for multiple use, which means for recreation, for hunting, for scenery, for grazing, for minerals, for all kinds of things under the multiple use concept.

When that is not available, then the economies of our States suffer greatly, as do the long-term upkeep and availability and accessibility of those lands

for Americans. I happen to be chair of the National Park Subcommittee. The purpose of a park is to maintain resources and to provide an opportunity for its owners, the American people, to enjoy it. Now we find ourselves faced with a number of things being proposed that would limit access, limit the enjoyment of these lands: 40-million acres roadless in the national parks, for example, which has never been fully explained as to what it means. The Antiquities Act is being used to set aside lands only by action of the President. The Congress is not involved. BLM has set out a roadless plan without details; nobody knows exactly what that means. Does it mean you are not accessible to it, that there are no roads to get to it? Forest regulation—instead of having multiple uses, one of the concepts of the plan goes totally to ecology. No one knows exactly what that means.

We have proposals from the administration to put billions of dollars, over a $1 billion each year, directly to purchase more Federal land. In the West, we think there is a substantial amount now.

We have a lot of things to do. I am confident we will get to them. I hope we do. I think we should. There is a philosophy, of course, that is different among Members of the Senate as to the role of the Federal Government, as to the size of the Federal Government, as to whether or not in an area of education, for example, there is flexibility to send the money, if you are going to support education, to the States and let them decide how it is used, or do you have the Federal Government bureaucracy in Washington tell people how it should be used. Frankly, whether it is schools or whether it is health care, whether it is highways, whatever, the needs in Wyoming are quite different than they are in New York and Pennsylvania. The school district in Meeteetse, WY has different needs than Pittsburgh. We ought to be able to recognize that and allow local people to be able to do that.

That is one of the big differences we have on this floor. The minority whip this morning talked about coming together to do things, a perfectly great idea. But as long as there is opposition to those concepts of letting States and counties participate, then it is very difficult to do that.

I am hopeful we will look forward. I am sure we will; that is the system. This is a great system. There are weaknesses and complaints, of course. But after all, this is the best system in the world. It is up to us to make it work.

I suggest the absence of quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In my capacity as the Senator from Arizona, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In my capacity as the Senator from Arizona, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 3 p.m. today.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 2:10 p.m., recessed until 3 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer [Ms. COLLINS].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In my capacity as a Senator from the State of Maine, I suggest the absence of a quorum. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, regardless of the conditions for speaking in morning business, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PERMANENT NORMAL TRADING RELATIONS WITH CHINA

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, there are a number of misconceptions about the upcoming vote in the Senate to grant China permanent normal trading relations or, as we often call it, PNTR. I will refer to it as normal trading relations.

Today, as chairman of the International Trade Subcommittee, and to inform my colleagues about the importance of this issue because I favor normal trading relations with China, I want to address two misunderstandings regarding China.

The first misconception is that a vote by the Senate on normal trading relations is a vote to admit China to the World Trade Organization. We do not have anything to do with China being in the World Trade Organization. It is a wrong misconception. Also, there is a belief if we do not approve PNTR, China will not be able to join the World Trade Organization. As a member of the World Trade Organization, we can say something about it through our representative there, but in the Senate our vote on PNTR will not affect China's ability to join the WTO.

I want to tell my colleagues what will be consequence of not approving permanent normal trading relations with China. The only thing that will happen if we vote against permanent normal trading relations with China is that American farmers and all of our businesses will miss out on lower tariff rates and the other market-access concessions China will grant to farmers and businesses in other countries.

Remember, China is not just a big chunk of land; China is 20 percent of the world's population. When we talk about doing business with China, we are not talking about doing business in East Podunk; we are talking about doing business with 20 percent of the people of this Earth.

Let me explain what the PNTR vote is really about. Congress has placed conditions on our trade with China. These stipulations are not consistent with the core World Trade Organization obligations for member countries to grant each other unconditional, most-favored-nation treatment. If we do not grant permanent normal trading relations with China, thus removing the Jackson-Vanik restrictions, and if, at the same time, China eventually becomes a World Trade Organization member—and this is going to happen sooner or later—then the World Trade Organization rules will require the United States to opt out of the tariff and market access concessions we helped negotiate.

It does not hurt China, it does not hurt any of the other 137 members of the World Trade Organization, but it is going to help us because these other countries will get market access. Other countries will gain and build market share in China while the United States is sitting on the sidelines. This will be at the expense of the American soybean farmers, at the expense of the American pork producers, at the expense of the American insurance companies, and other financial service providers. You can list any segment of the American economy. I happen to list those that are very much related to the economy of my State. In the process, China—this country with 20 percent of the world's population—will not be hurt one bit, either.

Let's make it clear. Let's say somehow the Congress decides we do not want permanent normal trading relations with China, and China joins the World Trade Organization. China gets the benefit of that. All the other countries get the benefit of that. Let's say we decide to not complete the agreement with China. China is not going to be hurt one bit. In fact, hundreds of millions of Chinese consumers—20 percent of the world's population—will reap the benefits of free trade. Our farmers and businesses will surely suffer. This is not fair.

Since I am a Republican, I would like to quote a Democrat. Within the last week, before the Senate Agriculture Committee, Secretary of Agriculture Glickman said something very interesting. He said that for a couple decades we have been letting almost anything from China they want to export come into our country, with few restrictions. Yes, this open access has certainly helped our consumers. When we talk about the difficulty of getting our goods into China, we have to deal with state trading organizations, and with a lot of nontariff trade barriers. So it is quite obvious this agreement with China would be a win-win situation for the United States of America.

That is Secretary of Agriculture Glickman speaking not only about agriculture but speaking about all the

nonagricultural manufacturing products and services that we can send to that country as a result of this agreement.

Remember, the first misconception I cited is that some believe if China does not get permanent normal trading relations, that it is going to keep China from joining the World Trade Organization. But if China does get in the World Trade Organization, she will have a fairly free trade relationship with 137 other countries. And then we will not have that same agreement with China. It will be a lose-lose situation for America.

The second misconception I want to address is that even if China does get into the World Trade Organization, it will not mean that much right away for American manufacturers and American agriculture.

That is something that could not be further from the truth because we are going to reap immediate benefits from China having normal trading relations with us. As well, with China being a member of the World Trade Organization, we will benefit from that relationship with China. Because we are also in the WTO, we will benefit from what happens with the increased trade that results from that.

The fact is, China is not only a large economy, it also happens to be a very dynamic economy. Because they have made economic reforms there, China's leaders have sparked an economic renewal that has led to growth rates of 7 to 10 percent every year of the last decade, easily dwarfing the rates of our own superheated economy in the United States.

China's economy has grown 7 to 10 percent. Quite frankly, I do not know whether they want to admit this, but China's economy has to grow at least 5 percent for them to make room for all the young people coming into the workforce.

Any way you look at it—the 5 percent they have to have to keep people employed or the 7 to 10 percent they have had in recent years—there is a lot of new prosperity in China. As a consequence of this, China is buying a great deal of everything, especially agriculture products.

But because about one-third of China's economic activity is generated and controlled by state-owned enterprises, China often manipulates its markets in a way that harms its trading partners. This agreement we have with China takes care of this problem. I would like to give you an example. It is one that is well known to the soybean farmers of my own State of Iowa.

In 1992, China soybean oil consumption shot up from about 750,000 metric tons to 1.7 million metric tons. Keeping pace with this increased new demand, soybean oil imports also more than doubled.

In order to keep up with surging domestic demand, China imported more soybeans and soybean meal, much of it from the United States, and, in fact, much of it from my State of Iowa—the leading producer of soybeans of the 50 States.

When China's soybean imports hit their peak in 1997, soybean meal in the United States was trading at an average base price of about $240 per ton. This meant for a while farmers were getting a lot better price than they are now for soybeans, sometimes close to $7 per bushel. Everyone was better off. China's consumers got what they wanted. American soybean growers prospered. Of course, this is the way trade is supposed to work.

But suddenly, Chinese state-run trading companies arbitrarily shut off imports of soybeans. Soybean meal that was selling in 1997 for $240 per ton in the United States plummeted to $125 per ton by January 1999. Soybeans selling for over $7 per bushel in 1997, fell to just over $4 per bushel by last summer.

So you can imagine what happened on the farm with the loss of that income. Combined with other factors, farmers were unable to pay their bills. Many farmers who were considered by their bankers to be well off are struggling to recover. In trade, what happens in China does make a difference in the United States of America, at least with our economy.

This shows what occurs when protectionism, when trade barriers, when tariffs, and when government-run controls take the place of the free market. Trade is distorted. Consumers abroad have less choice. And American family farmers suffer. It also demonstrates how important China's entry into the World Trade Organization is for America's farmers.

With a new bilateral market access agreement in place, and with meaningful protocol agreements that should soon be in place, China will not be able to use straight state trading enterprises to arbitrarily restrict and manipulate agriculture trade, and trade in any product, for that matter.

Once China has entered the World Trade Organization, they will have to do away with those organizations that violate the principles of a free market economy because they will have to in order to get into the World Trade Organization. For the first time in history, China would be bound by enforceable international trade rules.

When we trade with other countries, we export more than farm equipment, soybeans, computer chips, insurance, banking, a lot of services. We export part of our society and what our society stands for, the American values and ideals that can be communicated sometimes in commerce, that can never be communicated by American political leaders and by American diplomats. I think the exporting of our values and our ideals is very good. This is surely good for the World Trade Organization. It is good for China. It is good for the United States. I believe it is part of the process of keeping the peace.

We seldom get a real chance in Congress to make this a better and safer world in a very large way without expending American blood and deploying American military might around the world. This is one of those rare opportunities, through commerce and through a very peaceful approach, to do something for peace around the world.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting permanent normal trading relations with China.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business Friday, March 3, 2000, the Federal debt stood at $5,742,858,530,572.10 (Five trillion, seven hundred forty-two billion, eight hundred fifty-eight million, five hundred thirty thousand, five hundred seventy-two dollars and ten cents).

One year ago, March 3, 1999, the Federal debt stood at $5,653,396,000,000 (Five trillion, six hundred fifty-three billion, three hundred ninety-six million).

Five years ago, March 3, 1995, the Federal debt stood at $4,840,473,000,000 (Four trillion, eight hundred forty billion, four hundred seventy-three million).

Twenty-five years ago, March 3, 1975, the Federal debt stood at $496,847,000,000 (Four hundred ninety-six billion, eight hundred forty-seven million) which reflects a debt increase of more than $5 trillion—$5,246,011,530,572.10 (Five trillion, two hundred forty-six billion, eleven million, five hundred thirty thousand, five hundred seventy-two dollars and ten cents) during the past 25 years.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

PESTICIDE EXPOSURE

• Mr. LIEBERMAN. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment offered by Senator BOXER to S. 1134 that would help to protect children from exposure to pesticides used in schools. In the wake of tragic incidents in schools across the nation, many people now think of school safety in terms of enhanced protection from violent crime. My colleague's amendment addresses a less visible aspect of school safety: the need to reduce environmental health hazards from pesticides.

Because of their smaller size, greater intake of food and air relative to body weight, recreational environment, and developing systems, children are at higher risk from pesticide exposure than adults. Numerous studies show

that pesticides can pose health risks to children, such as impaired cognitive skills, fatigue, burns, elevated rates of childhood leukemia, soft tissue sarcoma, and brain cancer. Pesticides can be absorbed from exposure through skin contact, inhalation, or ingestion. One recent study showed that after a single broadcast use of chlorpyrifos, a pesticide commonly used in schools, the chemical remained on children's toys and hard surfaces for two weeks, resulting in exposure 21–119 times above the current recommended safe dose.

Last year, I requested that the General Accounting Office review the federal requirements that govern the use of pesticides in schools and the existence of data on the use and incidences of illnesses related to exposure. In January when I released the GAO report, ''Use, Effects, and Alternatives to Pesticides in Schools,'' I noted that its results underscore the lack of both comprehensive information about the amount of pesticides used in our nation's schools, and data on whether pesticide exposure is adversely affecting our children's health.

In January, I called on Administrator Browner to task her agency to take immediate steps to protect children from exposure to pesticides in schools, including providing guidance to applicators and school districts on the relative exposures of different application methods, taking action to appropriately label pesticides that are being used in school environments, and consider conducting a full-scale statistical survey on the use of pesticides in schools to determine whether risks are posed to children by pesticides through cumulative exposure.

Ultimately, these measures all would lead to better information about the risks of pesticide exposure to children. However, we also need to act now to help parents protect their children in the interim. In 1999, Connecticut passed a bill requiring schools to create registries of parents who wish to be informed prior to school use of pesticides. Several other states have taken similar action. However, parents in many states still do not have access to information about when and what pesticides are being used in their children's schools. Senator BOXER's amendment would remedy this problem by ensuring that all parents receive advance notification before toxic pesticides are applied on school or day care center grounds.

In addition to supporting Senator BOXER's notification amendment, I am a cosponsor of Senator TORRICELLI's School Environment Protection Act of 1999, or SEPA, which is currently before the Agriculture Committee. In addition to recognizing the need for parental notification before pesticides are used in schools, SEPA would create a national requirement that when pesticides are used in schools, only the safest methods are followed in order to protect children. I recently visited a school system in Cheshire, Connecticut, that has very successfully implemented these methods, known as Integrated Pest Management, or IPM. The Cheshire school system works closely with local contractors, who carry out monthly visual inspections of the schools, use least toxic pesticides when required, and apply them after hours and after contacting the school nurse. SEPA would require that, like the Cheshire schools, schools nationwide ensure that pesticides are applied safely and only when alternatives have failed.

I am pleased to be able to support Senator BOXER today in her effort to help parents protect their children by reducing their exposure to potentially harmful pesticides. And I hope that there will be further opportunities to discuss the important issue of decreasing children's exposure to pesticides in schools.●

HONORING MR. JACK BUTCHER OF LOOGOOTEE, INDIANA

● Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I rise today not only on my own behalf but also on behalf of my senior colleague, Senator RICHARD LUGAR, to honor a fellow Hoosier, Mr. Jack Butcher. Mr. President, as you know, the game of basketball is synonymous with the great state of Indiana. Our affection for the game goes much deeper than the sport itself. We love the game of basketball because of the values that it instills: spirit, teamwork, dedication, and most important, hard work.

We rise today to honor Coach Jack Butcher of Loogootee, Indiana, for his great success in the game of basketball, and for his outstanding service and contributions off the court. Coach Butcher has spent the last 43 years of his life coaching, teaching and influencing the young men and women of Loogootee High School. He has taught countless students lessons about hard work and dedication that one cannot learn from a book.

On December 28, 1999, Mr. Butcher achieved a remarkable milestone in Indiana basketball history, winning his 760th career game, and becoming the all-time winningest coach in Indiana high school basketball history. Mr. President, once again, Senator LUGAR and I would like to commend Coach Jack Butcher for his outstanding contributions both on and off the hardwood. His legacy will be permanently embedded in the record books and in the hearts and minds of the people of Loogootee.●

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC–7856. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Labor, Employment and Training, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Unemployment Insurance Program Letter No. 3–95, Change 3'', received March 2, 2000; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–7857. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 1999 annual report relative to the Department's prison impact assessment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–7858. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the 1998 annual report relative of the National Institute of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–7859. A communication from the Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Legislative and Public Affairs, Agency for International Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on economic conditions in Egypt, 1998–99; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–7860. A communication from the Acting General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation relative to military construction and related activities; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–7861. A communication from the Director, Federal Register transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Prices, Availability and Official Status of Federal Register Publications'' (RIN3095–ZA02), received March 2, 2000; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–7862. A communication from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Prevailing Rate Systems; Abolishment of the Franklin, PA Nonappropriated Fund Wage Area'' (RIN3206–AJ00), received March 2, 2000; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–7863. A communication from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's report under the Government in the Sunshine Act for calendar year 1999; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–7864. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation relative to fiscal year 2001 appropriations for certain maritime and other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7865. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Atka Mackerel in the Central Aleutian District and Bering Sea Subarea of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands'', received February 25, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7866. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Trawling in Stellar Sea Lion Critical Habitat in the Central Aleutian District of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands'', received March 2, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7867. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Modification of a Closure (Opens Directed Fishing for Pacific Cod in the Western and Central Regulatory Area in the Gulf of Alaska)'', received March 2, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7868. A communication from the Associate Bureau Chief, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''1998 Biennial Regulatory Review—Amendment of Part 97 of the Commission's Amateur Service Rules'' (WT Docket No. 98–143, FCC 99–412), received March 2, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7869. A communication from the Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747–100, –200, and –300 Series Airplanes; Docket No. 99–NM–366 (2–29/3–2)'' (RIN2120–AA64) (2000–0124), received March 2, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7870. A communication from the Secretary of the Commission, Bureau of Consumer Protection, Federal Trade Commission transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Appliance Labeling Rule, 16 CFR, Part 305'' (RIN3084–AA74), received March 6, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–7871. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Health Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the feasibility and advisability of offering chiropractic health care within the Military Health System; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–7872. A communication from the Director, Financial Management, General Accounting Office transmitting, pursuant to law, the 1999 annual report of the Comptrollers' General Retirement System; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–7873. A communication from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Tentative Differential Earnings Rate'' (Notice 2000–16), received March 28, 2000; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–7874. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, U.S. Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the danger pay rate for Montenegro; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–7875. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revisions to License Exception CTP'' (RIN0694–AC14), received March 3, 2000; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–7876. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Design Considerations Handbook'' (DOE HDBK 1132–99), received March 2, 2000; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–7877. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Integrated Safety Management Systems Verification Team Leader's Handbook'' (DOE HDBK 3027–99), received March 2, 2000; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–7878. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Bentazon; Pesticide Tolerance'' (FRL #6492–7), received March 3, 2000; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–7879. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Diclosulam; Pesticide Tolerance'' (FRL #6492–3), received March 3, 2000; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–7880. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Regulatory Analysis and Development, Policy and Program Development, Animal and Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Brucellosis in Cattle; State and Area Classifications; Arkansas'' (Docket #97–108–2), received March 3, 2000; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–7881. A communication from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Abnormal Occurances Fiscal Year 1999''; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–7882. A communication from the Director, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to funding for the response to the emergency declared as a result of the severe fires in California; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–7883. A communication from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a draft of proposed legislation relative to appropriations for fiscal year 2001; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM–421. A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Buffalo, NY relative to the proposed Great Lakes Grant Program; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

POM–422. A concurrent resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Iowa relative to the lower Des Moines River; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 101

Whereas, the lower Des Moines River is one of the most important natural resources in southeast Iowa; and

Whereas, the lower Des Moines River is impacted by the reservoir at Lake Red Rock; and

Whereas, the United States Corps of Engineers is responsible for the management of the reservoir; and

Whereas, the last management plan was put into effect for the reservoir at Lake Red Rock in 1993; and

Whereas, the management plan has had a tremendous impact on the lower Des Moines River, concerning both water quality and recreation; and

Whereas, there seems to be an adverse impact on the environment due to the present management plan of Red Rock Reservoir: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, the House of Representatives concurring, That the Iowa General Assembly requests the United States Corps of Engineers to conduct a new study regarding the management of the lower Des Moines River; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this Concurrent Resolution be sent by the Secretary of the Senate to the members of Iowa's delegation, to the President of the United States, to the President of the United States Senate, and to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives.

POM–423. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of South Dakota relative to railroad cars and railroad companies operating in the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 8

Whereas, there have been numerous accidents and unnecessary fatalities at unlit and unguarded railroad crossings throughout our state; and

Whereas, means now exist by which citizens can be made aware that there are railroad cars blocking the road ahead; and

Whereas, railroad reflectorization would provide positive indication of the presence of a railroad car; and

Whereas, some of the railroads operating in the state have recognized the need for reflectorized railroad cars and have voluntarily reflectorized their railroad cars; and

Whereas, other railroads have not implemented such a reflectorization program: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Senate of the Seventy-fifth Legislature of the State of South Dakota, the House of Representatives concurring therein, That all owners of railroad cars in South Dakota and all railroad companies operating in South Dakota be hereby requested to voluntarily reflectorize their railroad cars; and be it further

Resolved, That all owners of railroad cars in South Dakota and all railroad companies operating in South Dakota be hereby requested to voluntarily adopt a policy of only leasing railroad cars that have been reflectorized; and be it further

Resolved, That the South Dakota Congressional Delegation and the Clinton Administration be hereby requested to enact legislation that would require railroads operating in the United States to reflectorize all of their railroad cars in a timely manner.

POM–424. A resolution adopted by the House of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania relative to the proposed Firefighter Investment and Response Enhancement Act; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 319

Whereas, Fire departments and their volunteer members and employees are an essential element in preserving the public order and safety in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; and

Whereas, Firefighters throughout the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania make great sacrifices on behalf of their fellow Pennsylvanians on a daily basis; and

Whereas, Federal, State and local government all share an unspoken obligation to protect the health and safety of firefighters as well as the entirety of the general public; and

Whereas, This obligation requires that fire departments have the financial resources to purchase necessary equipment and other items; and

Whereas, Fire departments constantly find themselves under increased financial constraints in the effort to provide exemplary public protection; and

Whereas, State and local governments continue to bear the overwhelming burden for funding fire departments throughout the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; therefore be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania strongly urge the United States House of Representatives and Senate to pass and enact the Firefighter Investment and Response Enhancement Act (H.R. No. 1168) and/

or similar legislation in order to provide direly needed funding for fire departments; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of each house of Congress and to each member of Congress from Pennsylvania.

POM–425. A resolution adopted by the Board of Chosen Freeholders, Cape May County, NJ relative to the disposal of contaminated materials in the Atlantic Ocean at the Mud Dump site; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

POM–426. A resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Cambridge, MA relative to the island of Vieques, PR; to the Committee on Armed Services.

POM–427. A petition from a citizen of the State of Texas relative to amendment of the Constitution; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, without amendment:

S. 1653. A bill to reauthorize and amend the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation Establishment Act (Rept. No. 106–230).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. KERRY, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. SARBANES):

S. 2181. A bill to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act to provide full funding for funding the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and to provide dedicated funding for other conservation programs, including coastal stewardship, wildlife habitat protection, State and local park and open space preservation, historic preservation, forestry conservation programs, and youth conservation corps; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. GRASSLEY:

S. 2182. A bill to reduce, suspend, or terminate any assistance under the foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Arms Export Control Act to each country determined by the President to be engaged in oil price fixing to the detriment of the United States economy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Ms. SNOWE, and Mrs. LINCOLN):

S. 2183. A bill to ensure the availability of spectrum to amateur radio operators; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCTED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. BAUCUS, Mr. KERRY, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. SARBANES):

S. 2181. A bill to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act to provide full funding for funding the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and to provide dedicated funding for other conservation programs, including coastal stewardship, wildlife habitat protection, State and local part and open space preservation, historic preservation, forestry conservation programs, and youth conservation corps; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

CONSERVATION AND STEWARDSHIP ACT

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, today I am pleased to introduce the ''Conservation and Stewardship Act,'' which is cosponsored by Senators HOLLINGS, BAUCUS, KERRY, BOXER, LIEBERMAN, BRYAN, AKAKA, LEAHY, and SARBANES. This comprehensive bill will provide permanent and dedicated funding from Outer Continental Shelf oil and gas revenues to be used for the Land and Water Conservation Fund and many other important conservation programs, including coastal, wildlife habitat, endangered species, historic preservation, State and local park and open space preservation, forestry and farmland conservation, and youth conservation corps programs. While the bill will ensure much-needed funding for many Federal conservation programs, most of the programs included in the bill will assist States, counties, or cities to implement local conservation and recreation projects. In addition, this legislation will, for the first time, fully fund the Payments In Lieu of Taxes (PILT) program, which provides payments to local governments for the loss of tax revenues resulting from Federal lands in their jurisdiction.

In developing this bill, I have tried to include a variety of programs to ensure that the benefits from OCS revenues—which are a federal resource belonging to all Americans—are equitably distributed throughout the country. While some programs in the bill are of specific interest to coastal States, others will have more application in interior areas; some programs in the bill provide funding for large cities and urban areas, while others are designed to assist rural communities. If we are to succeed in passing a comprehensive conservation bill this year, the benefits must extend to all regions of the country.

In addition, I think it's important to recognize that several very meritorious legislative proposals have already been put forward. One of my goals in developing this bill was to try and incorporate important programs from the other bills, and I am pleased that many of the sponsors of those proposals are also supporting this bill. I also want to recognize the efforts that Senator LANDRIEU, Senator MURKOWSKI, and others have made in generating support for a comprehensive conservation bill with their legislative proposal. While there are differences in our bills and in some of our funding priorities, I believe our underlying goals are the same. I am committed to working with them, and with all other interested Senators, as we try to pass a bill this year.

