



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

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

Vol. 146

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, MARCH 13, 2000

No. 27

## Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, March 20, 2000, at 12 noon.

## House of Representatives

MONDAY, MARCH 13, 2000

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

□

### DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,

March 13, 2000.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DAN MILLER 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:

We are appreciative, O God, of our own heritage of faith for we know that we have gained strength and confidence by knowing our traditions and the values that make our traditions come alive. Yet we celebrate this day, gracious God, the opportunities that we have to hear other voices of faith and to learn about differing traditions. Grant every person, whatever their background or responsibility, not only to experience the fullness of their own faith, but to understand more fully the practice and traditions of others. Help us to lift our eyes and open our ears so we realize more fully that every person has been created in Your image and we share together in Your abiding spirit and love. This is our earnest prayer. 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 Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. DEFAZIO 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.

□

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the Speaker signed the following enrolled bill on Friday, March 10, 2000:

S. 376, to amend the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 to promote competition and privatization in satellite communications, and for other purposes.

□

### APPOINTMENT AS INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to clause 6 of

rule II, the Chair announces the joint appointment by the Speaker, majority leader, and minority leader of Mr. Steven A. McNamara of Sterling, Virginia, to the position of Inspector General for the United States House of Representatives for the 106th Congress.

There was no objection.

□

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

S. 1653. An act to reauthorize and amend the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation Establishment Act.

S.J. Res. 39. 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. Con. Res. 95. Concurrent resolution commemorating the twelfth anniversary of the Halabja massacre.

□

### FEDERAL BUREAUCRACY IS PREVENTING AMERICA'S CHILDREN FROM LEARNING

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, there is some troubling news about our educational system which seems to be heading in the wrong direction.

A recent survey of college students showed that 45 percent of those college

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H923

students would be denied U.S. citizenship because they could not correctly answer at least seven out of ten basic American history questions.

Mr. Speaker, foreigners know more about U.S. history and they know that history better than our own children. The poll showed that 56 percent of students could not place in order of occurrence the U.S. invasion of Normandy, the Korean War, the Cuban Missile Crisis and the fall of the Berlin Wall. But 94 percent knew that Leonardo DiCaprio was the lead actor in "Titanic."

Mr. Speaker, Federal spending on education is at an all-time high; and yet, 40 percent of our Nation's fourth graders fall below the basic level of reading achievement. It is obvious that more money on failing programs is not the answer.

We need to enact real educational reform that give parents and teachers the resources they need to educate our children.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back all the Federal bureaucracy that is preventing our children from learning U.S. history.

□

#### AMERICA IS SUBSERVIENT TO OPEC COUNTRIES

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

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, how long can we Americans tolerate the spectacle of our country groveling at the feet of OPEC countries and begging them to produce more oil, pleading with them to send us more oil, pleading with them to reduce the cost of gasoline at the pump, of our energy costs?

We are subservient to the OPEC countries. The greatest country in the world is being dictated to in its practices by OPEC. We cannot tolerate that. We shall not sustain that.

For those purposes, we are going to begin to circulate very soon a bill which will create a blue ribbon commission to determine how within 10 years we can become self-sufficient in energy. No more of this dependence on foreign oil. We can do it ourselves and we must.

We must explore to the fullest extent the oil possibilities in our own land, in Alaska, and wherever energy can be produced and conserved. We must give offshore drilling a fair chance with due diligence and due respect to the environment. But we must do everything possible so that we do not have to be enslaved by OPEC.

□

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

#### CONGRESS AND THE PRESIDENT MUST DO SOMETHING ABOUT THE HIGH COST OF OIL

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, gasoline is nearing \$2 a gallon across the United States. Diesel is up 50 percent. Home heating oil at one point spiked over 100 percent increase from last year. Aviation fuel is on the rise.

Now we have got the Federal Reserve saying they are worried about inflation so they are going to jack up interest rates. Of course, we have got the oil companies at OPEC fixing prices and curtailing production, causing inflation. I say the likelihood of an economic disaster or recession or a dramatic slowdown is pretty great.

Now, what is the response? Well, the response of the Clinton administration and the Republican leadership in Congress to the artificial shortages and the run up in prices is pathetic.

The administration sounds like a bunch of corporate Republicans, let the free market work. Well, guess what? There is no free market in the production and distribution of oil.

The OPEC cartels have met and decided to hold down production and drive up prices to profit themselves and the multi-national oil companies with whom they work hand in glove. Free market? Sure.