I would like to add that my primary goal in introducing this bill is to try and move the legislative process forward in the Senate. I think a consensus approach, such as we are proposing today, is our only chance of getting a bill enacted into law this year.

I know some have questioned why these programs—or any program—should be provided with dedicated funding. When Congress amended the LWCF Act in 1968 to credit a portion of Outer Continental Shelf oil and gas lease revenues into the fund, the premise was that at least some of the revenues from OCS oil and gas production, a non-renewable resource, should be used to protect other resources throughout the country. I think that was a wise concept then, and one we should continue to adhere to today. Along those lines, it is important that whatever programs are included in a comprehensive bill contribute to enriching the natural, cultural, or historical legacy of this country. In my opinion, such a bill is not only justifiable, but necessary if we are going to be responsible to future generations.

Mr. President, I would like to briefly describe some of the major programs that would receive dedicated funding in this bill.

Since its enactment over 35 years ago, the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act has been not only one of the most popular conservation measures ever signed into law, but one of the most far-sighted as well. Revenues deposited into the fund are used to protect our national and cultural heritage in our national parks, forests, wildlife refuges, wilderness areas, trails, wild and scenic rivers, and other important areas. In addition, the LWCF State grant program assists States in the planning, acquisition, and development of open space and outdoor recreation facilities.

However, over the past 35 years, appropriations from the LWCF have lagged far behind the amounts credited into the fund, even though demand for LWCF funding continues to increase. In fact, on average, less than half of the amounts credited to the fund have actually been authorized. Today, the fund's unappropriated balance exceeds $13 billion. History has shown that if the LWCF remains subject to the annual appropriations process, the intent of the fund will never be fulfilled. For that reason, my bill uses OCS oil and gas receipts to provide dedicated funding for the LWCF and all of the other conservation programs in the bill. The bill funds the LWCF and its fully authorized level of $900 million annually, divided equally between the Federal land acquisition and State grant programs.

In addition, I think it's important that the benefits we will get from fully

funding the LWCF not be negated by placing new restrictions on the land acquisitions in our national parks, forests and wildlife refuges. I am concerned about language in other bills on this issue which are pending in the House and Senate which would create new obstacles to protecting threatened national resources. I think a much better approach is to take the existing LWCF program, which has a proven track record, and ensure that it is adequately funded. However, I have included language which gives the Congress the ability to override proposed Federal agency expenditures, while ensuring that all of the money is actually spent for the intended purpose.

Likewise, I believe it's important that new restrictions not be placed on States for the use of the funds they receive under the State grant program. Although some have proposed to restructure the State program, I think the flexibility given to States in the current law is appropriate, and States should continue to determine how to allocate LWCF funds for recreational and open space needs, consistent with the requirements of the Act and with review by the Secretary of the Interior.

Title II of the Conservation and Stewardship Act provides funding to protect and restore our fragile coastal resources. It establishes the Ocean and Coast Conservation Fund, and dedicates $365 million annually, primarily to States, to address a broad array of coastal and marine conservation needs. This fund is administered by the Secretary of Commerce. The bill also establishes the Outer Continental Shelf Impact Assistance Fund, administered by the Secretary of the Interior, to provide $100 million annually to Coastal States suffering negative environmental impacts from oil and gas production on the OCS.

The Ocean and Coast Conservation Fund addresses four programs. The first account within the fund allocates $250 million to Coastal States for a broad range of coastal and marine conservation activities which ensure protection for coral reefs, wetlands, estuaries and marine species. The second account allocates $25 million to Coastal States to fund joint marine enforcement agreements between States and the Secretary of Commerce, thereby increasing enforcement capabilities for both Federal and State marine resource protection laws. The third account gives $75 million to Coastal States to fund fisheries research and management. The fourth account allocates $15 million to the Secretary of Commerce for the protection of coral reefs. A complementary program for protection of coral resources under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior is contained in Title VI of my bill as described further below.

Although other bills have been introduced which also address coastal funding, I believe the Ocean and Coast Conservation Fund contains several significant advantages. First, it requires that all money received under this fund be used only for the protection of the marine and coastal environment. Second, it ties the amount of money States will receive to demonstrated conservation need rather than the amount of production occurring offshore the State, or a State's or county's proximity to that production. In this manner, my bill refrains from allowing money from this fund to be used as an incentive to begin or increase production in the Federal OCS. My bill also excludes revenues from leases included within areas covered by a moratorium on leasing.

The Outer Continental Shelf Impact Assistance Fund allocates $100 million specifically to address the needs of those Coastal States which have hosted Federal OCS oil and gas production off their shores, and which have suffered negative environmental impacts from that production. Funds are distributed based on shoreline miles and coastal population (25 percent each) and the amount of production occurring offshore the Coastal State (50 percent). States can use the money only to mitigate adverse environmental impacts directly attributable to the development of oil and gas resources of the OCS.

The bill also establishes a separate Coral Reef Resources Restoration Fund. This fund provides $15 million annually to the Secretary of the Interior for the protection of coral reef resources under the jurisdiction of the Secretary. The bill authorizes the Secretary to make grants, not to exceed 75 percent of the total costs, for projects which promote the viability of coral reef systems under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior. Grants would be available to natural resource agencies of States or Territories, educational or non-governmental institutions, or organizations with demonstrated expertise in the conservation of coral reefs.

Like many of the other comprehensive conservation proposals, my bill includes significant new funding to assist States in protecting wildlife habitat. The Conservation and Stewardship Act includes a $350 million annual increase in deposits into the Pittman-Robertson fund, to help fund a broad variety of wildlife conservation programs, with an emphasis on protecting habitat for non-game species.

In addition, the bill establishes a new $50 million fund to protect threatened and endangered species. Under the program, the Secretary of the Interior would be authorized to enter into agreements with private landowners to protect habitat for threatened and endangered species. This incentive program would assist landowners who voluntarily agree to take protective actions beyond what is required under existing law.

In addition to the funds provided for Federal and State programs through the Land and Water Conservation Fund, the Conservation and Stewardship Act provides funding for several programs to assist States, local governments, and other organizations in the protection of open space. The bill includes $50 million in funding for the Forest Legacy Program, $50 million for the Farmland Protection Program, and $50 million for a new program to allow for the voluntary acquisition of conservation easements to prevent ranchlands from being converted to non-agricultural uses.

The bill also includes $125 million for a new grant program to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior to help States conserve, on a matching basis, non-Federal lands or waters of clear regional or national interest.

Presently, OCS revenues are credited to only two funds: the Land and Water Conservation Fund and the Historic Preservation Fund. Like the LWCF, appropriations from the HPF have lagged far behind the $150 million that is annually credited to the fund. The Conservation and Stewardship Act will, for the first time, ensure that the fully authorized amount is expended. In addition, the bill requires that at least half of the fund, $75 million, be available to States, tribes, and local governments to allow them to better carry out their responsibilities under the National Historic Preservation Act. The bill also requires that at least 50 percent of the Federal funds spent under the program be used for the restoration of historic properties.

The bill also funds the American Battlefield Protection Program at $15 million per year, fulfilling recommendations made by the Civil War Sites Advisory Commission. Funding would be available for preservation assistance for all types of battlefields, although with respect to Civil War battlefields, the funding priority would be for ''Priority 1'' battlefields identified in the Civil War Sites Advisory Commission's report.

Mr. President, it is well known that many of the natural and historic resources in the parks and historic sites of our National Park System are facing significant threats, especially given the limited funds available to the Park Service to address this issue. In an attempt to improve this problem, the Conservation and Stewardship Act creates a new ''National Park System Resource Protection Fund'' and provides $150 million in annual funding. Moneys from the fund are available to the Secretary of the Interior to protect significant natural, cultural or historical resources in units of the National Park System that are threatened by activities occurring inside or outside of the park boundaries. The Secretary is also authorized to enter into cooperative agreements with State and local governments and other organizations to address these threats. In addition, the bill makes clear that the fund cannot be used to fund land acquisitions, permanent employee salaries, road construction, or projects which already receive funding through the Recreational Fee Demonstration Program.

Like many of the other programs included in this bill, the Urban Parks and Recreation Recovery Program is a program with overwhelming demand and, in recent years, little or non-existent funding. In an effort to revitalize this program, the Conservation and Stewardship Act provides $75 million in dedicated funding each year for UPARR programs, a significant increase over recent appropriations.

I think it is important that a comprehensive conservation bill focus not only on land acquisition and other resource conservation programs, but also on improving the tie between these resources and local communities. I have included funding for four programs to assist the way communities, including young people, work with public and private partners to plan and take action for the long-term stewardship and maintenance of lands and resources.

Dedicated funding for the Youth Conservation Corps and related partnerships will enable us to make significant investments in two of our country's most valuable treasures—our natural resources and our young people. The investments in our youth and our natural resources can grow together and benefit one another.

The Youth Conservation Corps, and related partnerships with nonprofit, State, and local youth conservation corps (''YCC''), are administered by the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior. It is clear that they are successful and popular programs. The demand for summer conservation jobs for youth overwhelmingly exceeds the supply. Over the past twenty years, a lack of adequate funding has been the biggest obstacle preventing YCC from realizing an even greater level of success.

Our parks, forests, wildlife refuges, and other public lands benefit because important conservation projects are completed at a lower cost. Our youth, on summer break from school, benefit by engaging in positive and meaningful activities. There are many types of projects that youth complete—construction, maintenance, reconstruction, restoration, repair, or rehabilitation of natural, cultural, historic, archaeological, recreational, or scenic resources.

Senator Scoop Jackson was the sponsor of the original legislation that created the YCC. He had the foresight and vision to create opportunities for young people to complete conservation and restoration projects on our public lands. The bill I am introducing today will enable us to embrace Senator Jackson's legacy by fully funding YCC, thereby achieving the levels of participation that existed during his tenure in the Senate.

Last year, the National Parks, Historic Preservation, and Recreation Subcommittee held an oversight hearing on YCC and related partnerships. Both National Park Service Director Stanton, on behalf of the Department of the Interior, and Forest Service Chief Dombeck expressed enthusiastic support for these programs. Similarly, over the past year I have learned that strong bipartisan Congressional support exists for YCC and related partnerships.

All of our country's public lands will benefit from these programs. The existing authorizing law includes a State grant component as well as opportunities for projects to be completed on public lands other than Federal lands.

I have a letter that I will submit for the record from the National Association of Service and Conservation Corps and the Student Conservation Association supporting inclusion of the YCC provision in this bill. Partnerships between members of these organizations and the Federal land management agencies seem to be the most cost effective and efficient way to maximize both the number of conservation projects and the youth who complete them. Dedicated funding will ensure that existing partnerships are maintained while also allowing for the creation of new partnerships across the country.

The Forest Service's Economic Action Program (''EAP'') assists rural forest-dependent communities to foster stronger links between the health of forests and the well-being of communities. It is an important complement to land acquisition under the LWCF, helping rural communities to effectively participate in plans and actions that affect the future management of public and private forest lands.

One of the most important aspects of EAP is the emphasis on helping communities organize and develop their own broad-based local action plans. This is the first step in enabling a community to build a sustainable future based on the integration of economic, social, and environmental objectives. Communities can then focus on organizing, planning, and implementing natural resource based projects contained in their plans. Projects range from tourism and value-added manufacturing to historic preservation.

In addition to the planning component, EAP also helps communities to build rural business infrastructure to better use and market the byproducts of ecosystem restoration; strengthen, diversify, and expand their local economies; improve transportation networks for forest-based products; and increase their access to technology through partnerships. Projects range from tourism and value-added manufacturing to historic preservation.

EAP's focus is to promote self-sufficiency by leveraging small grants for capacity building. Many recipients of these grants are able to start forest-based small businesses with the Forest Service's technical and financial assistance. The Forest Service is the best, often the only, delivery mechanism because Forest Service personnel are already located and established in these communities.

As evidenced by a recent oversight hearing before the Subcommittee on Forests and Public Land Management, the Economic Action programs are strongly supported by rural communities across the country. Lack of adequate and consistent funding is the primary obstacle that has prohibited these programs from achieving even greater levels of success.

I ask unanimous consent to place a letter in the RECORD from American Forests supporting inclusion of this program in the bill that I am introducing today. The National Network of Forest Practitioners also has expressed support for EAP in testimony before Congress for several years.

Urban and Community Forestry is an important program that has been overlooked in other recent legislative proposals. Through this program, the Forest Service works with national groups and networks, such as American Forests and the Alliance for Community Trees, and with local governments, community groups, and private businesses in hundreds of rural communities and cities across the country to heighten awareness of the ecological benefits that trees and forests provide.

Urban and community forests provide tremendous value to communities in terms of ''ecological services,'' such as filtering air pollutants, cleaning drinking water, managing stormwater flows, and reducing energy consumption. Recent losses in tree and forest cover in communities in the United States translate into billions of dollars of lost value in terms of ecological services.

The Urban and Community Forestry Program is the key Federal program assessing and highlighting the significant environmental values associated with urban forests and helping communities plan and take action to preserve, restore, and maintain their green infrastructure. It is a capacity-building program, providing Federal technical and financial assistance to communities and empowering them to plan and take action for themselves, while strongly leveraging the Federal assistance.

This program complements the LWCF and other programs currently included in other legislative proposals to provide increased funding for conservation. This program could deliver increased levels of success with an increased and predictable level of funding.

My bill also provides full funding for the Payment In Lieu of Taxes Program. This program, like many of the others in this bill, is generally funded at far below its authorized level. The program compensates units of local governments, primarily counties, for the loss of tax revenues due to the presence of Federal lands within their jurisdiction, and recognizes the important partnership between the Federal government and local governments in any national conservation effort.

Mr. President, I have received letter from a broad coalition of environmental, conservation, and historic preservation groups in support of this

legislation. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 6, 2000.

Hon. JEFF BINGAMAN,
Hart Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR BINGAMAN: All of the environmental and preservation organizations listed below are writing to thank you for your leadership in introducing the Conservation and Stewardship Act of 2000 and to express our strong support. Your bill is an excellent piece of legislation that achieves the objective of providing permanent mandatory funding for a number of critical conservation needs including: the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF); the Historic Preservation Fund (HPF); acquisition of non-federal lands of regional or national interest; coastal restoration; state wildlife conservation; endangered species protection; preservation of our national parks; urban recreation and forestry; conservation easements for farm, forest, and ranch land; and important rural assistance programs.

We are especially grateful that the Conservation and Stewardship Act of 2000 achieves these vital objectives while addressing important concerns that the environmental community has identified in other legislative efforts to achieve these same ends. We look forward to working with you, the President, and other leaders to ensure passage of sound conservation funding legislation in this Congress. Again, we deeply appreciate your leadership on this legislation.

Sincerely,

Defenders of Wildlife; Environmental Defense; Friends of the Earth; League of Conservation Voters; National Parks Conservation Association; Natural Resources Defense Council; National Trust for Historic Preservation; Scenic America; Sierra Club; The Wilderness Society; U.S. Public Interest Research Group; World Wildlife Fund.

NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION,
Washington, DC, March 6, 2000.

Hon. JEFF BINGAMAN,
Hart Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR BINGAMAN: On behalf of the National Wildlife Federation and our millions of members and supporters, I want to thank you for introducing the Conservation and Stewardship Act and express our strong support for this important legislation. This bill would make an historic contribution to conservation by providing substantial and reliable funding for the protection and restoration of our nation's wildlife; public lands; coastal and marine resources; historic and cultural treasures; state, local and urban parks and recreation programs; and open space.

As you know, the House Resources Committee has approved similar legislation, H.R. 701 the Conservation and Reinvestment Act, which was recently introduced by Chairman Frank Murkowski and Senator Mary Landrieu as S. 2123. Like your bill, H.R. 701/S. 2123 would provide permanent funding to a variety of important conservation programs. The National Wildlife Federation is supporting H.R. 701/S. 2123 while seeking key changes to improve the bill. Many of the changes we are seeking in H.R. 701/S. 2123 are already in your bill.

We are eager to see the sponsors of these related bills work together to find a proposal that can be passed by the Senate and enacted into law.

The National Wildlife Federation looks forward to working with you, the President, and other leaders to ensure passage of sound conservation funding legislation in this Congress. Again, we deeply appreciate your leadership on this legislation.

Sincerely,

STEVEN J. SHIMBERG,
Vice President, Office of Federal and International Affairs.

THE TRUST FOR PUBLIC LAND,
San Francisco, CA, March 6, 2000.

Hon. JEFF BINGAMAN,
Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR BINGAMAN: On behalf of The Trust for Public Land and our many land conservation partners across America, I am writing to thank you for your promotion of legislation that would bring important new substance and certainty to our national investment in resource land protection.

We are gratified that the Conservation and Stewardship Act you introduce today would institute structural revisions to the Land & Water Conservation Fund to ensure full annual funding of LWCF's currently authorized but only partly realized potential to protect federal lands—including our irreplaceable national parks, forests, wildlife refuges, and other public land treasures—and to provide urgently needed grants for state and local parkland and recreation partnerships. We also deeply appreciate the new federal tools your legislation would provide for the protection of threatened ranchlands and non-federal lands of regional and national significance; the enhancements it would afford to such other existing programs as the Forest Legacy Program, the Farmland Protection Program, the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Act, and the Urban and Community Forestry Program; and its additional provisions to protect natural, cultural, recreational, and other crucial resources. And we are encouraged that your direct approach to establishing this lasting commitment to our nation's legacy of open spaces avoids new procedural complexities.

I am therefore pleased to offer The Trust for Public Land's support for the Conservation and Stewardship Act, and for your outstanding efforts to protect America's most vital resources. We look forward to working with you, as the legislative process unfolds this year, to secure permanent, stable funding for these vital programs.

Sincerely,

ALAN FRONT,
Senior Vice President.

AMERICAN FORESTS,
Washington, DC, March 6, 2000.

Hon. JEFF BINGAMAN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR BINGAMAN: I am writing to express our support for the bill you are introducing today, the Conservation and Stewardship Act. There is a great need for stronger and more consistent annual investment in programs that protect, restore, and maintain lands and resources, and we believe your bill is an excellent vehicle for working toward this objective. We are especially pleased that the bill includes three programs administered by the USDA Forest Service—the Urban and Community Forestry Program, Forest Legacy Program, and Economic Action Programs. These programs complement the land acquisition elements of other Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) bills by providing for the ongoing stewardship of lands and resources.

American Forests is the oldest national nonprofit conservation organization in the U.S. Since 1875, we have worked with scientists, resource managers, policymakers, and citizens to promote policies and programs that help people improve the environment with trees and forests. We partner with public and private organizations in communities around the country providing technical information and resources to leverage local actions. Our Global ReLeaf campaign, which raises private funds and provides grants to local organizations for ecosystem restoration projects, has helped people plant more than 12 million trees since 1990.

The three programs I cited above focus on helping communities plan and take action for the long-term maintenance, or stewardship, of lands and resources. The Urban and Community Forestry Program provides technical and financial assistance to local governments and community groups around the country to develop plans and actions to protect and maintain "green infrastructure" and deal with sprawl and quality-of-life issues. Forest Legacy helps communities work with willing private forest landowners to confront development pressures through the use of conservation easements which allow landowners to maintain their forests in conservation uses. The Economic Action Programs assist rural forest-dependent communities to effectively participate in plans and actions affecting public and private forests, and to foster stronger links between the health of the forest and the well-being of communities.

We appreciate your leadership in calling attention to the need to increase support for stewardship programs while Congress is considering major new public investments in conservation programs through the LWCF. If we can be of any assistance with respect to your new bill, we stand ready to help.

Sincerely,

DEBORAH GANGLOFF,
Executive Director.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SERVICE AND CONSERVATION CORPS,
Washington, DC, March 6, 2000.
STUDENT CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION,
Charlestown, NH, March 6, 2000.

Hon. JEFF BINGAMAN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR BINGAMAN: The National Association of Service and Conservation Corps and the Student Conservation Association join in thanking you for your leadership in finding a means of support for youth partnership programs on the nation's public lands.

Together, we wish to announce our strong support for the legislation you are introducing today that will establish a $60 million Youth Conservation Corps Fund with Outer Continental Shelf revenue, and which will take numerous other steps in support of essential Federal, state, and local conservation measures and programs.

State and local conservation and service corps in 31 states and the District of Columbia, as well as participants in the Student Conservation Association's programs nationwide, can look forward to the opportunity to work hard while providing conservation service that benefits the entire nation, thanks to this legislation.

We applaud your efforts and look forward to working with you to transform this vision into a reality that benefits the nation's youth and natural resources.

Sincerely yours,

KATHLEEN SELZ,
President, NASCC.
DALE PENNY,
President, SCA.

ALLIANCE FOR COMMUNITY TREES,
Dallas, TX, August 16, 1999.

Re support for the USDA Forest Service's Urban & Community Forestry Program to be part of the land and water conservation reauthorization bill.

Hon. JEFF BINGAMAN,
Budget Committee, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR BINGAMAN: The Miller/Young Land and Water Conservation Fund reauthorization bill includes funding for the Department of Interiors' Urban Parks Recovery Program (UPARR) but does not include any funding for the Forest Service's Urban and Community Forestry Program (U&CF).

While UPARR will address some of the basic physical components of the bill, it will not begin to touch the urban work needed to make the program a success in the community. The U&CF Program address's the community-based work and issues such as urban sprawl and natural resources and ecosystems.

We believe that the delivery system for the U&CF program has a wider audience, reaching Federal and State governments in all 50 states, as well as partners in the grassroots nonprofit community. The UPARR delivery system is strictly through the Federal government and in only 400 specific cities. The Alliance for Community Trees (ACT) members alone represents over 75 million Americans in twenty-eight states. ACT also partners with federal, state and local partners in every facet of the communities in which they serve. In addition, the Alliance for Community Trees groups, in partnership with the government agencies, will help address the human elements to the program through community outreach, technical assistance and volunteer opportunities. Lastly, we believe that the funding will be more productively spent through a coordinated effort of both UPARR and the U&CF Program.

Sincerely,

SUZANNE PROBART,
Issues Committee.

TREE NEW MEXICO, INC.,
Albuquerque, NM, August 16, 1999.

Re: Support for urban & community forestry programs in New Mexico through the proposed land and water conservation reauthorization bills.

Hon. JEFF BINGAMAN,
Budget Committee, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR BINGAMAN: Tree New Mexico (TNM) is New Mexico's premier nonprofit grassroots tree planting and education organization whose full-time programs offer volunteer tree planting opportunities, education and training to all NM citizens. Since 1990, Tree New Mexico has planted over 575,000 trees in urban, riparian, rural areas statewide. In addition, TNM's education program delivers environmental education and specialty training to over 6,000 New Mexico's children annually.

The various Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) reauthorization bills (H.R. 701—Young/Dingell, H.R. 798–Miller, S. 25—Landrieu/Murkowski, S. 446—Boxer, and S. 532—Feinstein) all included funding for conservation programs, land acquisition and park infrastructure through the Dept. of Interiors' Urban Parks Recovery Program (UPARR). Tree New Mexico recommends that the USDA Forest Service's Urban and Community Forestry Program (U&CF) is included in LWCF funding bill. While UPARR will address some of the basic physical components of the bill, it will not begin to touch the urban work needed to make the program a success in the community. In addition, the UPARR delivery system is strictly through the Federal government and in only 400 specific cities. With the exception of perhaps Albuquerque, we do not feel this will benefit New Mexico very well.

The delivery system for the U&CF program has a wider audience, reaching Federal and State governments in all 50 states, as well as partners in the grassroots nonprofit community—like Tree New Mexico. The U&CF Program addresses the green infrastructure—trees and landscaping! Who would want to play ball or spend time in a park with no trees? We believe that the funding will be more productively spent through a coordinated effort of both UPARR and the U&CF Program.

Tree New Mexico respectfully urges you to take a leadership role by encouraging the committee to request that the Urban & Community Forestry Program receive funding from the Land & Water Conservation Fund for the benefit of all New Mexicans.

Sincerely,

SUZANNE PROBART,
Executive Director.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Let me conclude by particularly thanking David Brooks, Mary Katherine Ishee, and Bob Simon, who are all on the staff of our Energy and Natural Resources Committee. They have done yeoman's work in getting this bill prepared for introduction and obtaining the support of many of the Senators who are cosponsors on the bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the bill I have introduced today be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2181

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 ''Conservation and Stewardship Act''.

TITLE I—LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Land and Water Conservation Fund Act Amendments of 2000''.

SEC. 102. LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND AMENDMENTS.

(a) PERMANENT APPROPRIATION INTO THE FUND.—Section 2 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 460*l*–5) is amended—

(1) in the first paragraph by striking ''During the period ending September 30, 2015, there'' and inserting ''There'';

(2) in paragraph (c)(1) by striking ''not less than'' and all that follows through the end of the paragraph and inserting ''not less than $900,000,000 for each fiscal year.''; and

(3) in paragraph (c)(2) by striking ''shall be credited'' and all that follows through the end of the paragraph and inserting ''shall be deposited into the fund from qualified Outer Continental Shelf revenues (as that term is defined in section 2(u) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331(u)) (as amended by the Coastal Stewardship Act of 2000)). Such moneys shall only be used to carry out the purposes of this Act.''.

(b) PERMANENT FUNDING AUTHORITY.—Section 3 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 460*l*–6) is amended to read as follows:

''Of amounts in the fund, $900,000,000 shall be available each fiscal year for obligation or expenditure in accordance with section 5 of this Act. Such funds shall be made available without further appropriation, and shall remain available until expended. Other moneys in the fund shall be available for expenditure only when appropriated therefor. Such appropriations may be made without fiscal year limitation.''.

(c) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.—Section 5 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 460*l*–7) is amended to read as follows:

''Fifty percent of the funds made available each fiscal year shall be used for Federal land acquisition purposes as provided in section 7 of this Act, and fifty percent shall be used for financial assistance to States as provided in section 6 of this Act.''.

(d) STATE FUNDING ALLOCATIONS.—Section 6(b) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 460*l*–8(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''Sums appropriated and available'' and inserting ''Amounts made available'';

(2) by striking paragraph (1) in its entirety and inserting the following:

''(1) Eighty percent of the amounts made available shall be apportioned as follows:

''(A) Sixty percent shall be apportioned equally among the several States;

''(B) Twenty percent shall be apportioned on the basis of the ratio which the population of each State bears to the total population of the United States; and

''(C) Twenty percent shall be apportioned on the basis of the urban population in each State (as defined by Metropolitan Statistical Areas).''; and

(3) in paragraph (2) by striking ''At any time, the remaining appropriation'' and inserting ''The remaining allocation''.

(e) FEDERAL LAND ACQUISITION PROJECTS.—Section 7(a) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 460*l*–9(a)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''Moneys appropriated'' and all that follows through ''subpurposes'' and inserting the following:

''(1)(A) The President shall transmit, as part of the annual budget proposal, a priority list for Federal land acquisition projects. Funds shall be made available from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, without further appropriation, 15 days after the date the Congress adjourns sine die for each year, for the projects identified on the President's priority list, unless prior to such date, legislation is enacted establishing a different priority list.

''(B) If Congress enacts legislation establishing an alternate priority list, and such priority list funds less than the annual authorized funding amount identified in section 5, the difference between the authorized funding amount and the alternate priority list shall be available for expenditure, without further appropriation, in accordance with the priority list submitted by the President.

''(C)(1) In developing the annual land acquisition priority list, the President shall require the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to develop the priority list for the sites under each Secretary's jurisdiction. The Secretaries shall prepare the lists in consultation with the head of each affected bureau or agency, taking into account the best professional judgment regarding the land acquisition priorities and policies of each bureau or agency.

''(2) In preparing the lists referred to in paragraph (1), the Secretaries shall ensure that not less than $5 million is made available each year for the acquisition of easements, on a willing seller basis, to provide for non-motorized access to public lands for hunting, fishing, and other recreational purposes.

''(D) Amounts made available from the fund for Federal land acquisition projects shall be used for the purposes and subpurposes identified in paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) of this subsection.''; and

(2) by redesignating subsequent paragraphs accordingly.

SEC. 102. NON-FEDERAL LANDS OF REGIONAL OR NATIONAL INTEREST.

Title I of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 460*l*-4 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 14. NON-FEDERAL LANDS OF REGIONAL OR NATIONAL INTEREST.

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF FUND.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a fund which shall be known as the ''Non-Federal Lands of Regional or National Interest Fund'' (in this section referred to as the ''fund''). There shall be deposited into the fund $125,000,000 in fiscal year 2001 and each fiscal year thereafter from qualified Outer Continental Shelf Revenues (as that term is defined in section 2(u) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331(u)) (as amended by the Coastal Stewardship Act of 2000)). Such moneys shall be used only to carry out the purposes of this section.

''(b) EXPENDITURES.—(1) Of the amounts in the fund, $125,000,000 shall be available each year to the Secretary of the Interior for obligation or expenditure in accordance with this section. Such funds shall be available without further appropriation, subject to the requirements of this section, and shall remain available until expended.

''(2) The Secretary shall prepare, as part of the annual budget proposal, a priority list for grant projects to be funded under this section, from among the applications submitted pursuant to subsection (c). Moneys shall be available from the fund, without further appropriation, 15 days after the date Congress adjourns sine die each year, for the projects specified on the priority list, unless prior to such date, legislation is enacted establishing a different priority list.

''(c) GRANTS TO STATES.—(1) A State may submit an application to the Secretary for a grant to fund the conservation of non-Federal lands or waters of clear regional or national interest.

''(2) In determining whether to recommend the award of a grant under this section, the Secretary shall consider, on a competitive basis, the extent to which a proposed conservation project described in the grant application will conserve the natural, historic, cultural, and recreational values of the non-Federal lands or waters to be protected.

''(3) The Secretary shall give preference to proposed conservation projects—

''(A) that seek to protect ecosystems;

''(B) that are developed in collaboration with other States, or with private persons or entities; or

''(C) that are complementary to conservation or restoration programs undertaken on Federal lands.

''(4) A grant awarded to a State under this subsection shall cover not more than 50 percent of the total cost of the conservation project.''.

TITLE II—COASTAL STEWARDSHIP

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Coastal Stewardship Act of 2000.''

SEC. 202. AMENDMENT TO OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF LANDS ACT.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 2 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(r) As used in sections 31 and 32, the term ''coastline'' has the meaning given such term in section 2(c) of the Submerged Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1301(c));

''(s) As used in sections 31 and 32, the term ''Coastal State'' has the same meaning given such term in section 304(4) of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1453(4));

''(t) As used in sections 31 and 32, the term ''leased tract'' means a tract, maintained under section 6 or leased under section 8 for the purposes of drilling for, developing and producing oil and natural gas resources, which is a unit consisting of either a block, a portion of a block, a combination of blocks or portions of blocks (or both), as specified in the lease, and as depicted on an Outer Continental Shelf Official Protraction Diagram;

''(u) As used in sections 31 and 32, the term ''qualified Outer Continental Shelf revenues'' means all amounts received by the United States as bonus bids, rents, royalties (including payments for royalty taken in kind and sold), net profit share payments, and related late payment interest from natural gas and oil leases issued pursuant to section 8 or maintained under section 6, accruing from each leased tract or portion of a leased tract, the geographic center of which lies within a distance of 200 miles from any part of the coastline of any Coastal State. It shall not include amounts from any leased tract or portion of a leased tract which is included within any area of the Outer Continental Shelf where a moratorium on new leasing was in effect as of January 1, 1999, unless the leased tract or portion of leased tract was issued prior to the establishment of the moratorium and is in production as of January 1, 2000. For each leased tract or portion of a leased tract lying within the zone defined and governed by section 8(g), and to which section 8(g) applies, the term ''qualified Outer Continental Shelf revenues'' shall include only amounts remaining after payment has been to States in accordance with section 8(g).''.

(b) OCEAN AND COAST CONSERVATION.—The Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 31. OCEAN AND COAST CONSERVATION FUND.

''(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF FUND.—(1) There is established in the Treasury of the United States a fund which shall be known as the ''Ocean and Coast Conservation Fund'' (in this section referred to as the ''fund''). There shall be deposited into the fund $365,000,000 from qualified Outer Continental Shelf revenues in fiscal year 2001 and each fiscal year thereafter. Such moneys shall be used only to carry out the purposes of this section.

''(2) Of the amounts in the fund, $365,000,000 shall be available each fiscal year for obligation or expenditure in accordance with this section. Such funds shall be made available to the Secretary of Commerce without further appropriation, subject to the requirements of this section, and shall remain available until expended.

''(b) ALLOCATION OF FUNDS.—Notwithstanding section 9, the Secretary of Commerce shall allocate funds available under this section as follows:

''(1) for uses identified in subsection (c), $250,000,000;

''(2) for uses identified in subsection (d), $25,000,000;

''(3) for uses identified in subsection (e), $75,000,000; and

''(4) for uses identified in subsection (f), $15,000,000.

''(c) COASTAL STEWARDSHIP.—(1) The Secretary of Commerce shall allocate among all Coastal States the funds available under subsection (b)(1) as follows:

''(A) 25 percent of the funds under this subsection shall be allocated based on the ratio of the coastline miles of the Coastal State to the coastline miles of all Coastal States;

''(B) 25 percent of the funds under this subsection shall be allocated based on the ratio of the coastal population of the Coastal State to the coastal population of all Coastal States;

''(C) 50 percent of the funds under this subsection shall be allocated based on the demonstrated conservation and protection needs of the Coastal State for coastal stewardship uses as determined under this subsection.

''(2) The Secretary of Commerce, in accordance with the requirements of this section, shall determine the allocation each State is entitled to receive based on demonstrated conservation and protection need under subsection (c)(1)(C).

''(3) To be eligible to receive moneys under subsection (c)(1)(C), a Coastal State must submit to the Secretary of Commerce an application demonstrating the conservation and protection needs of the Coastal State. Such application shall indicate how moneys received from that portion of the fund would be used in accordance with the allowable uses identified in this subsection. This application shall be submitted as part of the plan required under subsection (c)(6) and in accordance with the requirements of that subsection.

''(4) In determining the allocation of moneys based on demonstrated conservation and protection need as provided in subsection (c)(1)(C), priority shall be given to activities and plans—

''(A) which support and are consistent with National Estuary programs, National Estuarine Research Reserve programs, the National Marine Sanctuary Act, the Coastal Zone Management Act, and other State or Federal laws governing the conservation or restoration of coastal or marine fish habitat;

''(B) which promote coastal conservation, restoration, or water quality protection on a watershed or regional basis; or

''(C) which address coastal conservation needs created by seasonal or otherwise transient fluctuations in population in Coastal States.

''(5) Coastal States shall use moneys received under this subsection only for—

''(A) the conservation or protection of coastal and marine habitats including wetlands, estuaries, and coral reefs;

''(B) projects to remove abandoned vessels or marine debris that may adversely affect coastal habitat or living marine resources;

''(C) the reduction or monitoring of coastal polluted runoff or other coastal contaminants;

''(D) addressing watershed protection including conservation needs which cross jurisdictional boundaries;

''(E) the assessment, research, mapping and monitoring of coastal and marine habitats.

''(F) addressing coastal conservation needs associated with seasonal or otherwise transient fluctuations in coastal populations;

''(G) the establishment, monitoring or assessment of marine protected areas.

''(6) To be eligible to receive moneys under this subsection, a Coastal State must submit to the Secretary of Commerce a plan detailing the uses to which the Coastal State will put all funds received under this subsection. The plan shall be developed with public input, and must certify that uses set forth in the plan comply with all applicable Federal and State laws, including environmental laws. Each plan shall consider ways to use funds received under this subsection to assist local governments, non-profit organizations, or public institutions with activities or programs consistent with this subsection.

''(7) No funds under this subsection shall be made available to a Coastal State until the Secretary of Commerce has affirmatively found that all uses proposed by a Coastal

State are consistent with the purposes and requirements of this subsection.

''(d) COOPERATIVE ENFORCEMENT USES.—(1) The Governor of a State represented on an Interstate Fisheries Commission may apply to the Secretary of Commerce for execution of a cooperative enforcement agreement with the Secretary of Commerce. Cooperative agreements between the Secretary of Commerce and such States shall authorize the deputization of State law enforcement officers with marine law enforcement responsibilities, to perform duties of the Secretary of Commerce relating to any law enforcement provision of any marine resource laws enforced by the Secretary of Commerce, including the National Marine Sanctuaries Act. Such cooperative enforcement agreements shall be consistent with the purposes and intent of section 311(a) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1861(a)), to the extent applicable to the regulated activities, and may include specifications for joint management responsibilities as provided by section 1 of Public Law 91–412 (15 U.S.C. 1525).

''(2) Upon receiving an application meeting the requirements of this subsection, the Secretary of Commerce shall enter into the cooperative enforcement agreement with the requesting State.

''(3) Consistent with the fund amounts contained in subsection (b)(2), The Secretary of Commerce shall include in each cooperative enforcement agreement an allocation of funds to assist in management of the agreement. The allocation shall be equitably distributed among all States participating in cooperative enforcement agreements under this subsection, based upon consideration of the specific marine conservation enforcement needs of each participating State. Such agreement may provide for amounts to be withheld by the Secretary of Commerce for the cost of any technical or other assistance provided to the State by the Secretary of Commerce under the agreement.

''(e) COOPERATIVE RESEARCH AND MANAGEMENT USES.—The Governor of any State represented on an Interstate Marine Fishery Commission may apply to the Secretary of Commerce for the execution of a research and management agreement, on a sole source basis, for the purpose of undertaking eligible projects required for the effective management of living marine resources of the United States. Upon determining that the application meets the requirements of this subsection, the Secretary of Commerce shall enter into such agreement. Such agreement may provide for amounts to be withheld by the Secretary of Commerce for the cost of any technical or other assistance provided to the State by the Secretary of Commerce under the agreement.

''(2) The Secretary of Commerce shall allocate to States participating in a research and management agreement under this subsection funds to assist in implementing the agreement, consistent with the amounts available under subsection (b)(3).

''(3) For purposes of this subsection, eligible projects are those which address critical needs identified in fishery management reports or plans developed and approved by a State, Marine Fisheries Commission, Regional Fishery Management Council, or other regional or tribal entity, charged with management and conservation of living marine resources, and that pertain to—

''(A) the collection and analysis of fishery data and information, including data on landings, fishing effort, biology, habitat, economics and social changes, including those information needs identified pursuant to section 401 of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1881); or

''(B) the development of measures to promote innovative or cooperative management of fisheries.

''(4) In making funds available under this subsection, the Secretary of Commerce shall give priority to eligible projects that meet any of the following criteria:

''(A) establishment of observer programs;

''(B) cooperative research projects developed among States, academic institutions, and the fishing industry, to obtain data or other information necessary to meet national or regional management priorities;

''(C) projects to reduce harvesting capacity performed in a manner consistent with section 312(b) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery and Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 1862(b));

''(D) projects designed to identify ecosystem impacts of fishing, including the relationship between fishing harvest and marine mammal population abundance; and

''(E) projects for the identification, conservation or restoration of fish habitat.

''(5) Within 90 days of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce shall adopt procedures necessary to implement this section.

''(f) CORAL REEF PROTECTION.—The Secretary of Commerce shall use amounts provided in subsection (b)(4) for the conservation and protection of coral reefs.

''(g) ANNUAL ACCOUNTING.—Not later than June 15 of each year, each Coastal State receiving moneys from the fund shall account for all moneys so received for the previous fiscal year in a written report to the Secretary of Commerce. This report shall include a description of all projects and activities receiving funds under this section.

''(h) CONGRESSIONAL APPROVAL.—The Secretary of Commerce shall transmit, as part of the annual budget proposal, a priority list for allocations to Coastal States under subsection (c)(1)(C), and subsections (d), (e), and (f). Monies shall be made available from the fund 15 days after the sine die adjournment of the Congress each year, without further appropriation, for the projects identified on the priority list, unless prior to such date, legislation is enacted establishing a different priority list. If Congress enacts legislation establishing an alternate priority list, and such priority list funds less than the annual authorized funding amount identified in subsections (c)(3), (d), (e), or (f), the difference between the authorized funding amount and the alternate priority list shall be available for expenditure, without further appropriation, in accordance with the priority list submitted by the Secretary.

''SEC. 32. COASTAL IMPACT ASSISTANCE.

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) DISTANCE.—The term ''distance'' means minimum great circle distance, measured in statute miles; and

''(2) PRODUCING COASTAL STATE.—The term ''Producing Coastal State'' means a Coastal State, any portion of which lies within a distance of 200 miles from the geographic center of any leased tract having an approved plan of development, and which leased tract, as of January 1, 1999, was not covered by a moratorium on leasing, unless the lease was issued prior to the establishment of the moratorium and was in production on January 1, 1999.

''(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF FUND.—(1) There is established in the Treasury of the United States a fund which shall be known as the ''Outer Continental Shelf Impact Assistance Fund'' (in this section referred to as the ''fund''). There shall be deposited into the fund in fiscal year 2000 and each fiscal year thereafter $100,000,000 from qualified Outer Continental Shelf revenues for each leased tract or portion of a leased tract lying seaward of the zone defined and governed by section 8(g), or lying within that zone but to which section 8(g) does not apply. Such moneys shall be used only to carry out the purposes of this section.

''(2) Of the amounts in the fund, $100,000,000 shall be available each fiscal year for obligation or expenditure in accordance with this section. Such funds shall be made available to the Secretary without further appropriation, subject to the requirements of this section, and shall remain available until expended.

''(c) PAYMENT TO PRODUCING COASTAL STATES.—

''(1) Notwithstanding section 9, the Secretary shall, without further appropriation, make payments in each fiscal year to Producing Coastal States equal to the amount deposited in the fund for the prior fiscal year.

''(2) Such payments shall be allocated among the Producing Coastal States as follows:

''(A) 25 percent of the funds shall be allocated based on the ratio of the shoreline miles of the Producing Coastal State to the shoreline miles of all Producing Coastal States;

''(B) 25 percent of the funds shall be allocated based on the ratio of the coastal population of the Producing Coastal State to the coastal population of all Producing Coastal States;

''(C) 50 percent of the funds shall be allocated based upon the Outer Continental Shelf oil and gas production offshore of such Producing Coastal State. The allocation shall only include qualified Outer Continental Shelf revenues from any leased tract the geographic center of which lies within a distance of 200 miles from any portion of such Producing Coastal State, but shall not include revenues from any leased tract or portion of a leased tract which, as of January 1, 1999, was covered by a moratorium on leasing, unless the lease was issued prior to the establishment of the moratorium and was in production on January 1, 1999. Each Producing Coastal State's allocable share shall be inversely proportional to the distance between the nearest port on the coastline of such Producing Coastal State and the geographic center of each leased tract or portion of the leased tract as determined by the Secretary.

''(e) MINIMUM STATE SHARE.—The allocable share of revenues for each Producing Coastal State shall not be less than $2,000,000.

''(f) USES.—Producing Coastal States shall use moneys received from the fund only to mitigate adverse environmental impacts directly attributable to the development of oil and gas resources of the Outer Continental Shelf.

''(g) STATE PLANS AND ANNUAL REPORT.—(1) Prior to the receipt of funds pursuant to this section in any fiscal year, a Producing Coastal State shall submit to the Secretary a plan for the use of such moneys. The plan shall be developed with public participation and in accordance with all applicable State and Federal laws. The Secretary shall make payments from the fund only upon determining, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, that the State plan ensures that the Producing Coastal State will use its allocated funds in a manner that is consistent with the purposes of this section.

''(2) No later than June 15 of each year, each Producing Coastal State receiving money from this fund shall account for all moneys so received for the previous fiscal year in a written report to the Secretary and the Secretary of Commerce. The report shall include a description of all projects and activities receiving funds under this section.''.

TITLE III—WILDLIFE CONSERVATION AND RESTORATION

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE

This title may be cited as the ''Wildlife Conservation and Restoration Act of 2000''.

SEC. 302. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds and declares that—

(1) a diverse array of species of fish and wildlife is of significant value to the Nation for many reasons: aesthetic, ecological, educational, cultural, recreational, economic, and scientific;

(2) the United States should retain for present and future generations the opportunity to observe, understand, and appreciate a wide variety of wildlife;

(3) millions of citizens participate in outdoor recreation through hunting, fishing, and wildlife observation, all of which have significant value to the citizens who engage in these activities;

(4) providing sufficient and properly maintained wildlife associated recreational opportunities is important to enhancing public appreciation of a diversity of wildlife and the habitats upon which they depend;

(5) lands and waters which contain species neither classified as game nor identified as endangered or threatened can provide opportunities for wildlife associated recreation and education such as hunting and fishing permitted by applicable State or Federal law;

(6) hunters and anglers have for more than 60 years willingly paid user fees in the form of Federal excise taxes on hunting and fishing equipment to support wildlife diversity and abundance, through enactment of the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 1669 et seq.; commonly referred to as the Pittman-Robertson Act), and the Federal Aid in Sport Fish Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 777 et seq.; commonly referred to as the Dingell-Johnson Act);

(7) State programs, adequately funded to conserve a broader array of wildlife in an individual State and conducted in coordination with Federal, State, tribal, and private landowners and interested organizations, would continue to serve as a vital link in a nationwide effort to restore game and nongame wildlife, and the essential elements of such programs should include conservation measures which manage for a diverse variety of populations of wildlife; and

(8) cooperative conservation efforts aimed at preventing species from becoming endangered will significantly benefit private landowners and other citizens by responding to early warning signs of decline in a flexible, incentive-based manner that minimizes the social and economic costs often associated with listing species as threatened or endangered; and

(9) it is proper for Congress to bolster and extend this highly successful program to aid game and nongame wildlife in supporting the health and diversity of habitat, as well as providing funds for conservation education.

SEC. 303. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this title are—

(1) to extend financial and technical assistance to the States under the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act for the benefit of a diverse array of wildlife and associated habitats, including species that are not hunted or fished, to fulfill unmet needs of wildlife within the States while recognizing the mandate of the States to conserve all wildlife;

(2) to assure sound conservation policies through the development, revision and implementation of wildlife associated recreation and wildlife associated education and wildlife conservation law enforcement;

(3) to encourage State fish and wildlife agencies to create partnerships between the Federal Government, other State agencies, wildlife conservation organizations, and outdoor recreation and conservation interests through cooperative planning and implementation of this title; and

(4) to encourage State fish and wildlife agencies to provide for public involvement in the process of development and implementation of a wildlife conservation and restoration program.

SEC. 304. DEFINITIONS.

(a) REFERENCE TO LAW.—The term ''Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act'' means the Act of September 2, 1937 (16 U.S.C. 669 et seq.), commonly referred to as the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act or Pittman-Robertson Act.

(b) WILDLIFE CONSERVATION AND RESTORATION PROGRAM.—Section 2 of the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 669a) is amended by inserting after ''shall be construed'' the first place it appears the following: ''to include the wildlife conservation and restoration program and''.

(c) STATE AGENCIES.—Section 2 of the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 669a) is further amended by inserting ''or State fish and wildlife department'' after ''State fish and game department''.

(d) CONSERVATION.—Section 2 of the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 669a) is further amended by striking the period at the end thereof, substituting a semicolon, and adding the following: ''the term 'conservation' shall be construed to mean the use of methods and procedures necessary or desirable to sustain healthy populations of wildlife including all activities associated with scientific resources management such as research, census, monitoring of populations, acquisition, improvement and management of habitat, live trapping and transplantation, wildlife damage management, and periodic or total protection of a species or population as well as the taking of individuals within wildlife stock or population if permitted by applicable State and Federal law; the term 'wildlife conservation and restoration program' shall be construed to mean a program developed by a State fish and wildlife department that the Secretary determines meets the criteria in section 6(d), the projects that constitute such a program, which may be implemented in whole or part through grants and contracts by a State to other State, Federal, or local agencies wildlife conservation organizations and outdoor recreation and conservation education entities from funds apportioned under this title, and maintenance of such projects; the term 'wildlife' shall be construed to mean any species of wild, free-ranging fauna including fish, and also fauna in captive breeding programs the object of which is to reintroduce individuals of a depleted indigenous species into previously occupied range; the term 'wildlife-associated recreation' shall be construed to mean projects intended to meet the demand for outdoor activities associated with wildlife including, but not limited to, hunting and fishing, such projects as construction or restoration of wildlife viewing areas, observation towers, blinds, platforms, land and water trails, water access, trailheads, and access for such projects; and the term 'wildlife conservation education' shall be construed to mean projects, including public outreach, intended to foster responsible natural resource stewardship.''.

(e) FUNDING.—Subsection 3(a) of the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 669b(a)) is amended in the first sentence—

(1) by inserting at the beginning thereof the following: ''There shall be deposited into the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Fund (referred to as the ''fund'') in the Treasury: (1)''; and

(2) by striking ''shall,'';

(3) by inserting after ''Internal Revenue Code of 1954'' the following: ''; and (2) $350,000,000 in fiscal year 2001 and each fiscal year thereafter from qualified Outer Continental Shelf revenues (as that term is defined in section 2(u) of the Outer Continental Shelf Land Act (43 U.S.C. 1331(u)) (as amended by the Coastal Stewardship Act of 2000)).''; and

(4) by striking ''be covered into'' and all that follows through ''is authorized'' and inserting ''Moneys in the fund are authorized''.

SEC. 305. SUBACCOUNTS.

Section 3 of the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 669b) is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(c) A subaccount shall be established in the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Fund in the Treasury to be known as the ''wildlife conservation and restoration account'' and the deposits each fiscal year to such account shall be equal to the $350,000,000 referred to in subsection (a)(2). Amounts in such account shall be made available without further appropriation, for apportionment at the beginning of fiscal year 2001 and each fiscal year thereafter to carry out State wildlife conservation and restoration programs.

''(d) Funds covered into the wildlife conservation and restoration account shall supplement, but not replace, existing funds available to the States from the sport fish restoration and wildlife restoration accounts and shall be used for the development, revision, and implementation of wildlife conservation and restoration programs and should be used to address the unmet needs for a diverse array of wildlife and associated habitats, with an emphasis on species that are not hunted or fished, for wildlife conservation, wildlife conservation education, and wildlife-associated recreation projects. Such funds may be used for new programs and projects as well as to enhance existing programs and projects.

''(e) Notwithstanding subsections (a) and (b), with respect to the wildlife conservation and restoration account, so much of the appropriation apportioned to any State for any fiscal year as remains unexpended at the close thereof is authorized to be made available for expenditure in that State until the close of the fourth succeeding fiscal year. Any amount apportioned to any State under this subsection that is unexpended or unobligated at the end of the period during which it is available for expenditure on any project is authorized to be reapportioned to all States during the succeeding fiscal year.''.

SEC. 306. ALLOCATION OF SUBACCOUNT RECEIPTS.

Section 4 of the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 669c) is amended by adding the following:

''(c)(1) Notwithstanding subsection (a), not more than 2 percent of the revenues deposited into the wildlife conservation and restoration account in each fiscal year as the Secretary of the Interior may estimate to be necessary for expenses in the administration and execution of programs carried out under the wildlife conservation and restoration account shall be deducted for that purpose, and such amount is authorized to be made available therefor until the expiration of the next succeeding fiscal year. Within 60 days after the close of such fiscal year, the Secretary shall apportion any portion thereof as remains unexpended, if any, on the same basis and in the same manner as is provided under paragraphs (2) and (3).

''(2) The Secretary, after making the deduction under paragraph (1), shall make the following apportionment from the amount remaining in the wildlife conservation and restoration account:

''(A) to the District of Columbia and to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, each a sum equal to not more than ½ of 1 percent thereof; and

''(B) to Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, each a sum equal to not more than ⅙ of 1 percent thereof.

''(3) The Secretary, after making the deduction under paragraph (1) and the apportionment under paragraph (2), shall apportion the remaining amount in the wildlife conservation and restoration account for each year among the States in the following manner:

''(A) one-third of which is based on the ratio to which the land area of such State bears to the total land area of all such States; and

''(B) two-thirds of which is based on the ratio to which the population of such State bears to the total population of all such States.

''(4) The amounts apportioned under this paragraph shall be adjusted equitably so that no such State shall be apportioned a sum which is less than ½ of 1 percent of the amount available for apportionment under this paragraph for any fiscal year or more than 5 percent of such amount.

''(d) WILDLIFE CONSERVATION AND RESTORATION PROGRAM.—(1) Any State, through its fish and wildlife department, may apply to the Secretary for approval of a wildlife conservation and restoration program or for funds to develop a program, which shall—

''(A) contain provision for vesting in the fish and wildlife department of overall responsibility and accountability for development and implementation of the program; and

''(B) contain provision for development and implementation of—

''(i) wildlife conservation projects which expand and support existing wildlife programs to meet the needs of a diverse array of wildlife species, including a wildlife strategy as set forth in subsection (e),

''(ii) wildlife associated recreation programs, including provisions for non-motorized public access to public lands, and

''(iii) wildlife conservation projects; and

''(C) contain provisions for public participation in the development, revision, and implementation of projects and programs stipulated in subparagraph (B) of this subsection.

''(2) If the Secretary finds that an application for such program contains the elements specified in subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of paragraph (1), the Secretary shall approve such application and set aside from the apportionment to the State made pursuant to section 4(c) an amount that shall not exceed 90 percent of the estimated cost of developing and implementing segments of the program for the first 5 fiscal years following enactment of this subsection and not to exceed 75 percent thereafter. Not more than 10 percent of the amounts apportioned to each State from this subaccount for the State's wildlife conservation and restoration program may be used for law enforcement. Following approval, the Secretary may make payments on a project that is a segment of the State's wildlife conservation and restoration programs as the project progresses but such payments, including previous payments on the project, if any, shall not be more than the United States pro rata share of such project. The Secretary, under such regulations as he may prescribe, may advance funds representing the United States pro rata share of a project that is a segment of a wildlife conservation and restoration program, including funds to develop such program. For purposes of this subsection, the term 'State' shall include the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, America Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

''(e) WILDLIFE CONSERVATION STRATEGY.—Any state that receives an apportionment pursuant to section 4(c) shall within five years of the date of the initial apportionment development and begin implementation of a wildlife conservation strategy based upon the best scientific information and data available that—

''(1) integrates available information on the distribution and abundance of species of wildlife, including law population and declining species as the State fish and wildlife department deems appropriate, that exemplify and are indicative of the diversity and health of wildlife of the State;

''(2) identifies the extend and condition of habitats and community types essential to conservation of species identified under paragraph (1);

''(3) identifies the problems which may adversely affect the species identified under paragraph (1) or their habitats, and provides for research to identify factors which may assist in restoration and more effective conservation of such species and their habitats;

''(4) determines those actions which should be taken to conserve the species identified under paragraph (1) in their habitats, and establishes priorities for implementing such conservation actions;

''(5) provides for periodic monitoring of species identified under paragraph (1) and their habitats and the effectiveness of the conservation actions determined under paragraph (4), and for adapting conservation actions as appropriate to respond to new information or changing conditions;

''(6) provides for the review of the State wildlife conservation strategy and, if appropriate, revision at intervals of not more than ten years;

''(7) provides for coordination by the State fish and wildlife department, during the development, implementation, review, and revision of the wildlife conservation strategy, with Federal, State, and local agencies and Indian tribes that manage significant areas of land or water within the State, or administer programs that significantly affect the conservation of species identified under paragraph (1) or their habitats.''.

SEC. 307. FACA.

Coordination with State fish and wildlife department personnel or with personnel of other State agencies pursuant to the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act or the Federal Aid in Sport Fish Restoration Act shall not be subject to the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.). Except for the preceding sentence, the provisions of this title relate solely to wildlife conservation and restoration programs as defined in this title and shall not be construed to affect the provisions of the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act relating to wildlife restoration projects or the provisions of the Federal Aid in Sport Fish Restoration Act relating to fish restoration and management projects.

SEC. 308. LAW ENFORCEMENT.

The third sentence of subsection (a) of section 8 of the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 669g) is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof: '', except that not more than 5 percent of the funds available from this subaccount for a State wildlife conservation and restoration program may be used for law enforcement through existing State programs.''.

SEC. 309. PROHIBITION AGAINST DIVERSION.

No designated State agency shall be eligible to receive matching funds under this Act if sources of revenue available to it on January 1, 1998, for conservation of wildlife are diverted for any purpose other than the administration of the designated State agency, it being the intention of Congress that funds available to States under this Act be added to revenues from existing State sources and not serve as a substitute for revenues from such sources. Such revenues shall include interest, dividends, or other income earned on the foregoing.

TITLE IV—ENDANGERED AND THREATENED SPECIES HABITAT PROTECTION

SEC. 401. ENDANGERED AND THREATENED SPECIES RECOVERY FUND.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section—

(1) the term ''recovery agreements'' means Endangered and Threatened Species Recovery Agreements entered into by the Secretary under subsection (e); and

(2) the term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a fund that shall be known as the ''Endangered and Threatened Species Recovery Fund'' (in this section referred to as the ''fund''). There shall deposited into the fund $50,000,000 in fiscal year 2001 and each fiscal year thereafter from qualified Outer Continental Shelf revenues (as that term is defined in section 2(u) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331(u)) (as amended by the Coastal Stewardship Act of 2000)). Such moneys shall be used only to carry out the purposes of this section.

(b) EXPENDITURES.—Of the amounts in the fund, $50,000,000 shall be available each fiscal year to the Secretary of the Interior for obligation or expenditure in accordance with this section. Such funds shall be made available without further appropriation, subject to the requirements of this section, and shall remain available until expended.

(c) FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.—(1) The Secretary of the Interior may use amounts in the fund to provide financial assistance to any person for the development of recovery agreements.

(2) In providing assistance under this section, the Secretary shall give priority to the development and implementation of recovery agreements that—

(A) implement actions identified under recovery plans approved by the Secretary under section 4(f) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533(f));

(B) have the greatest potential for contributing to the recovery of an endangered or threatened species; and

(C) to the extent practicable, require the assistance of private landowners or the owners or operators of family farms.

(d) PROHIBITION OF ASSISTANCE FOR REQUIRED ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary may not provide financial assistance under this section for any action that is required by a permit issued under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) or that is otherwise required under that Act or any other Federal law.

(e) ENDANGERED AND THREATENED SPECIES RECOVERY AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary is authorized to enter into Endangered and threatened Species Recovery Agreements in accordance with this section. The purpose of such recovery agreements shall be to provide voluntary incentives for landowners to take actions to contribute to the recovery of endangered or threatened species. Each recovery agreement shall—

(1) require the person—

(A) to carry out on real property owned or leased by such person activities that are not otherwise required by law and that contribute to the recovery of an endangered or threatened species; and

(B) to refrain from carrying out on real property owned or leased by such person otherwise lawful activities that would inhibit

the recovery of a threatened or endangered species;

(2) describe the real property referred to in paragraph (1);

(3) specify species recovery goals for the agreement and measures for attaining such goals;

(4) establish a schedule for the implementation of the recovery agreement; and

(5) specify how the recovery agreement will be monitored to assess the effectiveness in attaining the species recovery goals.

SPECIES V—HISTORIC PRESERVATION FUND

SEC. 501. HISTORIC PRESERVATION FUND AMENDMENTS.

Section 108 of the National Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470h) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(a)'' before the first sentence of the first paragraph;

(2) by inserting ''(b)'' before the first sentence of the second paragraph;

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

''(c) There shall be deposited into the fund $150,000,000 in fiscal year 2001 and each fiscal year thereafter from qualified Outer Continental Shelf revenues (as that term is defined in section 2(u) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331(u)) (as amended by the Coastal Stewardship Act of 2000)). Such moneys shall be used only to carry out the purposes of this Act.

''(d)(1) Of the amounts in the fund, $150,000,000 shall be available each fiscal year for obligation or expenditure in accordance with paragraph (2). Such funds shall be made available without further appropriation, subject to the requirements of this Act, and shall remain available until expended.

''(2) Of the amounts made available each fiscal year—

''(A) not less than $75,000,000 shall be available for State, local governmental, and tribal historic preservation programs as provided in subsections 101(b), (c), and (d) of this Act; and

''(B) $15,000,000 shall be available to the American Battlefield Protection Program (section 604 of Public Law 104–333; 16 U.S.C. 469k) for the protection of threatened battlefields; and

''(C) the remainder shall be available for the matching grant programs authorized in section 101(e) of this Act: *Provided*, That not less than 50 percent of the amounts made available shall be used for preservation projects on historic properties in accordance with this Act, with priority given to the preservation of endangered historic properties.

''(e)(1) The President shall transmit, as part of the annual budget proposal, a list of matching grant programs to be funded and additional funding amounts, if any, for State, local governmental, and tribal historic programs. Funds shall be made available from the Historic Preservation Fund, without further appropriation, 15 days after the date the Congress adjourns *sine die* each year, for the programs identified by the President to be funded, unless prior to such date, legislation is enacted establishing funding, for other specific programs authorized in this Act.

''(2) If the list of programs approved by Congress funds less than the annual authorized funding amount, the remainder shall be available for expenditure, without further appropriation, in accordance with the list of programs submitted by the President.

''(3) If the President recommends additional funding for State, local government, or tribal historic preservation programs, priority shall be given to the preservation of endangered historic properties.''.

SEC. 502. AMERICAN BATTLEFIELD PROTECTION PROGRAM AMENDMENTS.

The American Battlefield Act of 1996 (section 604 of Public Law 104–333; 16 U.S.C. 469k) is amended as follows:

(1) in subsection (c)(2) by adding the following sentence at the end thereof; ''Priority for financial assistance for the preservation of Civil War Battlefields shall be given to sites identified as Priority 1 battlefields in the 1993 ''Civil War Sites Advisory Commission Report on the Nation's Civil War Battlefields'';

(2) by amending subsection (d) to read as follows:

''(d) FUNDING AUTHORITY.—Of amounts in the Historic Preservation Fund, $15,000,000 shall be available each year for obligation or expenditure for the protection of threatened battlefields in accordance with this title. Such funds shall be available without further appropriation, and shall remain available until expended.''.

(3) By repealing subsection (e) in its entirety.

TITLE VI—NATURAL RESOURCE RESTORATION PROGRAMS

SEC. 601. NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM RESOURCE PROTECTION.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a fund that shall be known as the ''National Park System Resource Protection Fund'' (in this title referred to as the ''fund''). There shall be deposited into the fund $150,000,000 in fiscal year 2001 and each fiscal year thereafter from qualified Outer Continental Shelf revenues (as that term is defined in section 2(u) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331(u)) (as amended by the Coastal and Marine Resources Enhancement Act of 2000). Such moneys shall be used only to carry out the purposes of this section.

(b) EXPENDITURES.—(1) Of the amounts in the fund, $150,000,000 shall be available each fiscal year to the Secretary of the Interior for obligation or expenditure in accordance with this section. Such funds shall be made available without further appropriation, subject to the requirements of this section, and shall remain available until expended.

(2) Amounts in the fund shall only be used to protect significant natural, cultural or historical resources at units of the National Park System that are—

(A) threatened by activities occurring inside or outside park boundaries; or

(B) in need of stabilization or restoration.

(3) The Secretary is authorized to enter into cooperative agreements with State and local governments and other public and private organizations to carry out the purposes of this section.

(4) No funds made available by this section shall be used for—

(A) acquisition of lands or interests therein;

(B) salaries of National Park Service permanent employees;

(C) construction of roads;

(D) construction of new visitor centers;

(E) routine maintenance activities; or

(F) specific projects which are funded by the Recreational Fee Demonstration Program (section 315 of Public Law 104–134; 16 U.S.C. 460*l* (note)).

(5)(A) The Secretary of the Interior shall prepare, as part of the annual budget proposal, a priority list for projects to be funded under this section. Moneys shall be made available from the fund, without further appropriation, 15 days after the date the Congress adjourns *sine die* each year, for the projects identified on the priority list, unless prior to such date, legislation is enacted establishing a different priority list.

(B) In preparing the list of projects to be funded under this section, the Secretary of the Interior shall give priority to projects that—

(i) are identified in the park unit's general management plan;

(ii) are included in authorized environmental restoration projects; or

(iii) are identified by the Secretary of the Interior as necessary to prevent immediate damage to a park unit's natural, cultural, or historical resources.

(B) If Congress enacts legislation establishing an alternate priority list, and such priority list funds less than the annual authorized funding amount identified in subjection (b)(1), the difference between the authorized funding amount and the alternate priority list shall be available for expenditure, without further appropriation, in accordance with the priority list submitted by the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 602. CORAL REEF RESOURCE CONSERVATION FUND.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF FUND.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a fund that shall be known as the ''Coral Reef Resources Restoration Fund'' (in this section referred to as the ''fund''). There shall be deposited into the fund $15,000,000 in fiscal year 2000 and each fiscal year thereafter from qualified Outer Continental Shelf revenues (as that term is defined in section 2 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331) (as amended by the Coastal and Marine Resources Enhancement Act of 1999)). Such moneys shall be used only to carry out the purposes of this section.

(b) EXPENDITURES.—(1) Of the amounts in this fund, $15,000,000 shall be available each fiscal year to the Secretary of the Interior for obligation or expenditure in accordance with this section, and shall remain available until expended.

(2)(A) the Secretary shall prepare, as part of the annual budget proposal, a priority list for projects to be funded under this section. Monies shall be made available from the fund, without further appropriation, 15 days after the date the Congress adjourns sine die for each year, for the projects identified on that priority list, unless prior to such date, legislation is enacted establishing a different priority list.

(B) If Congress enacts legislation establishing an alternate priority list, and such priority list funds less than the annual authorized funding amount identified in subsection (b)(1), the difference between the authorized funding amount and the alternate priority list shall be available for expenditure, without further appropriation, in accordance with the priority list submitted by the Secretary.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section—

(1) the term ''coral reef'' means species (including reef plants and coralline algae), habitats, and other natural resources associated with any reefs or shoals composed primarily of corals within all maritime areas and zones subject to the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, including in the south Atlantic, Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and Pacific Ocean;

(2) the term ''coral'' means species of the phylum Cnidaria, including—

(A) all species of the orders Antipatharia (black corals), Scleractinia (stony corals), Gorgonacea (horny corals), Stlolnifea (organpipe corals and others), Alcyanacea (soft corals), and Coenothecalia (blue corals), of the class Anthozoa; and

(B) all species of the order Hydrocorallina (fire corals and hydrocorals), of the class Hydroza;

(3) the term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior;

(4) the term ''coral reef conservation project'' means activities that contribute to or result in preserving, sustaining or enhancing coral reef ecosystems as healthy, diverse and viable ecosystems, including—

(A) actions to enhance or improve resource management of coral reefs, such as assessment, scientific research, protection, restoration and mapping;

(B) habitat monitoring and species surveys and monitoring;

(C) activities necessary for planning and development of strategies for coral reef management;

(D) Community outreach and education on coral reef importance and conservation; and

(E) activities in support of the enforcement of laws relating to coral reefs; and

(5) the term ''coral reef task force'' means the task force established under Executive Order 13089 (June 11, 1998).

(d) CORAL REEF CONSERVATION PROGRAM.—(1) The Secretary shall provide grants of financial assistance for coral reef conservation projects on areas under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior in accordance with this section.

(2)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), Federal funds for any coral reef conservation project under this section may not exceed 75 percent of the total cost of such project. For purposes of this paragraph, the non-Federal share of project costs may be provided by in-kind contributions or other non-cash support.

(B) The Secretary may waive all or part of the matching fund requirement under paragraph (A) if the project costs are $25,000 or less.

(3) Any relevant natural resource management authority of a State or territory of the United States, or other government authority with jurisdiction over coral reefs or whose activities affect coral reefs, or educational or non-governmental institutions or organizations with demonstrated expertise in marine science or the conservation of coral reefs, may submit a proposal for funding to the Secretary.

(4) The Secretary shall ensure that financial assistance provided under subsection (a) is distributed so that—

(A) not less than 40 percent of the funds available are awarded for conservation projects in the Pacific Ocean;

(B) not less than 40 percent of the funds are awarded for coral reef restoration and conservation projects in the Atlantic, Gulf of Mexico and Caribbean Sea; and

(C) remaining funds are awarded for coral reef project that address emerging priorities or threats identified by the Secretary in consultation with the Coral Reef Task Force.

(5) After consultation with the Coral Reef Task Force, States and territories, regional and local entities, and non-governmental organizations involved in coral and marine conservation, the Secretary shall identify—

(A) site-specific threats and constraints, and

(B) comprehensive threats known to affect coral reef ecosystems in the national parks, refuges, territories and possessions to be used in establishing funding priorities for grants issued under subsection (a).

(6) The Secretary shall review and rank final coral reef conservation project proposals according to the criteria set out in subsection (d)(7).

(A) For projects costing $25,000 or greater, the Secretary shall provide for the merit-based peer review of the proposal and require standardized documentation of that peer review.

(B) As part of the peer review process for individual grants, the Secretary shall also request written comments from the appropriate bureaus or departments of State or territorial governments, or other governmental jurisdiction, where the project is proposed to be conducted.

(7) The Secretary shall evaluate final project proposals based on the degree to which the project will—

(A) promote the long-term protection, conservation, restoration or enhancement of coral reef ecosystems within or adjoining areas under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior;

(B) promote cooperative conservation projects with local communities, non-governmental organizations, educational or private institutions; or local affected governments, territories or insular areas;

(C) enhance public knowledge and awareness of coral reef resources and sustainable use through education and outreach;

(D) develop sound scientific information on the condition of coral reef ecosystems or the threats to such ecosystems, through mapping, monitoring, research and analysis; and

(E) enhance compliance with laws relating to coral reefs.

(8) Within 180 days after the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall promulgate guidelines and requirements for implementing this section, including the requirements for project proposals.

(A) In developing guidelines and requirements, the Secretary shall consult with the Coral Reef Task Force, interested States, regional and local entities, and non-governmental organizations.

TITLE VII—URBAN PARK AND FORESTRY PROGRAMS

SEC. 701. URBAN PARK AND RECREATION RECOVERY FUND.

Section 1013 of the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Act of 1978 (Title X of Public Law 95–625; 16 U.S.C. 2512) is amended to read as follows:

''(a) There is established in the Treasury of the United States a fund that shall be known as the 'Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Fund' (referred to as the 'fund'). There shall be deposited into the fund $75,000,000 in fiscal year 2001 and each fiscal year thereafter from qualified Outer Continental Shelf revenues (as that term is defined in section 2(u) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331(u)) (as amended by the Coastal Stewardship Act of 2000)). Such moneys shall be used only to carry out the purposes of this Act.

''(b)(1) Of the amounts in the fund, $75,000,000 shall be available each fiscal year for obligation or expenditure in accordance with this Act. Such funds shall be made available without further appropriation, subject to the requirements of this Act, and shall remain available until expended.

''(2) Not more than 3 percent of the funds made available in any fiscal year may be used for grants for the development of local park and recreation recovery programs pursuant to subsection 1007(a) and (c) of this Act.

''(3) Not more than 10 percent of the funds made available in any fiscal year may be used for innovation grants pursuant to section 1006 of this act.

''(4) Note more than 15 percent of the funds made available in any fiscal year may be provided as grants, in the aggregate, for projects in any one State.''.

SEC. 702. URBAN AND COMMUNITY FORESTRY ASSISTANCE FUND.

Section 9(i) of the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (Public Law 95–313; 16 U.S.C. 2101(note)) is amended to read as follows:

''(a) There is established in the Treasury of the United States a fund that shall be known as the 'Urban and Community Forestry Assistance Fund' (referred to as the 'fund'). There shall be deposited into the fund $50,000,000 in fiscal year 2001 and each fiscal year thereafter from qualified Outer Continental Shelf revenues (as that term is defined in section 2(u) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331(u)) (as amended by the Coastal Stewardship Act of 2000)). Such moneys shall be used only to carry out the purposes of this Act.

''(b) Of the amounts in the fund, $50,000,000 shall be available each fiscal year for obligation or expenditure in accordance with this Act. Such funds shall be made available without further appropriation, subject to the requirements of this Act, and shall remain available until expended.''.

TITLE VIII—CONSERVATION EASEMENTS

SEC. 801. FOREST LEGACY FUND.

Section 7(l) of the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (Public Law 95–313; 16 U.S.C. 2010 (note)) is amended to read as follows:

''(a) There is established in the Treasury of the United States a fund that shall be known as the 'Forest Legacy Fund' (referred to as the 'fund'). There shall be deposited into the fund $50,000,000 in fiscal year 2001 and each fiscal year thereafter from qualified Outer Continental Shelf revenues (as that term is defined in section 2(u) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331(u)) (as amended by the Coastal Stewardship Act of 2000)). Such moneys shall be used only to carry out the purposes of this Act.

''(b) Of the amounts in the fund, $50,000,000 shall be available each fiscal year to the Secretary of Agriculture for obligation or expenditure in accordance with this Act. Such funds shall be made available without further appropriation, subject to the requirements of this Act, and shall remain available until expended.''.

SEC. 802. FARMLAND PROTECTION PROGRAM.

Section 388(c) of Public Law 104–127 (16 U.S.C. 3831 (note)) is amended to read as follows:

''(a) There is established in the Treasury of the United States a fund that shall be known as the 'Farmland Protection Fund' (referred to as the 'fund'). There shall be deposited into the fund $50,000,000 in fiscal year 2001 and each fiscal year thereafter from qualified Outer Continental Shelf revenues (as that term is defined in section 2(u) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331(u)) (as amended by the Coastal Stewardship Act of 2000)). Such moneys shall be used only to carry out the purposes of this Act.

''(b) Of the amounts in the fund, $50,000,000 shall be available each fiscal year to the Secretary of Agriculture for obligation or expenditure in accordance with this Act. Such funds shall be made available without further appropriation, subject to the requirements of this Act, and shall remain available until expended.''.

SEC. 803. RANCHLAND PROTECTION.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF RANCHLAND PROTECTION FUND.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a fund that shall be known as the ''Ranchland Protection Fund'' (in this section referred to as the ''fund''). There shall be deposited into the fund $50,000,000 in fiscal year 2001 and each fiscal year thereafter from qualified Outer Continental Shelf revenues (as that term is defined in section 2(u) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331(u)) (as amended by the Coastal Stewardship Act of 2000)). Such moneys shall be used only to carry out the purposes of this section.

(b) EXPENDITURES.—Of the amounts in the fund, $50,000,000 shall be available each fiscal year to the Secretary of the Interior for obligation or expenditure in accordance with this section. Such funds shall be made available without further appropriation, subject to the requirements of this section, and shall remain available until expended.

(c) RANCHLAND PROTECTION PROGRAM.—(1) The Secretary of the Interior shall establish and carry out a program, to be known as the ''Ranchland Protection Program'', under

which the Secretary shall provide grants from the Ranchland Protection Fund to State or local governmental agencies, Indian tribes or appropriate non-profit organizations to provide the Federal share of the cost of purchasing permanent conservation easements on ranchland, for the purpose of protecting the continued use of the land as ranchland or open space and preventing its conversion to non-agricultural or open space uses.

(2) No funds made available under this section may be used to acquire any interest in land without the consent of the owner thereof.

(3) The holder of a conservation easement described in paragraph (1) may enforce the conservation requirements of the easement.

(4) Prior to making funds available for a grant under this section, the Secretary of the Interior shall receive certification from the Attorney General of the State in which the conservation easement is to be purchased that the conservation easement is in a form that is sufficient, under the laws of that State, to achieve the purpose of the Ranchland Protection Program and the terms and conditions of the grant.

(5) For the purposes of this section, the term ''ranch land'' means private or tribally owned range land, pasture land, grazed forest land, and hay land.

TITLE IX—NATURAL RESOURCE COMMUNITY INVESTMENT PROGRAMS

SEC. 901. YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS FUND.

Section 106 of the Youth Conservation Corps Act of 1970 (Public Law 91–378; 16 U.S.C. 1706) is amended to read as follows:

''(a) There is established in the Treasury of the United States a fund that shall be known as the 'Youth Conservation Corps Fund' (in this section referred to as the 'fund'). There shall be deposited into the fund $60,000,000 in fiscal year 2001 and each fiscal year thereafter from qualified Outer Continental Shelf revenues (as that term is defined in section 2(u) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331(u)) (as amended by the Coastal Stewardship Act of 2000)). Such moneys shall be used only to carry out the purposes of title I and II of this Act.

''(b) Of the amounts in the fund, $60,000,000 shall be available each fiscal year for obligation or expenditure in accordance with titles I and II of this Act. Such funds shall be made available to the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior, without further appropriation, subject to the requirements of titles I and II of this Act, and shall remain available until expended.''.

SEC. 902. FOREST SERVICE RURAL COMMUNITY ASSISTANCE.

(a) RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.—The Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (Public Law 95–313; 16 U.S.C. 2101 (note)) is amended by adding the following new section:

''SEC. 21. RURAL DEVELOPMENT.

''(a) The Secretary shall conduct a Rural Development program to provide technical assistance to rural communities for sustainable rural development purposes.

''(b) There is established in the Treasury of the United States a fund that shall be known as the 'Forest Service Rural Development Fund' (in this section referred to as the 'fund'). There shall be deposited into the fund $25,000,000 in fiscal year 2001 and each fiscal year thereafter from qualified Outer Continental Shelf revenues (as that term is defined in section 2(u) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331(u)) (as amended by the Coastal Stewardship Act of 2000)). Such moneys shall be used only to carry out the purposes of this Act.

''(c) Of the amounts in the fund, $25,000,000 shall be available each fiscal year to the Secretary of Agriculture for obligation or expenditure in accordance with this Act. Such funds shall be made available without further appropriation, subject to the requirements of this section, and shall remain available until expended.''.

(b) RURAL COMMUNITY ASSISTANCE.—Section 2379 of the National Forest-Dependent Rural Communities Economic Diversification Act (Public Law 101–624, 7 U.S.C. 6601 (note)) is amended to read as follows:

''(a) There is established in the Treasury of the United States a fund that shall be known as the 'Forest Service Rural Community Assistance Fund' (in this section referred to as the 'fund'). There shall be deposited into the fund $25,000,000 in fiscal year 2001 and each fiscal year thereafter from qualified Outer Continental Shelf revenues (as that term is defined in section 2(u) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331(u)) (as amended by the Coastal Stewardship Act of 2000)). Such moneys shall be used only to carry out the purposes of this Act.

''(b) Of the amounts in the fund, $25,000,000 shall be available each fiscal year for obligation or expenditure in accordance with this Act. Such funds shall be made available without further appropriation, subject to the requirements of this Act, and shall remain available until expended.''.

TITLE X—PAYMENT IN LIEU OF TAXES

SEC. 1001. PAYMENT IN LIEU OF TAXES.

Section 6906 of title 31, United States Code, (96 Stat. 1035) is amended to read as follows:

''(a) There is established in the Treasury of the United States a fund that shall be known as the 'Payment in Lieu of Taxes Fund' (referred to as the 'fund'). There shall be deposited into the fund in fiscal year 2001 and thereafter from qualified Outer Continental Shelf revenues (as that term is defined in section 2(u) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331(u)) (as amended by the Coastal Stewardship Act of 2000)) such moneys as are necessary to full fund payments to units of general local governments as provided in this Act.

''(b) Amounts in the fund shall be available each fiscal year to the Secretary of the Interior for obligation or expenditure in accordance with this Act. Such funds shall be made available without further appropriation, and shall remain available until expended.''.

By Mr. GRASSLEY:

S. 2182. A bill to reduce, suspend, or terminate any assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Arms Export Control Act to each country determined by the President to be engaged in oil price fixing to the detriment of the United States economy, and for other purposes; to the committee on Foreign Relations.

OIL PRICE REDUCTION ACT OF 2000

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today I introduced a companion piece of legislation to H.R. 3822, the Oil Price Reduction Act of 2000. This bill will help to address the problems our constituencies are experiencing throughout the nation due to climbing fuel prices.

Last weekend I traveled back to my home and held a briefing near Des Moines to explain to my constituents that prices will likely rise significantly past current levels. I had the displeasure of looking truckers and farmers in the eye and telling them there is no relief in sight. In my home state we are experiencing price levels not seen in almost a decade, but all I could tell them was that it is going to get worse.

Many of my colleagues know the cold, hard truth of the matter. When the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) finally makes a substantive, definitive decision to increase oil production, it will still most likely take 60 days before adequate levels of fuel can be distributed throughout the U.S. That means if the OPEC Cartel decided to remedy the harm they have imposed on the American consumer today, we are still at least six weeks away from witnessing the peak in the price increase. We could very well see $2 per gallon gasoline by May and that is not acceptable.

Iowans and the rest of the nation should not have been subjected to this price spike. The monopolistic production controls promulgated by OPEC in March of 1999 should have been challenged by our administration upon establishment, not when we finally felt the pinch.

In addition, the Administration's energy policy is an aberration. This crisis only accentuates the problem with relying on foreign energy instead of expanding domestic opportunities. Since 1992, U.S. oil production is down 17% while consumption has risen 14%. We now import 56% of our oil and that number is growing rapidly. DOE predicts that by 2020 we will import 65% of our oil. Guess which country has benefited the most from the Administration's energy policy? As unbelievable as this seems it's Iraq. Saddam Hussein's Iraq. Iraq is now our fastest growing source for oil. How can we be administering a policy that strengthens this dictator's grip on our economy and the Middle East?

The bill I introduced today would require the President of the United States to cut off foreign aid and arms sales to countries engaged in oil price fixing.

Specifically, the legislation would require the President to send a report to Congress, within 30 days of enactment, detailing the U.S. security relationship with each OPEC member and any other major oil exporting country; assistance programs and government-supported arms sales provided to those countries; and his determination regarding the extent each country is engaged in oil price fixing and whether such price fixing is detrimental to the U.S. economy.

The bill would then require the President to reduce, terminate or suspend any assistance or arms sales to the country or countries determined to be fixing oil prices.

In addition, the legislation would require the President to submit a report to Congress 90 days after enactment describing the diplomatic efforts by the U.S. to convince all major net oil exporting countries that current price levels are unsustainable and will cause widespread economic harm in oil consuming and developing nations.

Even if the production quotas put in place last year are lifted, low reserves

may continue to plunder American consumers and farmers during the busy summer vacation and planting seasons. The Clinton administration was caught off-guard this year without much of an energy policy. Now, the President needs to exercise his authority to help solve the problem, which is going to get worse before it gets better.

By Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Ms. SNOWE, and Mrs. LINCOLN):

S. 2183. A bill to ensure the availability of spectrum to amateur radio operators; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

THE AMATEUR RADIO SPECTRUM PROTECTION ACT

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I rise to introduce the Amateur Radio Spectrum Protection Act of 2000. This bill would help preserve the amount of radio spectrum allocated to the Amateur Radio Service during this era of dramatic change in our telecommunications system. I am pleased to introduce this bipartisan measure with my colleagues, Senator COLLINS, Senator AKAKA, Senator BOB SMITH, Senator SNOWE, and Senator LINCOLN.

Organized radio amateurs, more commonly known as ''ham'' operators, through formal agreements with the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the National Weather Service, the Red Cross, the Salvation Army, and other government and private relief services, provide emergency communication when regular channels are disrupted by disaster. In Idaho, these trained volunteers have performed tasks as various as helping to rescue stranded back-country hikers, organizing cleanup efforts after the Payette River flooded, and helping the Forest Service communicate during major forest fires. In other communities, they may be found monitoring tornado touchdowns in the Midwest, helping authorities reestablish communication after a hurricane in the Gulf or sending ''health and welfare'' messages following an earthquake on the West Coast. Not only do they provide these services using their own equipment and without compensation, but they also give their personal time to participate in regular organized training exercises.

In addition to emergency communication, amateur radio enthusiasts use their spectrum allocations to experiment with and develop new circuitry and techniques for increasing the effectiveness of the precious natural resource of radio spectrum for all Americans. Much of the electronic technology we now take for granted is rooted in amateur radio experimentation. Moreover, amateur radio has long provided the first technical training for youngsters who grow up to be America's scientists and engineers.

The Balanced Budget Act of 1997 requires the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) to conduct spectrum auctions to raise revenues. Some of that revenue may come from the auction of current amateur radio spectrum. This bill simply requires the FCC to provide the Amateur Radio Service with equivalent replacement spectrum if it reallocates and auctions any of the Service's current spectrum.

The Amateur Radio Spectrum Protection Act of 2000 will protect these vital functions while also maintaining the flexibility of the FCC to manage the nation's telecommunications infrastructure effectively. It will not interfere with the ability of commercial telecommunications services to seek the spectrum allocations they require. I ask my colleagues to join the more than 670,000 U.S. licensed radio amateurs in supporting this measure and welcome their co-sponsorship.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 92

At the request of Mr. DOMENICI, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 92, a bill to provide for biennial budget process and a biennial appropriations process and to enhance oversight and the performance of the Federal Government.

S. 569

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 569, a bill to amend the internal revenue Code of 1986 to exclude certain farm rental income from net earnings from self-employment if the taxpayer enters into a lease agreement relating to such income.

S. 577

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 577, a bill to provide for injunctive relief in Federal district court to enforce State laws relating to the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquor.

S. 642

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 642, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for Farm and Ranch Risk Management Accounts, and for other purposes.

S. 820

At the request of Mr. BREAUX, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. THOMPSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 820, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the 4.3-cent motor fuel excise taxes on railroads and inland waterway transportation which remain in the general fund of the Treasury.

S. 1020

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. THOMAS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1020, a bill to amend chapter 1 of title 9, United States Code, to provide for greater fairness in the arbitration process relating to motor vehicle franchise contracts.

S. 1158

At the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. GRAMM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1158, a bill to allow the recovery of attorney's fees and costs by certain employers and labor organizations who are prevailing parties in proceedings brought against them by the National Labor Relations Board or by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration.

S. 1272

At the request of Mr. NICKLES, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VOINOVICH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1272, a bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to promote pain management and palliative care without permitting assisted suicide and euthanasia, and for other purposes.

S. 1452

At the request of Mr. SHELBY, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. ABRAHAM), and the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT) were added as cosponsors of S. 1452, a bill to modernize the requirements under the National Manufactured Housing Construction and Safety Standards of 1974 and to establish a balanced consensus process for the development, revision, and interpretation of Federal construction and safety standards for manufactured homes.

S. 1810

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1810, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify and improve veterans' claims and appellate procedures.

S. 1855

At the request of Mr. MURKOWSKI, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY), and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) were added as cosponsors of S. 1855, a bill to establish age limitations for airmen.

S. 1921

At the request of Mr. CAMPBELL, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1921, a bill to authorize the placement within the site of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial of a plaque to honor Vietnam veterans who died after their service in the Vietnam war, but as a direct result of that service.

S. 1980

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1980, a bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 to ensure improved access to the signals of local television stations by multichannel video providers to all households which desire such service in unserved and underserved rural areas by December 31, 2006.

S. 2023

At the request of Mr. LIEBERMAN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2023, a bill to provide for

the establishment of Individual Development Accounts (IDAs) that will allow individuals and families with limited means an opportunity to accumulate assets, to access education, to own their own homes and businesses, and ultimately to achieve economic self-sufficiency, and for other purposes.

S. 2049

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. EDWARDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2049, a bill to extend the authorization for the Violent Crime Reduction Trust Fund.

S. 2061

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. KOHL) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) were added as cosponsors of S. 2061, a bill to establish a crime prevention and computer education initiative.

S. 2074

At the request of Mr. ASHCROFT, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VOINOVICH), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL), the Senator from Montana (Mr. BURNS), the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. ROBB), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), and the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) were added as cosponsors of S. 2074, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the social security earnings test for individuals who have attained retirement age.

S. 2087

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAIG), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS), and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BOND) were added as cosponsors of S. 2087, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to improve access to benefits under the TRICARE program; to extend and improve certain demonstration programs under the Defense Health Program; and for other purposes.

S. 2097

At the request of Mr. GRAMM, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2097, a bill to authorize loan guarantees in order to facilitate access to local television broadcast signals in unserved and underserved areas, and for other purposes.

S. 2123

At the request of Ms. LANDRIEU, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. ASHCROFT), and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BOND) were added as cosponsors of S. 2123, 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.

S. CON. RES. 84

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) and the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 84, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the naming of aircraft carrier CVN–77, the last vessel of the historic *Nimitz* class of aircraft carriers, as the U.S.S. *Lexington*.

S.J. RES. 39

At the request of Mr. CAMPBELL, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. ROTH), and the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 39, a joint resolution recognizing the 50th anniversary of the Korean War and the service by members of the Armed Forces during such war, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 87

At the request of Mr. L. CHAFEE, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 87, a resolution commemorating the 60th Anniversary of the International Visitors Program

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1999

ABRAHAM (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 2882

(Ordered referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation)

Mr. ABRAHAM (for himself, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. KOHL, Mr. VOINOVICH, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. BAYH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them to the bill (S. 1089) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2000 and 2001 for the United States Coast Guard, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 4, beginning on line 8, strike ''$350,326,000'' and all that follows through page 4, line 12, and insert the following: ''$488,326,000, to remain available until expended, of which—

''(A) $20,000,000 shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund to carry out the purposes of section 1012(a)(5) of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990; and

''(B) $128,000,000 shall be available for construction or acquisition of a replacement vessel for the Coast guard icebreaker MACKINAW.''.

● Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. President, I rise today, along with several of my fellow Great Lakes Senators, to introduce an amendment to Senate Bill 1089, the Coast Guard Authorization Act. I want to thank Senators DEWINE, FEINGOLD, GRAMS, KOHL, LUGAR, SANTORUM, VOINOVICH, and WELLSTONE for their support and commitment to the continued presence of a suitable and reliable heavy icebreaking capability on the Great Lakes. The purpose of our amendment is to authorize adequate funding to replace the current Great Lakes icebreaker, the *Mackinaw*, which is scheduled for decommissioning in 2006.

Mr. President, heavy icebreaking on the Great Lakes is vital to the region's industry. Each year, almost 200 million tons of cargo travel across the Great Lakes, including 70 percent of U.S. steel. Transportation of U.S. steel alone directly affects 108,000 jobs, and indirectly affects 400,000.

Shipping on the Great Lakes faces a unique challenge because the season begins and ends in ice. Windrows, slabs of broken ice piled atop each other by the wind, can reach 15 feet in thickness. The *Mackinaw*, with 12,000 horsepower packed into her 290-foot-long hull has kept commerce moving even under the most trying conditions since 1944. The presence of the *Mackinaw* improves shipping efficiency, reliability, and competition. Further, shipping provides a more environmentally sound alternative to surface transportation, because maritime shipments use less fuel and produce fewer emissions than rail and truck alternatives.

Mr. President, after over 55 years of service, the *Mackinaw's* productive life is nearing an end. The Coast Guard has committed to keeping the cutter in service until 2006, when it hopes to have a replacement vessel operating. To meet this important deadline, funds to construct a multi-purpose heavy icebreaker must be included in the fiscal year 2001 budget, which is why I have joined with the aforementioned Great Lakes Senators in seeking authorization. In addition, I and several other Senators have sent various letters requesting appropriations for the *Mackinaw*, as well as an assumption within the fiscal year 2001 budget resolution for this funding.

The construction of a multi-purpose vessel designed to perform icebreaking operations will bring the cutter's mission profile in line with Coast Guard employment standards while improving the efficiency of the Great Lakes fleet performance. Extensive studies and modeling validate the feasibility of a multi-purpose design. Additionally, the multi-mission design is less than 4 percent more expensive than a single-purpose design, and provides a more robust Great Lakes fleet by increasing the number of available operational days by 38 percent.

Without a heavy icebreaker, the Great Lakes shipping season could be shortened by as much as 10 weeks, causing a host of problems for which there are few solutions and none of which are in the region's best interests. We must appropriate these funds this year, and to do that we should make sure that the authorization bill provides for this important one-time expense so that there will be no doubt as to the intent of Congress on this important project.

And Mr. President, let me just inform my colleagues that this is not simply a Great Lakes issue. The winter Great Lakes maritime commerce dependent upon the availability of a heavy icebreaker is the same maritime commerce that delivers iron ore to steel mills along the Eastern Seaboard and the South, the same maritime commerce that delivers aggregates to the Mid-Atlantic, and the same maritime commerce that delivers agricultural projects throughout the United States and overseas. With that in mind, I ask for the support of all of my colleagues to assure the continued operation of Great Lakes icebreaking through the full funding of the Great Lakes ice breaker in fiscal year 2001.●

● Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, today I join my good friend from Michigan, Senator ABRAHAM, and the rest of the Great Lakes delegation in sponsoring this very important amendment to provide funds for the construction of a new ice-breaking vessel to replace the *Mackinaw*. Stationed on the Great Lakes, the *Mackinaw* operates during the ice season, which lasts from December 15th through April 15th. My colleagues from the Great Lakes region know the importance of this vessel during those 4 months. Without this boat, regional commerce on the water would be significantly impaired. Approximately 14 million tons of cargo are moved on the Great Lakes during the ice season. This cargo includes iron ore, coal, limestone, cement, and grain. These resources are necessary to our entire country and our economy.

In addition to the economic need for ice-breaking on the Great Lakes, there are national defense implications. The *Mackinaw* was christened in 1944 to meet our nation's wartime need for iron ore. Today, more than 70 percent of our nation's steelmaking capacity is located in the Great Lakes basin. Should our country ever become embroiled in a protracted military crisis, our ability to transit the Lakes during periods of ice cover would be crucial.

Mr. President, the *Mackinaw* is showing signs of its age, and the time has come to replace the vessel. After several years of studying a replacement design, the Coast Guard has concluded that a multi-purpose ice-breaking vessel is the preferred option. Not only will this replacement ship perform ice-breaking services, but it also will maintain floating aids-to-navigation. Compared with the construction of a single-purpose icebreaker, the multi-mission design increases the number of available operational days by 38 percent.

Constructing a multi-purpose ice-breaking vessel is a common-sense solution to address the needs of the Great Lakes. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.●

NOTICE OF HEARING

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER AND POWER

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a legislative hearing has been scheduled before the Subcommittee on Water and Power.

The hearing will take place on Wednesday, March 22, 2000 at 2:30 p.m. in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, D.C.

The purpose of this hearing is to receive testimony on the following bills: H.R. 862, To direct the Secretary of the Interior to implement the provisions of an agreement conveying title to a distribution system from the United States to the Clear Creek Community Services District; H.R. 992, to convey the Sly Park Dam and Reservoir to the El Dorado Irrigation District; H.R. 1235, To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into contracts with the Solano County Water Agency, California, to use Solano Project facilities for impounding, storage, and carriage of nonproject water for domestic, municipal, industrial, and other beneficial purposes; S. 2091 and the companion H.R. 3077, To amend the Act that authorized construction of the San Luis Unit of the Central Valley Project, California, to facilitate water transfers in the Central Valley Project; S. 1659, To convey the Lower Yellowstone Irrigation Project, the Savage Unit of the Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Program, and the Intake Irrigation Project to the appurtenant irrigation districts; and S. 1836, To extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project in the State of Alabama.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record should send two copies of their testimony to the Subcommittee on Water and Power, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, 364 Dirsken Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510–6150.

For further information, please call Trici Heninger, Staff Assistant, or Colleen Deegan, Counsel, at (202) 224–8115.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Committee on Aging be permitted to meet on March 6, 2000, from 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. in Hart 216 for the purpose of conducting a hearing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMERGING THREATS AND CAPABILITIES

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Monday, March 6, 2000, at 2:30 p.m., in open and closed sessions to receive testimony on the Department of Defense's Cooperative Threat Program and the Department of Energy's Russian Threat Reduction Programs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, for our leader, I ask unanimous consent that at 5 p.m. on Tuesday, March 7, the Senate proceed to executive session and immediately proceed to a vote on the confirmation of Calendar No. 423, the nomination of Julio M. Fuentes to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit.

Finally, I ask unanimous consent that following the vote, the President be notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then resume legislative business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I now ask unanimous consent that it be in order to ask for the yeas and nays on the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Therefore, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, MARCH 7, 2000

Mr. GRASSLEY. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until the hour of 10 a.m. on Tuesday, March 7. I further ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday, immediately following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate then begin a period of morning business until 12:30 p.m. with Senators speaking for up to 5 minutes each, with the following exceptions:

Senator BROWNBACK, 30 minutes; Senators MURKOWSKI and HATCH, 20 minutes total; Senator COLLINS, 15 minutes; Senator GRAMS, 45 minutes; Senator DORGAN, 20 minutes; and Senator DURBIN, 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I further ask consent that the Senate recess from 12:30 to 2:15 on Tuesday for the weekly policy luncheons.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I ask unanimous consent that at 2:15 on Tuesday, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider en bloc Executive Calendar No. 159 and No. 208, the nominations of Marsha Berzon and Richard Paez.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. GRASSLEY. For the information of all Senators, following the party luncheons tomorrow, the Senate will begin consideration of two Ninth Circuit judges who are on the calendar. There are a number of Senators who have expressed a desire to speak with respect to those nominations.

Under a previous order, at 5 o'clock p.m. on Tuesday, the Senate will vote on the confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 423, the nomination of Julio Fuentes. Senators can, therefore, expect the next vote to occur at 5 o'clock tomorrow afternoon. Votes are expected each day and possibly evening this week as the Senate attempts to finish its business prior to the upcoming adjournment.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GRASSLEY. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator DURBIN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG COVERAGE—A LIFELINE, NOT A POISON PILL

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I rise to express my disappointment that the Congress has been unable to move forward on a bipartisan basis on the prescription drug benefit under Medicare. There is a lot of talk with our surplus about potential tax breaks for businesses and families and individuals. In fact, it appears one of the proposals is going to be virtually unanimous, and that is the suggestion we take the cap off income for those who are under Social Security so people between the ages of 65 and 70 can work without penalty. That is encouraging. We should move on that and move quickly.

Another element of some debate but some agreement as well is the so-called marriage penalty. This is a feature of our Tax Code that was probably not there by design, but it reads that if two individuals making a certain amount of money should get married and their combined income puts them in a different and higher income tax category, they face a penalty.

Some have argued, with very little evidence, that many people do not get married because of this. I have my doubts about it. I do not know how many people visit their accountant before they buy the engagement ring, but I suppose it happens.

I do believe we can, on a bipartisan basis, come to an agreement that we will remove the so-called marriage penalty and do it in a way that is not unreasonable so we benefit those who would otherwise be disadvantaged.

There is an irony to this as well, of course, in that when many people get married, their combined income puts them in a lower tax bracket. This is, I guess, a marriage bonus, if you want to use the term. We certainly believe that should continue and that it should not be changed. I hope we can move in that direction.

Unfortunately, the House of Representatives recently passed a package on the marriage penalty that was really quite different than what I have described. First of all, as with so many other tax bills that have come from the other party over the years, the vast majority—two-thirds of the benefits of this so-called marriage penalty tax bill coming from the House—goes to higher-income couples; that is, couples making over $75,000 a year. These higher-income couples get an average tax cut of close to $1,000. Couples who earn less than $50,000 receive an average of $149. That is a very small percentage of the amount that goes to those in higher-income categories.

The price tag for the Republican marriage penalty bill coming out of the House—well, it's a whopping $182 million, and almost half the benefits go to couples who do not face the marriage penalty in their taxes. In this process, this huge expense, mostly going to high-income families, crowds out a lot of very important priorities.

I hope we all can agree that if our goal is to eliminate the marriage penalty, it can be done for a fraction of what the House of Representatives did in their tax relief bill. There are other deserving tax benefit suggestions we should consider. At the top of these priorities is a prescription drug benefit for senior citizens.

On the Democratic side, our party believes we can address both the marriage penalty and the prescription drug benefit. The prescription drug coverage for our seniors is a lifeline. One of the leaders in the House of Representatives on the other side of the aisle said if we put the prescription drug benefit in his bill, he will consider it a ''legislative poison pill.''

For the seniors with whom I speak in Illinois and from across the Nation, prescription drug coverage is a lifeline, not a poison pill. House Majority Leader DICK ARMEY and other House Republicans who called it a poison pill illustrate the flaws in their priorities.

I hope we can come together. I hope my friends on the Republican side, particularly in the House of Representatives, will learn, as I have, about the skyrocketing costs of prescription drugs.

Prescription drug prices have been rising at an almost double-digit rate for the last 20 years. A Families USA study shows these prices rising at four times the rate of inflation. Medicare beneficiaries' annual out-of-pocket drug costs tell the story: 38 percent of Medicare beneficiaries are spending more than $1,000 a year on their prescription drugs. Many of them are on tight, fixed incomes. Eighteen percent of Medicare beneficiaries spend between $500 and $1,000, and 31 percent are paying out up to $500.

For some people stepping back and saying $1,000 a year should not mean much, I can tell them that for a person on a fixed income of $600 or $800 a month under Social Security, $100 a month can mean a real sacrifice, and many senior citizens have to face those sacrifices on a regular basis.

When we held a hearing in Chicago on the prescription drug situation, there were seniors who told us that when they visited large supermarkets in the Chicagoland area that had prescription drug counters, first they would have to find out what their drugs would cost and then calculate what was left over for the groceries they needed to buy to fill their refrigerators and feed themselves in the days ahead.

That is a tough sacrifice and choice for anyone to make, certainly for one to decide between health and the basic necessities of life. One study showed fully 1 in 8 seniors faces this choice between food and medicine. That is unacceptable.

Addressing this problem is certainly not a poison pill, in Mr. ARMEY's words. Time and again, in each of my town meetings around the State, I heard how much money seniors have to spend to remain healthy. It was not unusual in any senior citizen setting to find someone spending $200, $300, $400 a month or even more.

In Illinois, my constituents tell me they are having a tough time paying for their own drugs. Many are worried about whether their parents can afford the drugs they need to stay healthy.

I had a town meeting in Chicago recently. Julie Garcia told me of her concerns about her mother's health care needs. This was not an uncommon story. Many children are concerned about a parent who has been ill. They want to make certain their parents have access to prescription drugs to stay healthy.

Julie Garcia's mother was diagnosed with cancer 11 years ago and must still see her oncologist for routine visits every 2 or 3 months. Because of her cancer, Julie Garcia's mother was unable to buy individual insurance. When she was going through her cancer treatment, she was on what is known as a spend-down program through Medicaid. This paid for a large portion of her hospital bill, but she still incurred thousands of dollars in bills for which she was held liable. A great many of those thousands of dollars were for the cost of prescription drugs she needed.

So many seniors who are concerned about their health are often faced with

these terrible choices. I have run into seniors who do not fill prescriptions given to them by doctors. Some fill the prescription and take it every other day. Some will try to stretch the prescription out in other ways. Little do they know they may be losing all of the beneficial impact of the prescription drug itself.

One lady in particular had a double lung transplant. She found it was going to cost $2,500 a month for her to deal with the antirejection drugs and other things necessary to stay healthy after this transplant surgery. She came to the conclusion she could not afford it. She decided, on her own, to cut back on the prescription drugs she would take. As a result of that decision—a monetary decision—she lost one-third of her lung capacity permanently, irreparable harm which could damage her for years to come—a money decision that resulted in a health disaster.

Those are the choices people are making every single day. It is not just the seniors, of course. Under Medicare, many who are disabled find themselves in the same predicament: Cutting back, mainly on drugs, sometimes because of large price increases. Over the last couple of years, it has gone from bad to worse. As I mentioned before, one study shows that one senior in eight is forced to choose between food and medicine.

What kind of drug price increases are we talking about?

In 1992, the average cost of a prescription drug was $30. Six years later, in 1998, it had more than doubled to an average of $78. Drug prices are increasing much more quickly than the pace of inflation.

A study by Families USA, a national health care consumer group, examined the prices of 50 drugs most often used by seniors. They tested the period between January 1, 1998, and January 1, 1999. Here is what they found.

For the 50 most popular drugs used by seniors, 36 out of those 50 drugs increased two or more times faster than the rate of inflation. More than a third of these drugs—17 out of 50—increased four times the rate of inflation.

Pharmacists in my State tell me that in the past they used to get a price increase once or twice a year. Now many of them face price increases on drugs on a weekly or monthly basis. The curiosity about this is the relative expense of these drugs.

We understand the pharmaceutical companies are in business to make a profit. If they did not, their shareholders would turn on the management and oust them and find someone who could make a profit. That happens all the time. That is the nature of capitalism, the nature of our free market, and the nature of business.

We also understand that pharmaceutical companies need to make enough money so they can invest in future research, to find the next cure, the next drug on which they can make a profit. We want them to do that. Of course, success in doing that moves us closer to the day when we start eradicating many of the worrisome diseases Americans face.

Having said that—that we are going to concede the profit motive, we are going to concede the amount of money needed for research—I think there are still serious questions to be raised about the pharmaceutical industry, particularly when you compare the cost of these drugs in the United States to the cost of these drugs in other places.

There are several people now who live in the border States in the northern part of our United States who take buses, on a regular basis, into Canada. Senior citizens get on these buses for a daily excursion and make a trip across the border to buy prescription drugs.

Why would somebody want to leave the United States to go to Canada to buy drugs? Frankly, because the drugs are cheaper. For every dollar Americans spend on prescription drugs, that same drug costs 64 cents across the border—64 percent of what it costs in the United States—in England, 65 percent; in Italy, 51 percent; in Germany, 71 percent.

You ask yourself, are they different drugs? The answer is no; they are exactly the same drugs. Exactly the same thing sold in the United States—made by an American company, inspected by the Food and Drug Administration, approved for sale here—when it crosses that invisible border between the United States and Canada becomes a bargain.

A lot of these seniors from the northern States in our country have decided to go to Canada to fill their prescriptions to save money.

Why in the world would these same drugs cost less in Canada? Frankly, because the Canadian Government has said to the drug companies that if they want to sell the drugs in Canada, in the national health care system, they have to reduce the price. They take an average of the price increases around the world and say to the drug companies: This is as far as you can go. The same thing happens in Mexico. The same thing happens in virtually every other industrialized country in the world.

American drugs—developed in this country, sold to Americans—are sold at a fraction of the cost in other countries.

Let me say, that is not the only case where the American drug companies sell at a discount. They sell at a discount to the Federal Government for the Veterans' Administration, for example, and for the Indian Health Service. They bargain with them. The Veterans' Administration, at our hospitals, says to drug companies: If you want to sell these drugs, we demand that you give a discount for the veterans and thereby save the Federal taxpayers a few dollars. The same thing is true with the Indian Health Service.

It is also true that insurance companies, HMOs, and managed care companies bargain, as well. They will go to a drug company and say: If you want your drug to be on the formulary, the list of drugs that can be prescribed by the doctors in our plan, then you have to sell at a discount to this insurance company and these doctors. Of course, the insurance company makes out well in that decision, and the patient still gets the drugs, and the discount is there.

There is only one group who cannot bargain. It is the largest group in America when it comes to buying drugs—the Medicare beneficiaries. For what is supposed to be a free market system, the only place where it is a so-called ''free market'' is when it comes to seniors in America.

Isn't it ironic that these American drug companies charge the highest prices, for the drugs that they sell, to the elderly and disabled in our own country? We are a country which, through the National Institutes of Health, has generated research which has led to the discovery of these drugs. We are a country which, through its Federal agencies, such as the FDA, inspects and approves the manufacturing of these drugs to make sure they are of the highest quality. And with all of the benefits given to pharmaceutical companies under our Tax Code to reduce their tax burden and to increase the profitability of these companies in America, the one group they target to charge the highest prices turns out to be our seniors and our disabled in America. I do not think that is fair. I think it should change.

For example, Ciperal is a drug that is used to treat infections. The exact same bottle, the exact same pill, the same amount, made in the same manufacturing plant, costs $171 in Canada but costs $399 in the United States—more than twice as much.

What about the drug called Claritin? It is the same company, Schering-Plough. The shape of the bottle in which the pills are sold is different in Canada as compared to the United States, but it is still the same pill, made in the same facility, subject to the same Federal inspection. For a bottle of this pill, Claritin, in Canada, they charge $61; in the United States, at your local pharmacy, $218—more than three times the cost of the drug in Canada.

The bottom line is this. The rest of the world gets better deals, and Americans pay far more. This is keeping Medicare beneficiaries from being able to afford prescription drugs. It is just plain unacceptable.

If we were to decide this year in Congress to pass a prescription drug benefit under Medicare, I am sure we could devise a system that might work to provide benefits and access to drugs for a lot of seniors and disabled people across our country. If we were to create this benefit package and not address the underlying challenge of the increase in prices each year, each month, sometimes each week, and the

differential in prices between the United States and Canada, any prescription drug benefit program we devise would be bankrupted in no time flat.

The Medicare program, as we know, does not include a prescription drug benefit. The reason for this is, of course, when it was enacted in 1965, prescription drugs just didn't play that large a role in health care. But the world has changed. There are so many drugs now that maintain quality of life for people across America that we couldn't have dreamed up 35 years ago. Isn't it ironic that we don't pay for prescription drugs but if a person doesn't take his medicine and gets sick and goes into a hospital, Medicare will pay for the hospitalization. Wouldn't we want to invest a few pennies in prevention rather than spend hundreds of dollars in a cure that might involve some hospitalization? It seems obvious to me.

Too many seniors find it virtually impossible to comply with their doctor's orders. As we know, they have to make tough choices between what their doctor tells them is good for them and what they can afford, a choice no one should have to make. According to a report prepared for the Department of Health and Human Services, three out of four Medicare beneficiaries do not have dependable private drug coverage. Some folks on Capitol Hill, in the House and Senate, have suggested this isn't really a problem; they believe that many people have prescription drug coverage. They ought to get out of this Capitol Building into the real world.

I think what they will find is this: About a third of the people in the United States have exceptionally good drug coverage in their retirement. I found a lot of them in Illinois. Some of them are retired union workers and their families. Others have benefited from a great plan that takes care of their prescription drugs. They are the exception rather than the rule.

A third of the people have prescription drug coverage which is anemic at best; it barely pays the most basic bills and, of course, with large expenses, provides no relief to the seniors who turn to them.

Then a third are on their own. Those are the sorriest stories of all, where people are faced with actually paying out of pocket for every single thing they need when it comes to prescription drugs. That tells you, if we rely on the current system without looking to a new benefit, we will leave two-thirds of America behind. Those are the underinsured, when it comes to prescription drugs, and those who are basically uninsured.

Incidentally, those who have some sort of prescription drug benefit under HMOs in Illinois tell me over and over again that the copays and deductibles keep going up. Their coverage is virtually evaporating.

I met a woman in Chicago, Anita Milton of Morris, IL, who became disabled in 1995 and, in 1996, had a bilateral lung transplant. Her prescription drug costs are $2,500 a month. Now on Medicaid, she has to pay a certain amount each month out of pocket on drugs before she gets the first dollar in coverage. She has an income of $960 a month. That is her only income. She pays up to $638 a month out of pocket for the drugs she needs. Somehow she is supposed to survive on $251 a month.

For many elderly people in that circumstance, they have little or no recourse but to move in with their children and try to survive. On a month when her drugs aren't covered, she doesn't meet her spending requirement, so she loses coverage for a full month. In other words, she only receives coverage every other month.

This story sounds bizarre, but it is not. It is virtually commonplace to see in America people who have lived a good life, raised their families, contributed so much to this country, paid their taxes, obeyed the laws, and now find themselves captives of a situation they cannot control. A pharmacist in Illinois told me what they are faced with—telling seniors the problems of prescription drug costs is really difficult to deal with. A pharmacist, Linda Esposito, came to my meeting in Chicago and said:

> Virtually every day pharmacists are faced with older Americans who have assumed that their medications, the prescription that their physician has written for them, is covered by their supplemental Medicare benefits or Medicare itself. All too often they find the insurance isn't there when they really need it to be there.

Men and women who want to stay healthy, who want to stay independent, and want to stay out of the hospital find they cannot afford the medications to make that happen. That is why it is important we move forward with a comprehensive drug benefit to the Medicare program for all beneficiaries. America's seniors shouldn't have to pay more than everyone else for prescription drugs. As I have heard from Illinois senior citizens, prescription drug coverage offers a lifeline to them and not a poison bill. Congress must work to offer our seniors this lifeline this year.

The record of this Congress over the last several years has been scant, to say the least. There is just very little we even take seriously around here and consider by way of addressing problems that American families face.

It has been a frustration to me, as a Senator from the State of Illinois, to go home repeatedly and hear the people I represent raise issues they are concerned with, issues about education, what are we going to do in Washington to help improve schools in America. A bill we passed last week will have virtually no impact whatsoever on education in this country. We have not addressed the most basic requirements to make sure our teachers are well trained and qualified to teach, held accountable for their own standards in their classroom; that kids are held accountable to make certain when they graduate, they can be promoted to another grade and succeed rather than just be pushed along; to try to upgrade and modernize the schools our kids attend so they can deal with modern technology. Has this Congress done anything to address that over the last 3 years? Sadly, the answer is no.

The President has proposed these things. This Congress has ignored them.

On the issue of health care, whether it is prescription drugs or a Patient's Bill of Rights, I am afraid the drug companies and the insurance companies have really ruled the agenda. We are trying our best to move this issue to the forefront, and those forces are trying their best to keep it out.

On the issue of peace and tranquility in our communities, we find people asking whether this Congress can respond with sensible gun control. The honest answer is, it is not likely. The President is holding a summit this week—I am glad he is—bringing in the leaders from Congress and challenging them to look anew at this issue of gun control.

When we have reached the point in America where first graders are killing other first graders with guns, we are dealing with a gun crisis. For those who blithely say we have all the laws we need, there is not an idea we should consider, we have everything taken care of, pick up any morning paper and tell me we have everything taken care of. I don't believe that is the case at all.

On issue after issue, whether it is education, health care, or sensible gun control, this Congress sits on its hands. The people across America ask of us, the world's so-called greatest deliberative body, when are you going to deliberate? What are you going to do? Sadly, the answer for the last 3 years is little or nothing.

I think that is what elections are all about. This coming election in November, the people across America can really issue their own report card on this do-nothing Congress. They can take a look back and see at the end of our work this calendar year what we have achieved. If we leave town without addressing the needs of education, if we leave town without creating a prescription drug benefit under Medicare, if we leave town without increasing the minimum wage from $5.15 an hour to something that is more humane and more livable, if we don't do anything to cope with the health care crisis that has been generated because of HMOs and managed care, if we don't do something about sensible gun control, this Congress will rightly deserve a failing grade.

I think it is important we try to come together. For those who say there is no intention on this side of the aisle, the Democratic side, to really find solutions, I think the challenge is on the table to come forward and try

on a bipartisan basis. I will be there, and I think many on my side will as well, to make certain this Congress adjourns this year with not only a record of accomplishment but a record of response for American families.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 4:29 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, March 7, 2000, at 10 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE POVERTY TRAP STUDY ACT OF 2000

HON. THOMAS E. PETRI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 2000

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Poverty Trap Study Act of 2000. This legislation would create a commission to study the combined effects on low income families of effective marginal tax rates resulting from the simultaneous phaseouts of a number of welfare programs as well as payroll taxes and federal and state income taxes.

Why does this prosperous country still have millions of people living in poverty? Why, in the face of tremendous economic growth, does the poverty rate barely drop if at all? It's not because we are a selfish country; it's not because we spend too little on welfare and it's not because the minimum wage is too low. It's because we have adopted tax and welfare policies which bring about that exact result!

Not that it was the intent of those who wrote those programs to keep people in poverty. I'm sure that when the housing assistance program was created, it was thought that taking 30 percent of income as rent was not too much of a disincentive to work. Likewise, when the Earned Income Tax Credit was created and later revised, I'm sure no one thought that a 21 percent phaseout of benefits for two-child families just over the poverty level was a drastic disincentive. And when the Food Stamp Program was begun, a 24 percent phaseout didn't seem so bad. But add them up and we already have a 75 percent effective marginal tax rate from just these three programs. Now add in a 7.65 percent payroll tax, federal and state income taxes, and possible phaseouts of other state welfare programs, plus copayments for child care, and in most states families with children with earnings around the poverty level face marginal tax rates over 100 percent! Furthermore, at an income level where most of these phaseouts are still in effect, these families face the ''cliff effect'' of Medicaid and lose their health coverage. It's not surprising that we have a seemingly intractable problem of poverty no matter how high the economy soars. What is amazing is that some people are able to work their way out of poverty anyway.

We have created this mess by designing every program in a vacuum without ever considering the combined effects. I supported the welfare reform of 1996, sending most of the decisions back to the states. The main effect has been for states to institute work requirements for most able-bodied recipients, moving them off of AFDC and into subsidized jobs. That's good but it is only the first step. Phase II has to be to move people from subsidized jobs into self-sufficiency, and that is never going to happen until more work actually means more money in their pockets.

Likewise, I supported the recently passed marriage penalty relief act. However, as a percentage of income, the biggest marriage penalties have nothing to do with moving to higher tax brackets or the size of the personal exemption. In some cases in my home state of Wisconsin, a single parent with two children who marries someone with a similar income loses ALL of the spouse's income to lost benefits and taxes and the family of four has to live on less than the family of three did! Ending the poverty trap should also be considered phase II of marriage penalty relief.

It's time to look at welfare and tax policy for low income families in a coherent fashion instead of the hit or miss piecemeal approach we have been employing. That is why I have introduced the Poverty Trap Study Act of 2000. This legislation would create a commission to examine the poverty trap problem and make recommendations to fix it. I call on my colleagues who support ending marriage penalties, cutting taxes for low income families and fighting poverty, to support this bill.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF ALPHA KAPPA ALPHA SORORITY, INC. TO AFRICAN AMERICAN HISTORY

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 2000

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay special tribute to Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Inc. during African-American history month. I would like to highlight the organization's ninety-two years of service to our nation. Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority currently has over 800 chapters in the United States and the Virgin Islands and has spread to several countries abroad including: Germany, Caribbean, London, England, and Japan.

Since 1908, Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Inc. has served as an instrument to enrich social and economic conditions in the world. Alpha Kappa Alpha strives to promote high scholastics and ethical standards, vocational and career guidance, health services and the advancement of human and civil rights. Led by national Basileus, Norma S. White, Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Inc. focuses on five national targets including: education, health, the black family, economics, and the arts.

Today, the tradition of Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Inc. lives on. As we move into the 21st century, Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Inc. will continue to uplift the principles of service to all mankind.

HONORING HARCUM COLLEGE

HON. JOSEPH M. HOEFFEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 2000

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on the occasion of National TRIO day to congratulate the Upward Bound Program at Harcum College in Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania. National TRIO Day celebrates 35 years of programs aimed at expanding opportunities for disadvantaged students to attend college. Upward Bound is a wonderful, practical program that challenges and motivates students to achieve the necessary skills for higher education. TRIO's Upward Bound is essential for attainment of the critical goal of ensuring access to higher education for low-income and first-generation college students.

Harcum College has an outstanding record of success with Upward Bound for the ten years since the program began. This year, Harcum was awarded a prestigious five-year grant for scoring one hundred percent on their program proposals. Harcum College Upward Bound serves 75 students from three high schools in Philadelphia. The vast majority of participants are low-income and the first generation of their families to attend college. In the past five years one hundred percent of all high school students participating in Harcum's Upward Bound program graduated from high school and seventy-five percent were accepted to and enrolled in a four year college or university.

I applaud Harcum College's commitment to providing students from all backgrounds with an opportunity to excel in education and to prepare those students for the future.

RECOGNITION OF MR. WILLIAM C. COONCE

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 2000

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to William C. Coonce—one of our Federal Government's finest public servants and a long time resident of the Commonwealth of Virginia. This April he will retire from an exceptionally distinguished career of service to his country. He has worked for the Department of Defense since 1967, first with the Navy, and for the last 19 years with the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller). He has served more than 34 years of exemplary service to our nation. He has been an exceptional manager of the public's resources and his efforts have strengthened our national defense. It gives me pride to have the opportunity to honor him today for his tremendous accomplishments.

Mr. Coonce began his career at the Naval Ordnance Depot in Louisville, Kentucky as an engineer working on underwater sensors and weapons. He moved to the great Commonwealth of Virginia in 1971 to work for the Naval Sea Systems Command and later for the Comptroller of the Navy on important budget issues. He was promoted to work for the Defense Comptroller, first as a budget analyst and, for the last sixteen years, to the Senior Executive Service, where he served as

the Director for Military Construction and later Director for Revolving Funds. The quality of his work has been recognized by every Administration he has served, and he has received civil service awards too numerous to mention. Among the more significant, he has received the Presidential Rank Award for Meritorious Service, the Secretary of Defense Medal for Meritorious Civilian Service, and the Vice President's National Performance Review Award.

Bill Coonce has served six Secretaries of Defense and six Department Comptrollers, as their key advisor on a range of budget issues. His recommendations on a wide range of vital issues were constantly sought and greatly helped the Department robustly defend the funding requirements that support U.S. forces and missions. He has a significant reputation as a budget-cutter across a wide range of national programs. Year in and year out, his wise counsel and sound advice produced the best possible, yet fiscally responsible, spending plans to satisfy the nation's national security needs.

Mr. Coonce brought exceptional insight and skill to the many diverse challenges presented to and undertaken by him. He displayed outstanding skills as a manager of budget analysts, inspiring work that was of the highest quality. He has been the Department of Defense's expert in budgeting for Military Construction, Base Realignment and Closure actions, Intelligence Community requirements, and the logistics infrastructure programs. On an extraordinary number of occasions, his sage advice assured the adoption of sound spending decisions that supported major Defense programs while remaining consistent with the President's priorities and prevailing perspectives in the Congress. His comprehensive knowledge and exceptional skills were immensely invaluable to a whole generation of Department of Defense leaders, to our Armed Forces, and to U.S. national security.

The senior U.S. leaders, both in the Congress and in the Defense Department, benefited enormously from his extensive knowledge, exceptional dedication, and wise judgment. His contributions and public service allowed the leaders of our nation to make the wisest possible allocation of declining defense resources while maintaining America's security. Mr. Coonce is retiring from a career of singular merit and has earned the profound gratitude of the American people.

A TRIBUTE TO MONTGOMERY COUNTY COUNCILMEMBER BETTY ANN KRAHNKE

HON. CONSTANCE A. MORELLA

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 2000

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I pay tribute to an outstanding citizen and public servant of Montgomery County, MD. I praise the courage and determination of Montgomery County Councilmember Betty Ann Krahnke. She has served with distinction for many years, both in and out of public office. Betty Ann Krahnke is a role model for our community, and our Nation.

I am extremely proud of Betty Ann's integrity, commitment, and legislative contributions, particularly on behalf of domestic violence victims. She has spearheaded cell phone programs for domestic violence victims and convinced the State of Maryland to implement an automated victim notification program in Montgomery County. For her leadership on victims' rights issues, Betty Ann has received the 1998 Governor's Victim Assistance Award and the 1998 leadership award from the Montgomery County Against Domestic Abuse task force. In addition, the Montgomery County Civic Federation awarded its most prestigious award, the Distinguished Public Service Citation, to Betty Ann.

During her current battle with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis, Betty Ann has shown tremendous stamina and strength of character. She and her family have exhibited incredible bravery during this most difficult time. I have watched Betty Ann with inspiration as she continued her unfaltering commitment to Montgomery County. I praise her determination to keep making positive contributions to her community.

I have admired Betty Ann for many years as a leader and public servant, and most importantly, as a friend. I send my heartfelt appreciation for her hard work and dedicated service.

CELEBRATING THE FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE REPUBLIC OF ARMENIA CONSULATE GENERAL IN LOS ANGELES

HON. JAMES E. ROGAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 2000

Mr. ROGAN. Mr. Speaker, representing the Republic of Armenia proudly in the western United States is the Consulate General, in Los Angeles—not far from my home district.

In honor of the consulate's fifth anniversary in Los Angeles, I ask my colleagues here today to join me in saluting not just this accomplishment, but the freedom this nation has cherished for nearly a decade.

There is indeed a freedom in Armenia to which I can attest. Not long ago, I spent nearly a week in Armenia. And I am proud to say that the spirit of democracy we hold so dear in the United States has taken an equally deep root in the Republic of Armenia.

Despite cultural and political annihilation at the hands of the Ottoman Turks, the Armenian people today thrive at home and abroad. Armenian-Americans have contributed greatly to our community while maintaining a strong cultural heritage. I am especially proud to claim the same home district as the largest population of Armenians in America.

Representing this community, and the Republic is the Consulate General in Los Angeles. The professional staff in this office is responsible for consular and diplomatic affairs—acting as liaison between the Republic and governments at the local, state, and national level. Their efforts guarantee that Armenia will continue to thrive: leading the region in the growth of industry, education, the arts and technology.

Mr. Speaker, five short years ago, the Republic of Armenia established a diplomatic foundation in Los Angeles, reaching out to the surrounding Armenian-American community and the public. This work was led by the Honorable Armen Baibourtian who is now serving as the Deputy Foreign Minister in Yerevan, the Armenian Capital. His successor, The Honorable Armen Melkonian is following in this tradition, proudly representing the Republic of Armenia in the United States. I am proud not just to call these two leaders colleagues, but to call them friends.

I ask my colleagues here today to join me along with the Armenian-American community in celebration of the Consulate General's fifth anniversary in Los Angeles, and in tribute to Armenia's decade of freedom. Let us work to keep the light of freedom lit in Armenia and around the globe.

SUPPORT OF H.R. 5, THE SENIOR CITIZENS' FREEDOM TO WORK ACT OF 1999

HON. MAX SANDLIN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 2000

Mr. SANDLIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5, the Senior Citizens' Freedom to Work Act of 1999. This legislation will finally repeal the outdated and unreasonable Social Security earnings limit that has penalized seniors for working beyond the age of 65 by reducing their monthly Social Security benefit. H.R. 5 is good for America's seniors and good for the economy.

The Senior Citizens' Freedom to Work Act is about basic fairness. There are numerous reasons seniors may choose to continue working past the age of 65. Many seniors would like to retire but have to continue working simply to make ends meet. It is outrageous that the government penalizes these individuals for trying to support their most basic needs. Other seniors may continue to work simply for the pleasure and pride they take in contributing a lifetime's worth of skills and knowledge to their chosen profession. The government should not deprive industry of this dedicated, skilled, and resourceful population of workers. Regardless of the reason, America's seniors deserve the benefits they earn whether or not they choose to continue working beyond the national retirement age.

I became a cosponsor of H.R. 5 last year because I feel so strongly about the merits of this legislation. According to the Social Security Administration, over 800,000 seniors lose part or all of their Social Security benefits because of the earnings limit. With the retirement of the massive baby boom generation fast-approaching, the number of seniors affected by this penalty will increase significantly over the next decade. Today, we have the opportunity to prevent that injustice.

Mr. Speaker, my district has the good fortune of holding a large population of hard-working senior citizens who stand to benefit from the repeal of the Social Security earnings limit. The communities and businesses in the First Congressional District of Texas stand to benefit as well. Retaining skilled retirees is important in meeting today's workforce needs, and Congress needs to eliminate the very real financial disincentive seniors face if they want to continue working beyond retirement age. This is a win-win situation and deserves the full support of this Congress. I urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 5 to end the earnings penalty once and for all.

THE HISTORICAL CONTRIBUTIONS OF AFRICAN-AMERICANS TO THE ADVANCEMENT OF HEALTH AND SCIENCE

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 2000

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to lead the citizens of the Thirtieth Congressional District as we pay tribute to the extraordinary contributions African-Americans have made in the advancement of health and science in America. I look forward to an equally storied future.

Beginning with Imhotep, who many call the father of medicine, blacks have led the world in medical and scientific innovation. In Ancient Egypt, Imhotep diagnosed and treated over 200 diseases and illnesses, including tuberculosis, appendicitis, and arthritis. As early as 2850 B.C., Imhotep was performing surgery, and documenting the roles of the human circulatory system and vital organs.

Like their ancestors in Africa, blacks in America have historically and consistently enhanced the quality of life through scientific discoveries and medical breakthroughs. In the 1860's Dr. Alexander T. Augusta was named head of a Union Army hospital during the Civil War. Also during the Civil War, one of my predecessors in the U.S. Congress, Ohio Senator Benjamin Wade, an abolitionist, gave Rebecca Lee a scholarship which enabled her to become the first African-American woman doctor.

Following the example of Doctors Augusta and Lee, African-Americans have continued to lead the nation in advancing health care. Institutions like the Howard University College of Medicine and Meharry Medical College trained physicians who have saved the lives of thousands of African-Americans, many of whom had no other access to medical treatment. Black doctors have blazed trails throughout our history, including Dr. Charles Parvis, who helped keep the Howard Medical School open by declining to accept a salary and later became the first African-American to run a civilian hospital, Freedman's Hospital right here in Washington, D.C.

For too long medical history did not include the legendary contributions of African-American health care professionals, who, despite serious obstacles and institutionalized racism, soared to amazing heights of success. Dr. Daniel Hale Williams, without access to the benefit of X-rays, breathing apparatus, or blood transfusions, performed the first successful open heart operation. Dr. Louis Wright is credited with the development of the neck brace. Dr. Charles R. Drew developed a critical method of preserving blood, and Dr. Ben Carson performed the first successful separation of Siamese twins joined at the back of the head. Dr. Levi Watkins, Jr. performed the first surgical implantation of the device that corrects arrhythmia in the human heart. Today, our nation can reflect with great pride on the contributions of former Secretary of Health and Human Services Louis Sullivan and former Surgeon Generals Dr. Joycellyn Elders and Dr. David Satcher.

Just as in the health care field, African-Americans have led the way in other areas of science. History is replete with the inventions and creations of African-American scientists. George Washington Carver revolutionized the agricultural foundation of this country through his discoveries—300 new uses for the peanut, 118 from the sweet potato, and 60 from pecans. Elijah ''The Real'' McCoy, helped make the industrial revolution possible by developing an oiling device for machines. Garrett Morgan's inventions still impact us today, in the form of the gas mask and the traffic light.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on about the contributions of African-Americans to health and science, including Lewis Latimer and his electrical filament, Benjamin Banneker and the first striking clock and space pioneers, Guy Bluford, Ronald McNair, and Mae Jemison. The world would certainly not be as prepared to enter the new millennium if it had not been for the contributions of these outstanding Americans. And the scientists, health care professionals, and inventors I have mentioned barely scratch the surface. Scores of other African-Americans fought against the odds to dramatically change the scientific frontier. I join the citizens of America in paying tribute to the African-American legacy, and as we look to the future, I am proud to stand on the shoulders of these great Americans.

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF CHELTENHAM TOWNSHIP

HON. JOSEPH M. HOEFFEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 2000

Mr. HOEFFEL. Mr. Speaker, I stand today to congratulate the township of Cheltenham on its 100th anniversary. On March 5, 1900 the first Board of Commissioners of the newly incorporated Cheltenham Township met and formed what has become a model township government in Montgomery County.

The township of Cheltenham has many achievements of which to be proud. Cheltenham's roots extend to the 1600s when Quakers settled the area just outside Philadelphia. The settlers primarily farmed the land, with several mills dotting the landscape as well. The 1850s brought rapid change to Cheltenham with the advent of the railroad. Philadelphians soon began settling in the township and commuting to Philadelphia.

Cheltenham can take pride in its municipal works. Not only did the township institute fire hydrants and streetlights as early as 1901, but also established a police force, a Board of Health, a garbage collection system, and a sewer system. The township set aside parkland and encouraged the formation of the Cheltenham Township Fire Department from a conglomeration of volunteer fire companies. Cheltenham's police force won recognition for innovation crime solving techniques and use of technology in 1916. This innovative and vision has continued ever since and Cheltenham remains one of the most progressive townships in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

I am proud to represent such an extraordinary town. This anniversary should serve as a long-standing tribute to the hard work and dedication for all who have made the Cheltenham Township the wonderful place it is.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTION OF MUSIC EDUCATORS

HON. DAVID M. McINTOSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 2000

Mr. McINTOSH. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing a resolution recognizing the value of music education and honoring music educators across our nation who contribute so much to the intellectual, social, and artistic development of our children.

Music education has touched the lives of many young people in my state of Indiana. It has taught them team work and discipline, while refining their cognitive and communications skills. Music education enables Hoosier children with disabilities to participate more fully in school while motivating at-risk students to stay in school and become active participants in the educational process.

Consider the experience of Patrick, a young man in Muncie, Indiana. A couple of years ago, Patrick was an angry teenager who was having trouble in school and with the law. His father had left home years before. His family tried very hard to reach him but it seemed nothing could help him get his life turned around.

Knowing that Patrick loved music, his grandmother suggested he audition for the White River Youth Choir. With the encouragement of his mother and probation officer, he tried out and was accepted. Patrick has been a member of the choir ever since. He faithfully attends practice and has even toured with the choir outside of the country. The choir director, Dr. Don Ester, has become a powerful role model in his life. Patrick has made new friends and has goals for his life.

The change in Patrick's life was so remarkable that his grandmother wrote this letter to Dr. Don Ester, the choir director, thanking him for helping her grandson. In her letter she says:

> Recently, some of the friends that [Patrick] used to hang out with were arrested for a series of armed robberies. This holiday season, their families are visiting them in jail and preparing for criminal trial proceedings. We (Patrick's family) are counting our blessings that we are able to come hear him sing in the winter concert rather than what might have been if he had continued on the path he was headed. Of course, many events and many good people in this community have helped Patrick, but I am convinced that much of the credit goes to you and the loving work you are doing with the kids in the choir.

Studies support anecdotal evidence—students who participate in music education are less likely to be involved in gangs, drugs, or alcohol abuse and have better attendance in school. A 1999 report by the Texas Commission on Drug and Alcohol Abuse found that individuals who participated in band or orchestra reported the lowest levels of current and lifelong use of alcohol, tobacco, and illicit drugs.

Consider the case of the Boys Choir of Harlem which performed last month at the Kennedy Center. The 200 member choir is composed of intercity youth aged 8–18. In spite of the difficulties these children face, almost all of them graduate from high school and go on to college.

Not only does music education help many at-risk kids develop an interest in learning, but

it also helps many children excel in their studies.

Recent studies underscore what parents and teachers have known for a long time—that music education contributes to enhanced cognitive development, discipline, teamwork, and self-esteem. These studies indicate that music education dramatically enhances a child's ability to solve complex math and science problems. Further, students who participate in music programs often score significantly higher on standardized tests.

In kindergarten classes in Kettle Moraine, Wisconsin, children who were given music instruction scored 48 percent higher on spatial-temporal skill tests than those who did not receive music training. After learning eighth, quarter, half, and whole notes, second and third graders scored 100 percent higher on fractions tests than their peers who were taught fractions using traditional methods.

Gwen Hunter, a music teacher at DeSoto and Albany Elementary Schools in Indiana, recently wrote me a letter: ''I feel strongly that the arts broaden children's creativity, self-esteem, and emotional well-being. Music is an area of study that builds cognitive, affective, and psychomotor skills that can be transferred to other areas of interest. It caters itself to the different types of learners by offering opportunities for visual learners, listening learners and kinesthetic learners. Music education allows students the opportunity to develop and demonstrate self-expression.''

Just this last February, students from 11 different sites in Indiana participated in Circle the State with Song. The event, sponsored by the Indiana Music Educators Association, began as an all day rehearsal and culminated in an afternoon concert. Janet Morris, who is a teacher at Royerton Elementary School in Muncie, Indiana, shared with me what some of the participants learned during the event.

Here are some of the statements they made:

I learned that when you put enough time and effort into something, it pays off in the end.

I learned how to work together.

I learned that music is so meaningful and powerful when everybody works together.

Music is really, really, fun!

I want to learn to compose.

I've learned how fun it is to perform for people.

Janet also shared with me one of her favorite memories teaching elementary school music. She said, ''One of the best stories I have is of a 4th grade young lady who looked at me very seriously during a choir rehearsal one day and blurted out, ''I'm going to grow up and be you . . . I want to be a music teacher.'' Needless to say, I was almost in tears her emotion was so intense and I was so stunned that a child saw and shared my passion for teaching. This young lady is still planning on being a music teacher and probably won't let anything detour her. She is now in 8th grade and working very hard on her flute, piano and singing.''

So, too, music education builds dreams. The symphonies of tomorrow begin in the classroom of today.

I want to thank Gwen Hunter, Janet Morris, Joe Poio, Keith Pautler, and Dr. Don Ester and all the music teachers in Indiana and across the nation for their wonderful contribution to the education of our youth. I especially want to thank my band teachers, Peter Bottomly and Phil Zent, who served as good role models while I was in high school in Kendallville, Indiana. The discipline I learned while mastering a difficult instrument like the tuba, has served me well.

I would also like to thank all of my colleagues who joined me in introducing this resolution—Representatives CLEMENT, HILLEARY, KUCINICH, and ROUKEMA. Music education is an important academic discipline which can provide a deep, lasting contribution to a child's formal schooling and music educators are doing a terrific job.

TRIBUTE TO CHIEF JOHN TURNER

HON. JAY INSLEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 2000

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an exceptional police chief from Mountlake Terrace, Chief John Turner. Chief Turner recently retired from law enforcement after twenty-nine years of dedicated service to the State of Washington. He was also the longest serving Chief in Snohomish County. As a law enforcement officer, Chief Turner has spent most of his life providing a sense of security and ensuring public safety for the community. He is a dedicated public servant, and the community wholeheartedly embraces and appreciates his tireless service.

Chief Turner, although leaving the Mountlake Terrace Police, will still be involved in the realm of law enforcement as the Executive Director for the Western Regional Institute for Community Policing (WRICOPS). WRICOPS, one of twenty-nine university/law enforcement collaborations funded by Congress, provides an integrated approach to community policing through training, technical assistance, and applied research. WRICOPS is based at Washington State University in Spokane, and serves the states of Idaho, Montana, South Dakota, Washington, and Wyoming.

Chief Turner has always been a visionary leader and has taken a pro-active approach as an officer of the law. He has a long legacy of encouraging community involvement by working with many community groups, elected officials, and citizens in an effort to improve public safety. He helped to establish the Northwest High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area (HIDTA), created to stop the flow of drugs and drug-related crime into our counties. HIDTA, part of the Office of National Drug Control Policy, works to reduce drug trafficking in the most critical areas of the country by providing a coordination umbrella for local, state, and federal law enforcement efforts. He was also ahead of his time in notifying the public about registered sex offenders—Mountlake Terrace was the first police agency in Washington State to broadcast such warnings.

Finally, Chief Turner recognized the need to reach out to at-risk youth and give young people a safe place to spend their weekend nights. The Neutral Zone was created in 1992 as a collaborative effort between Chief Turner and the Edmonds School District. The Neutral Zone, a hugely successful program that has received nation-wide recognition, provides a supervised, drug-free place where young people can simply hang out and socialize on Friday and Saturday nights until 2 a.m. Teens learn to develop positive relationships with peers and adults, and parents are assured that their child is safe.

Chief Turner is a shining example of a great police officer and a great community leader. I ask all of my colleagues to join me in thanking him for his service, and wishing him well in all of his future endeavors.

NORTHEASTERN PENNSYLVANIA RED CROSS BLOOD PROGRAM HONORED

HON. PAUL E. KANJORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 2000

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the American Red Cross Blood Program in my District in Pennsylvania. On March 9, the local chapter will celebrate 50 years of service to Northeastern Pennsylvania. I am pleased and proud to have been asked to participate in the celebration.

It is fitting, during American Red Cross Month, to acknowledge the outstanding service of the blood program. In 1950, the Wyoming Valley Chapter of Blood Services was formed. By the end of the first year, over 21,000 units of blood were collected and the unit was serving 17 counties and 56 hospitals.

In 1979, the facility moved to its current location in Hanover Industrial Estates and expanded service to 19 counties in Pennsylvania and 2 counties in New York. Expansion continued when Bloodmobile Buses were included, taking the collection effort throughout the district. By 1999, the program included two bloodmobile units.

Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that the American Red Cross is one of our nation's finest and most dedicated institutions, helping millions of people through disaster and difficulty. The blood program is a vital part of that effort. Currently the local chapter serves 1.5 million people, and in 1999, collected an unprecedented 87,600 units of blood.

Blood collection assists in the care of the critically ill, premature newborns, accident victims, surgery patients, and burn victims. Over 10,000 volunteers assist the staff of 200 professionals, currently led by Ms. Chris Rogers. The agency supplies blood to 41 hospitals in Northeastern and Central Pennsylvania. In addition to collecting blood, the Blood Center offers blood testing, including typing and HIV testing.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring this milestone anniversary of the American Red Cross Blood Program of Northeastern Pennsylvania to the attention of my colleagues. I send these dedicated people my sincere gratitude for a ''job well done'' and best wishes for continued success.

CONGRATULATING TIM AND LINDA RUPLI ON THE BIRTH OF THEIR SON, TIMOTHY RICHARD RUPLI, JR.

HON. ROBERT W. NEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 2000

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, Tim and Linda Rupli celebrated the birth of their son, Timothy Rupli, Jr. on February 19th, 2000. Timothy was born at 12:22 AM and weighed 7.1 lbs and was 19.5 inches long.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in celebrating the birth of Timothy Richard Rupli, Jr. I am sure that his birth will bring a bundle of love and enjoyment to their lives. I send the three of them my best wishes.

IN RECOGNITION OF EVELYN G. SUMTER

HON. NYDIA M. VELAZQUEZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 2000

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my sincerest congratulations to Missionary Life Member, Evelyn G. Sumter of Bushwick, Brooklyn, who on March 11, 2000, will be Honored at the New York Annual Lay Organization Conference of the African Methodist Episcopal Church.

''Go ye therefore, and teach all nations,'' Matthew 28:19 speaks volumes for the work and contributions, Mrs. Sumter has made to her community. As a member of the Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church of Harlem, New York, Mrs. Sumter has also given valuable love and tireless energy as a mother, grandmother, and care giver to 52 foster children in Brooklyn and Harlem.

In dedicating her life to community service work, Mrs. Sumter has served as the Housing Chairperson of the Community Corporation; Director of the Young People and Children's Division of her church; Chairperson of the New York Lay Organization's Social Action Committee; New York HIV/AIDS Program; Operator of her own private day care center; Director of the Bushwick Neighborhood Coordinating Day Care Center; Director of the Bushwick Family Life and Education Project Counseling Services; Parliamentarian of Woodhull Medical and Mental Hospital Advisory Board; Director of the Bushwick Youth Community Support Program; and Family Counselor for the Horace E. Green Day Care Center.

Currently she is the Director of the Palmetto Garden Senior Center; Member of the Together With Love Food For Survival Program; 1st Vice Chairperson of the Bushwick Community Action Association, Inc.; and Board Member of the Bushwick Community Service Society.

Mrs. Sumter holds a Bachelor's degree in Early Childhood Education from Antioch University in Yellowspring, Ohio and a Master's in Social Work with credits in Special Education from Adelphi University in Garden City, New York.

In 1951, Mrs. Sumter became the first Lay delegate of the New York Conference to the biennial Convention Tulsa, Oklahoma. And a year later, she became the President of the Rosa B. Williams Women's Missionary; and Dean of the Manhattan Area Institute.

As President John F. Kennedy once said ''Leadership and learning are indispensable to each other.'' I believe Evelyn G. Sumter understands that which is why she has been such an inspirational figure in her community, and has dedicated her time and spirit in enhancing the lives of others. I am proud to offer my congratulations to Evelyn today and to personally thank her for all her contributions to society.

EULOGY OF GENERAL LEONARD F. CHAPMAN

HON. JOHN P. MURTHA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 6, 2000

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, General Chapman was one of the finest Commandants of the Marine Corps and General Mundy's comments, which follow, are an outstanding tribute to him.

EULOGY

(By General Carl Mundy)

The son of a Methodist minister, Leonard Chapman came up from his birthplace in Key West, to Deland, Florida where he grew up. He graduated from the University of Florida, and was commissioned a lieutenant of Marines in 1935, eight days before I was born. Fifty-six years later, he administered the oath that made me the thirtieth Commandant. Leonard Chapman never outgrew his Southern roots. His Grandfather was a young Confederate soldier from Tennessee who lost a leg in the War. In order to maintain his farm, and to get about comfortably, he trained his horses to a gait we know as the Tennessee walking horse. General Chapman never abandoned that family homestead, keeping the 1790 tavern on the Natchez Trace—today a National Historic Landmark—as a farmhouse in the hands of a caretaker. He stayed there a couple of months each year, usually in June and July. A call on the telephone to him would get an answer from Miss Ella, the caretaker's wife. ''Yallow!'', she would answer, and after you had identified yourself as wanting to speak with ''The General'', came ''Hold on a minute'', followed by the sound of a squeaking screen door, and a loud call: ''Fielding; there's a fellow wants to talk to you on the telephone over here!''. Grass roots.

General Chapman's heroes were Robert E. Lee, and ''Lee's Lieutenants''. He read voraciously, re-reading several times Douglas Southall Freeman's volumes on the soldier-leaders of the Confederacy. He won the hand of a Southern Belle—Miss Emily Walton Ford, of the Birmingham Fords. Had this grand lady not become a Marine wife, it's likely she would have claimed the role of Scarlet O'Hara in ''Gone With the Wind''. As it was, she brought the elegance and graciousness of the ''Old South'' into the Corps with her, and eventually to the Home of the Commandants. Leonard's love affair with Emily was life-long, and his quiet devotion and attentiveness to her during her prolonged illness before death were an inspiration to all of us who knew them. He lost his first son, Len—a Marine—to a tragic accident, and became to his daughter-in-law, Gayle, and his granddaughter, Danielle, the companion and father they lost. I'll never forget, Danny, when you were small enough that you'll be embarrassed if I talk too much about it, watching your grandfather, in an almost crouched position, teaching you ballroom dancing at an Army-Navy Country Club Friday night dance! His second son, Walton Ford Chapman, was also a Marine, to his father's great pride.

Working their way through Duke in the early sixties enroute to the Corps, as their Officer Selection Officer, I can recall judging whether the Chapman boys had been, or were headed home for a visit, by the length of their hair! In more recent years, how excited, and filled with pride your dad's voice would become when he would announce that he was ''. . . going up to Massachusetts for a few days to help Walt clear a little timber!'' His pride in each member of his family, his joy in your accomplishments, and his devotion to, and love for you were palpable and inspirational.

I met General Chapman when I was a first lieutenant, and he, a brand new Brigadier General. We were in the field at Camp Lejeune, and I recall thinking that this was the sharpest Marine officer I had ever seen. My opinion never changed. His early years of sea-duty at the outset of world War II left him with a spit and polish that never left. On the day he retired, he was still the sharpest Marine officer I've ever known. Others must have had the same opinion, like General Lemuel Shepherd, our 20th Commandant, who ordered him to the Marine Barracks in Washington, where among his lasting legacies is the spit and polish precision and the unexcelled spirit and professionalism he created in the Evening Parades at the Barracks, and the Marine Corps War Memorial. Leonard Chapman's manner, his demeanor, and his character matched the perfection of his deportment and appearance. He was a gentleman in all respects. At the outset of his commandancy, a reported called him ''The Quiet Man''. Those closest to him knew him to have been invariably courteous; never to have raised his voice in anger, never to have indulged in gossip, or never to have badmouthed or criticized even those with whom he might disagree. But they knew him also, to have an analytic mind that missed no detail, and a layer of tungsten steel determination just below the surface. He was tough, but he led by logic, character, and inspiring example.

In his final tours, as Chief of Staff of the Corps, he helped General Wallace Greene build, train, equip, and employ in combat in Vietnam the largest Marine Corps since World War II. He introduced computers to the Corps, and gave us automated management and information systems. When he became Commandant, the war was on a downward spiral, and the United States wasn't going to win. Throughout his tenure, his abiding determination was to bring the Corps home in fighting condition, and to preserve it as a spirited American Institution. He faced obstacles in a society where the profession of arms and answering the call to duty were under fire, and in which morals, accountability, and discipline were decaying. He responded by driving the Corps to maintain standards.

When Sister Services succumbed to societal pressures and relaxed standards and discipline, General Chapman tightened them in the Corps. When others advertised, ''We want to join you'' to prospective recruits, General Chapman countered with, ''Maybe you're good enough to be one of us!''. When anti-war activists rallied against war, General Chapman countered with ''Nobody likes to fight, but somebody has to know how!'' For those in the Corps who weakened under the enormous pressures of the times, General Chapman issued a simple edict: ''Marines Don't

Do That''—a leadership thesis used to this day to teach Marines, and leaders of Marines, what is expected of them above and beyond others.

He believed in education. As Commandant, he established Staff NCO Academy, and in retirement, was founder of the Marine Corps Command and Staff College Foundation, with the purpose of enhancing leadership development among the officers and NCOs of the Corps. He led the Foundation as its President for 14 years, leaving yet another legacy to leadership.

But there was a spirited and fun-loving side to this great man. He was an inveterate golfer, playing the game with skill and enthusiasm to the end. Until recent years, he was a seven handicap. He would tell with a chuckle the story of an officer on whom he wrote a glowing fitness report, but ended it with, ''. . . but he can't putt!'' He walked the course, carrying his bag, and referred to those in his foursome who chose to ride a cart as ''couch potatoes''. Even with his spirited humor, however, the courtly, gentlemanliness was ever there. As he and I played golf together one day, after a particularly humiliating tee shot where, with a mighty swing, I topped the ball and dribbled it into the rough about seventy-five yards out, we walked together in silence for a few moments before he offered, gently, ''Carl, that was not among your better shots today!'' Classic Chapman. He loved the Washington Redskins, and rarely missed a game, always, of course, making it first to church on a Sunday. He delighted, when the minister asked the congregation to greet and extend ''Peace'' to those beside them, in saying instead, ''War!'' if it were a Redskins Sunday! Noting that his team entered the playoffs last weekend, maybe that was one ''for the General!''

Commandants have an occasional habit of gathering their ''formers'' at some point during their tenures to update on what's going on. This usually begets spirited discussions of how it used to be, how it might better be, or how it ought to be. General Chapman, usually the elder at such gatherings, as the tempo of suggestions from around the table increased, would delight in breaking in, good naturedly, but with meaning, to say, ''If you junior officers will hold it down, I'll remind you that each of you had the chance to do what you're suggesting on your watch. Let's listen to what the Commandant has to say!''

Linda and I, with Gayle and General Chapman, were guests for dinner at John and Ginny Kinniburg's home a few years back. As Ginny was busily passing her wonderful dishes, the butter came by. Always concerned for the welfare of ''The General'', for whom she and John so devotedly never gave up being aides-de-camp for, and closest friends with, Ginny handed General Chapman the butter with the healthful comment, ''I don't suppose you'll be having any butter, General, but, please pass it along''. With a wry twinkle in his eye, General Chapman took a sizeable slice for his bread, and quipped, ''No, Ginny; I'm going down with the ship!''

Leonard Fielding Chapman, Jr.—husband, father, grandfather, friend, gentleman, Marine—did not go down with the ship. He was the helmsman who steered his life, many of ours, and that of our Corps, through sometimes troubled waters, but with a steadiness that brought calm inspiration, personal strength, and legacy to us, and thousands of others. As we remember him, let us be grateful that America produced one among its ''few good men and women called Marines'', who we were privileged to know and love. Men of the stature of Leonard Chapman do not often pass this way.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, March 7, 2000 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MARCH 8

9:30 a.m.

Judiciary

Administrative Oversight and the Courts Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 2089, to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to modify procedures relating to orders for surveillance and searches for foreign intelligence purposes.

SH–216

Rules and Administration

To hold hearings on the nomination of Danny Lee McDonald, of Oklahoma, to be a Member of the Federal Election Commission; and Bradley A. Smith, of Ohio, to be a Member of the Federal Election Commission; hearing to be followed by a business meeting.

SR–301

Armed Services

Airland Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 2001 for the Department of Defense and the Future Years Defense Program, focusing on Army transformation.

SR–232A

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Communications Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine recent hacker attacks on popular websites, and examine the coordination of federal and industry efforts to heighten Internet security.

SR–253

Energy and Natural Resources

To hold oversight hearings to examine energy supply and demand issues, focusing on the rise in price of crude oil, heating oil, and transportation fuels.

SD–366

10 a.m.

Appropriations

Defense Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2001 for the Department of Defense, focusing on medical programs.

SD–192

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Business meeting to consider S. 2097, to authorize loan guarantees in order to facilitate access to local television broadcast signals in unserved and underserved areas; S. 1452, to modernize the requirements under the National Manufactured Housing Construction and Safety Standards of 1974 and to establish a balanced consensus process for the development, revision, and interpretation of Federal construction and safety standards for manufactured homes; the nomination of Kathryn Shaw, of Pennsylvania, to be a Member of the Council of Economic Advisers; and the nomination of Jay Johnson, of Wisconsin, to be Director of the Mint.

SD–628

10:30 a.m.

Foreign Relations

International Operations Subcommittee

To hold hearings on the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2001 for foreign aid.

SD–419

2 p.m.

Intelligence

To hold closed hearings on pending intelligence matters.

SH–219

Armed Services

Strategic Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 2001 for the Department of Defense and the Future Years Defense Program, focusing on National Security Space programs, policies, and operations.

SR–222

2:30 p.m.

Foreign Relations

Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.

SD–419

Energy and Natural Resources

National Parks, Historic Preservation, and Recreation Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 1705, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to enter into land exchanges to acquire from the private owner and to convey to the State of Idaho approximately 1,240 acres of land near the City of Rocks National Reserve, Idaho; S. 972, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to improve the administration of the Lamprey River in the State of New Hampshire; S. 1727, to authorize for the expansion annex of the historic Palace of the Governors, a public history museum located, and relating to the history of Hispanic and Native American culture, in the Southwest and for other purposes; S. 1849, to designate segments and tributaries of White Clay Creek, Delaware and Pennsylvania, as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System; S. 1910, to amend the Act establishing Women's Rights National Historical Park to permit the Secretary of the Interior to acquire title in fee simple to the Hunt House located in Waterloo, New York; and H.R. 1615, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to extend the designation of a portion of the Lamprey River in New Hampshire as a recreational river to include an additional river segment.

SD–366

Indian Affairs

To hold hearing on the reauthorization of the Health Care Improvement Act.

SR–485

MARCH 9

9 a.m.

Joint Economic Committee

To hold hearings to examine the impact of supply-side economics on the United States economy over the past twenty years.

SD–562

Environment and Public Works

Clean Air, Wetlands, Private Property, and Nuclear Safety Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

SD–406

9:30 a.m.

Intelligence

To hold closed hearings on pending intelligence matters.

SH–219

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine issues dealing with Medicare.

SH–216

Armed Services

To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 2001 for the Department of Defense and the Future Years Defense Program, focusing on the Atomic Energy Defense Activities of the Department of Energy.

SR–222

10 a.m.

Appropriations

Transportation Subcommittee

To hold hearings on the Department of Transportation Program oversight.

SD–124

Governmental Affairs

Oversight of Government Management, Restructuring and the District of Columbia Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine managing human capital in the 21st century.

SD–342

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe

To hold hearings to examine certain issues in Belarus.

334 Cannon Building

Judiciary

Business meeting to markup H.R. 1658, to provide a more just and uniform procedure for Federal civil forfeitures; S. 2045, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to H–1B nonimmigrant aliens; S. 1796, to modify the enforcement of certain anti-terrorism judgements; and S.J. Res. 39, recognizing the 50th anniversary of the Korean War and the service by members of the Armed Forces during such war.

SD–226

Foreign Relations

European Affairs Subcommittee

To hold hearings on NATO and the European Defense Progam.

SD–419

Appropriations

Treasury and General Government Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2001 for the Department of the Treasury.

S–116, Capitol

2 p.m.

Intelligence

To hold closed hearings on pending intelligence matters.

SH–219

MARCH 10

9 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Forests and Public Land Management Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 1892, to authorize the acquisition of the Valles Caldera, to provide for an effective land and wildlife management program for this

resource within the Department of Agriculture.

SD–366

Armed Services

Readiness and Management Support Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 2001 for the Department of Defense and the Future Years Defense Program, focusing on the Service's infrastrutre accounts and Real Property Maintenance Programs and the National Defense Construction Request.

SR–232A

MARCH 15

10 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs on the Legislative recommendation of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

345 Cannon Building

MARCH 21

9:30 a.m.

Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings on regulating Internet pharmacies.

SD–430

10 a.m.

Appropriations

Commerce, Justice, State, and the Judiciary Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2001 for the Federal Communications Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission.

S–146, Capitol

10:30 a.m.

Indian Affairs

To hold hearings on S. 2102, to provide to the Timbisha Shoshone Tribe a permanent land base within its aboriginal homeland.

SR–485

MARCH 22

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Interior Subcommittee

To hold hearings on the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2001 for the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.

SD–124

Indian Affairs

To hold hearings on the nomination of Thomas N. Slonaker, of Arizona, to be Special Trustee, Office of Special Trustee for American Indians, Department of the Interior.

SR–485

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings on the nomination of Susan Ness, of Maryland, to be a Member of the Federal Communications Commission.

SR–253

10 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs on the Legislative recommendation of the Vietnam Veterans of America, the Retired Officers Association, American Ex-Prisoners of War, AMVETS, and the National Association of State Directors of Veterans Affairs.

345 Cannon Building

Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings on Department of Energy's management of health and safety issues surrounding the DOE's gaseous diffusion plants at Oak Ridge, Tennessee, and Piketon, Ohio.

SD–342

2:30 p.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine recent program and management issues at NASA.

SR–253

MARCH 23

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2001 for the Environmental Protection Agency.

SD–138

Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

Public Health Subcommittee

To hold hearings on safety net providers.

SD–430

10 a.m.

Appropriations

Commerce, Justice, State, and the Judiciary Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2001 for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration of the Department of Commerce, and the Securities and Exchange Commission.

S–146, Capitol

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold oversight hearings on the Monetary Policy Report to Congress pursuant to the Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act of 1978.

SH–216

MARCH 28

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Communications Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine the current state of deployment of hi-speed Internet technologies, focusing on rural areas.

SR–253

Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

Children and Families Subcommittee

To hold hearings on child safety on the Internet.

SD–430

MARCH 29

9:30 a.m.

Indian Affairs

Business meeting to consider pending calendar business; to be followed by hearings on S. 1967, to make technical corrections to the status of certain land held in trust for the Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians, to take certain land into trust for that Band.

SR–485

Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.

SD–430

Appropriations

Interior Subcommittee

To hold hearings on the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2001 for the Department of the Interior.

SD–124

10 a.m.

Appropriations

Defense Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2001 for the Department of Defense, focusing on Air Force programs.

SD–192

Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings on meeting the challenges of the millennium, focusing on proposals to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the Federal Government.

SD–342

MARCH 30

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2001 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

SD–138

10 a.m.

Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings on medical records privacy.

SD–430

APRIL 4

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Interior Subcommittee

To hold hearings on the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2001 for the Bureau of Indian Affairs and Office of the Special Trustee, Department of the Interior.

SD–138

APRIL 5

9:30 a.m.

Indian Affairs

To hold hearings on S. 612, to provide for periodic Indian needs assessments, to require Federal Indian program evaluations.

SR–485

10 a.m.

Appropriations

Defense Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2001 for the Department of Defense, focusing on Army programs.

SD–192

APRIL 6

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2001 for the Department of Veterans Affairs.

SD–138

APRIL 11

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

Interior Subcommittee

To hold hearings on the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2001 for the Department of Energy.

SD–138

APRIL 12

9:30 a.m.

Indian Affairs

To hold hearings on S. 611, to provide for administrative procedures to extend Federal recognition to certain Indian groups, and will be followed by a business meeting to consider pending committee business.

SR–485

10 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2001 for the Department of Defense, focusing on missile defense programs.
SD–192

APRIL 13

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2001 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
SD–138

APRIL 26

10 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2001 for the Department of Defense.
SD–192

SEPTEMBER 26

9:30 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs on the Legislative recommendation of the American Legion.
345 Cannon Building

POSTPONEMENTS

MARCH 8

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2001 for the National Science Foundation, and the Office of Science and Technology Policy.
SD–138

MARCH 15

9:30 a.m.
Indian Affairs
Business meeting to consider pending calendar business; to be followed by hearings on the proposed Indian Health Care Improvement Act.
SR–485

APRIL 19

9:30 a.m.
Indian Affairs
Business meeting to consider pending calendar business; to be followed by hearings on S. 611, to provide for administrative procedures to extend Federal recognition to certain Indian groups.
SR–485

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S1159–91

Measures Introduced: Three bills were introduced, as follows: S. 2181–2183. **Page S1173**

Measures Reported: Reports were made as follows: S. 1653, to reauthorize and amend the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation Establishment Act. (S. Rept. No. 106–230) **Page S1173**

Nomination—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for a vote on the confirmation of the nomination of Julio M. Fuentes, of New Jersey, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit, to occur at 5 p.m., on Tuesday, March 7, 2000. **Page S1187**

Nominations—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for the consideration of the nominations of Marsha L. Berzon, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, and Richard A. Paez, of California, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, on Tuesday, March 7, 2000, at 2:15 p.m. **Page S1187**

Communications: **Pages S1171–72**

Petitions: **Pages S1172–73**

Statements on Introduced Bills: **Pages S1173–85**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S1185–86**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S1186–87**

Notices of Hearings: **Page S1187**

Authority for Committees: **Page S1187**

Additional Statements: **Pages S1170–71**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 12:02 p.m., and adjourned at 4:29 p.m., until 10 a.m., on Tuesday, March 7, 2000. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S1187.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS—DEFENSE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Defense concluded hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2001 for the Department of Defense, after receiving testimony from John J. Hamre, Deputy Secretary of Defense.

AIR FORCE DEPOT MAINTENANCE

Committee on Armed Services: On Friday, March 3, Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support concluded hearings to examine the management of Air Force depot maintenance on fielded weapon systems, after receiving testimony from F. Whitten Peters, Secretary of the Air Force; Gen. George T. Babbitt, Jr., USAF, Commander, Air Force Materiel Command; and David R. Warren, Director, and Julia C. Denman, Assistant Director, both of Defense Management Issues, National Security and International Affairs Division, General Accounting Office.

RUSSIAN THREAT REDUCTION PROGRAMS

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities concluded closed and open hearings to examine U.S. programs to reduce the threats that the former Soviet Union's weapons of mass destruction pose to national security, focusing on the Department of Defense Cooperative Threat Reduction programs and the Department of Energy Nonproliferation programs, after receiving testimony from John A. Lauder, Director, Nonproliferation Center, Central Intelligence Agency; Harold J. Johnson, Associate Director, International Relations and Trade Issues, National Security and International Affairs Division, General Accounting Office; Susan J. Koch, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Threat Reduction Policy; and Rose E. Gottemoeller, Acting Deputy Administrator for Defense Nuclear Nonproliferation, Department of Energy.

COLON CANCER PREVENTION

Special Committee on Aging: Committee concluded hearings to examine the prevention and treatment of colon cancer, focusing on efforts to increase awareness and screening procedures, including the use of Medicare-covered screening and diagnostic services to prevent colorectal cancer and minimize its effect on beneficiaries health status through early detection and treatment, after receiving testimony from William J. Scanlon, Director, Health Financing and Public Health Issues, Health, Education, and Human Services Division, General Accounting Office; Michael McMullan, Deputy Director, Center for Beneficiary Services, Health Care Financing Administration, Department of Health and Human Services; Katie Couric, National Broadcasting Company, on behalf of the National Colorectal Cancer Research Alliance, and Shirley Heiligman, both of New York, New York; and Bernard Levin, University of Texas M.D. Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, on behalf of the American Gastroenterological Association.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: 8 public bills, H.R. 3832–3839; and 4 resolutions, H.J. Res. 90 and H. Con. Res. 264–266, were introduced. **Pages H646–47**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed as follows:

H.R. 1743, to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2000 and 2001 for the environmental and scientific and energy research, development, and demonstration and commercial application of energy technology programs, projects, and activities of the Office of Air and Radiation of the Environmental Protection Agency, and for other purposes, amended (H. Rept. 106–511); and

H.R. 1742, to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2000 and 2001 for the environmental and scientific research, development, and demonstration programs, projects, and activities of the Office of Research and Development and Science Advisory Board of the Environmental Protection Agency, and for other purposes, amended (H. Rept. 106–512). **Page H646**

Speaker Pro Tempore: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he designated Representative Petri to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H643**

House of Representatives Child Care Center Advisory Board: The Chair announced the Speaker's appointment of the following individuals to the Advisory Board for the House of Representatives Child Care Center: Mr. Ron Haskins, Rockville, Maryland; Ms. Linda Bachus, Birmingham, Alabama; Mr. Lee Harrington, Alexandria, Virginia; Ms. Patricia Law, Chevy Chase, Maryland; Ms. Barbara Morris Lent, Arlington, Virginia; Ms. Leisha Pickering, Washington, D.C.; Ms. Nancy Piper, Alexandria, Virginia; Mr. Christopher Smith, Bethesda, Maryland. And upon the recommendation of the Minority Leader: Ms. Paula Swift, Alexandria, Virginia; Ms. Sara Davis, Falls Church, Virginia; Ms. Debbie Dingell, Arlington, Virginia; Mr. Donnald Anderson, Washington, D. C., Ms. Tamra Bentsen, Washington, D.C.; Mr. Jeff Mendelsohn, Washington, D.C.; and Ms. Sylvia Sabo, Vienna, Virginia. **Pages H643–44**

Presidential Messages: Read the following messages from the President:

National Emergency Re Iraq: Message wherein he transmitted his six month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Iraq—referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered printed (H. Doc. 106–204); and **Page H644**

Trade Policy Agenda: Message wherein he transmitted his Trade Policy Agenda and Annual Report on the Trade Agreements Program—referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered printed (H. Doc. 106–205). **Page H644**

Senate Messages: Messages received from the Senate today appear on page 643.

Referrals: S. 1794 was referred to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and S. Con. Res. 91 was referred to the Committee on International Relations. **Page H645**

Quorum Calls—Votes: No quorum calls or recorded votes developed during the proceedings of the House today.

Adjournment: The House met at 2 p.m. and adjourned at 2:10 p.m.

Committee Meetings

CHARTER SCHOOLS: SUCCESSES AND CHALLENGES

Committee on Education and the Workforce, On March 3, the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a hearing on Charter Schools: Successes

and Challenges. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

FEBRUARY EMPLOYMENT

Joint Economic Committee: On Friday, March 3, Committee concluded hearings to examine the employment-unemployment situation for February, focusing on the current consumer and producer price indexes with respect to the inflation outlook, after receiving testimony from Katharine G. Abraham, Commissioner, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR TUESDAY, MARCH 7, 2000

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Military Construction, to hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2001 for the Army and Air Force, 9 a.m., SD–116.

Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, and the Judiciary, to hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2001 for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Drug Enforcement Administration, and Immigration and Naturalization Service, all of the Department of Justice, 10 a.m., SD–192.

Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2001 for the Food and Drug Administration, 10 a.m., SD–138.

Committee on Armed Services: to hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 2001 for the Department of Defense and the Future Years Defense Program, focusing on military strategy and operational requirements; to be followed by a closed hearing (SR–232A), 9:30 a.m., SR–222.

Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support, to hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 2001 for the Department of Defense and the Future Years Defense Program, focusing on readiness programs, 2 p.m., SR–222.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: to hold hearings on S. 1755, to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to regulate interstate commerce in the use of mobile telephones, 9:30 a.m., SR–253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Water and Power, to hold hearings on the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2001 for the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior, and the Bonneville Power Administration, the Southeastern Power Administration, the Southwestern Power Administration, and the Western Area Power Administration, all of the Department of Energy, 2:30 p.m., SD–366.

Committee on Finance: Subcommittee on International Trade, to hold hearings to examine agriculture negotiations in the World Trade Organization after Seattle, 10 a.m., SD–215.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: business meeting to mark up S. 2, to extend programs and activities under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, 10 a.m., SD–430.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to hold closed hearings on pending intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH–219.

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Administrative Oversight and the Courts, to hold hearings on S. 2089, to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to modify procedures relating to orders for surveillance and searches for foreign intelligence purposes, 9:30 a.m., SH–216.

Subcommittee on Technology, Terrorism, and Government Information, to hold hearings on Internet identity preservation, 2 p.m., SD–226.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: to hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs on the legislative recommendations of the Retired Enlisted Association, Gold Star Wives of America, Military Order of the Purple Heart, Air Force Sergeants Association, and the Fleet Reserve Association, 9:30 a.m., 345 Cannon Building.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, on public witnesses, 10 a.m., and 2 p.m., 2358 Rayburn.

Joint Meetings

Joint Meetings: Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, to hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs on the legislative recommendations of the Retired Enlisted Association, Gold Star Wives of America, Military Order of the Purple Heart, Air Force Sergeants Association, and the Fleet Reserve Association, 9:30 a.m., 345 Cannon Building.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10 a.m., Tuesday, March 7

Senate Chamber

Program for Tuesday: After the recognition of six Senators for speeches and the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 12:30 p.m.), *Senate will recess until 2:15 p.m., for their respective party conferences*.

At 2:15 p.m., Senate will begin consideration of the nominations of Marsha L. Berzon and Richard A. Paez, both of California, each to be a U.S. Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

At 5 p.m., Senate will vote on the confirmation of the nomination of Julio M. Fuentes, of New Jersey, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Wednesday, March 8

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Consideration of Suspensions:

1. H.R. 2952, Keith D. Oglesby Postal Service Station in Greenville, South Carolina and

2. H.R. 3018, Marybelle H. Howe Post Office in Charleston, South Carolina;

Consideration of H.R. 1827, Government Waste Corrections Act (open rule, one hour of general debate).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Hoeffel, Joseph M., Pa., E227, E229
Inslee, Jay, Wash., E230
Johnson, Eddie Bernice, Tex., E227, E229
Kanjorski, Paul E., Pa., E230
McIntosh, David M., Ind., E229
Moran, James P., Va., E227
Morella, Constance A., Md., E228
Murtha, John P., Pa., E231
Ney, Robert W., Ohio, E231
Petri, Thomas E., Wisc., E227
Rogan, James E., Calif., E228
Sandlin, Max, Tex., E228
Velazquez, Nydia M., N.Y., E231

Congressional Record The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed at one time. ¶Public access to the Congressional Record is available online through *GPO Access,* a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. The online database is updated each day the Congressional Record is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d session (January 1994) forward. It is available on the Wide Area Information Server (WAIS) through the Internet and via asynchronous dial-in. Internet users can access the database by using the World Wide Web; the Superintendent of Documents home page address is http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs, by using local WAIS client software or by telnet to swais.access.gpo.gov, then login as guest (no password required). Dial-in users should use communications software and modem to call (202) 512–1661; type swais, then login as guest (no password required). For general information about *GPO Access,* contact the *GPO Access* User Support Team by sending Internet e-mail to gpoaccess@gpo.gov, or a fax to (202) 512–1262; or by calling Toll Free 1–888–293–6498 or (202) 512–1530 between 7 a.m. and 5:30 p.m. Eastern time, Monday through Friday, except for Federal holidays. ¶The Congressional Record paper and 24x microfiche will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, $179.00 for six months, $357.00 per year, or purchased for $3.00 per issue, payable in advance; microfiche edition, $141.00 per year, or purchased for $1.50 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly Congressional Record Index may be purchased for the same per issue prices. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250–7954, or phone orders to (202) 512–1800, or fax to (202) 512–2250. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily Congressional Record is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the Congressional Record.