Now, the Republican response is equally pathetic, cut taxes, cut taxes. That seems to be the only solution to anything around here. How much? 4.3 cents. They are going to cut gasoline taxes by 4.3 cents. That will solve the problem.

Well, guess what? The taxes were the same level last year when gas was a dollar a gallon. Now it is going to be \$2 a gallon. And that 4.3 cents, the oil companies will suck that up in less than an hour. That is a pathetic response.

They do have another response. Drill the Alaskan National Wildlife Refuge. Ninety-five percent of the north slope is available for oil exploitation.

There is one little tiny bit left. Let us go and punch holes in there. For what? To destroy that pristine area, for what? For 6 months' supply if the optimists are right. More likely, for a few pathetic months' supply. Ruin that area for all time.

And ironically, the same party, the Republicans, jammed legislation through this House 5 years ago demanding that the United States export the oil currently being produced in Alaska.

Now, that is kind of strange. They want to go up and destroy the Alaskan National Wildlife Refuge to produce more oil that they will then export. Why are they doing that? Well, because the big oil companies wanted that, and they are beholding to the big oil companies. This is a predictable and pathetic response to a national crisis.

There is an alternative. Take on the big oil companies. Well, there are not too many around here that want to do that. But, guess what? There is a way we can do it. The President is all for rules-based trade. The Republican majority says they are the greatest defenders of the World Trade Organization. They provided the majority of votes to create it, and they defend it day in and day out in this body.

Article 11 of the Charter of the World Trade Organization, of which six OPEC countries are full members, prohibits, prohibits restrictions on the productions of materials for export.

It is pretty simple. Here we have an organization the U.S. has created, the Clinton administration and the Republican majority backs a hundred percent, they say they want rules-based trade. Well, let us use those rules.

Now, they filed a complaint for a guy who grows bananas. Now, we do not grow bananas in the United States. But he is a big campaign contributor, so the U.S. used its clout in that organization for bananas, used it for hormone-laced beef. But somehow it seems that we cannot use our clout in that organization to file a complaint against OPEC and the largest multi-national oil companies in the world.

It is time to stand tall as a Nation to those oil companies and their partners, the OPEC nations. Use the rules we have. That is a good beginning. There is more that needs to be done.

I am introducing legislation today to ask the President, to strongly urge the President to file that complaint. I hope he does not need that legislation to move forward.

We also need to begin dealing with all the subsidies we provide to those countries, the foreign aid, the military subsidies and the others.

Burden sharing. Kuwait is one of the countries dragging its feet for additional oil production. Did we not save Kuwait?

Now, Kuwait says they are not going to lift a finger. In fact, they want to keep prices down because nobody in Kuwait has to work because the prices are so high. They import workers in Kuwait. Maybe a little burden sharing is in order for some of these countries that we are protecting and extending billions of dollars or our defense umbrella to every year.

And then finally, let us get serious about conservation and renewables and energy independence in this country. If anything poses a threat to this Nation in the next century, it is the fact that we have not gotten serious about concentration and renewables and now we are importing 60 percent of our oil.

This is a threat to the future security of this country. This Congress should not sit on its hands, nor should the President downtown just because some of the largest campaign contributors in the world do not want to do anything about the higher prices for oil. We can do something. It is in our power. Let us act.

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

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

□

#### DOD'S PRIVATIZATION POLICY IN GUAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to do an extended special order on a matter of significance not only to the people in Guam but to the general readiness of our military, and that is the Department of Defense's continuing privatization efforts.

Today I want to discuss this matter which affects not only Guam, my home district, but certainly the whole readiness posture of our Armed Forces.

The Department of Defense has for many years been pursuing a better way to improve efficiencies in the way they conduct business and have begun many, many initiatives to improve their business practices. And like any large government bureaucracy, DoD has for years employed amongst its ranks thousands of civilians, technicians, and specialists, operators, maintenance personnel, laborers, and hundreds of other classifications of jobs.

In all likelihood, I am sure that we all recognize that there are many redundancies and cost inefficiencies and unsound business practices which cried out for reform. Indeed, there were thousands of uniform personnel carrying out tasks and assignments that would have been more suitable for a civilian technician.

However, as a result of the Cold War and in the name of military readiness, these non-war fighting jobs remained a part and parcel of DoD's workforce.

In the age of tight budgets and military drawdowns during the 1990s, the time has come to reform the Federal Government in general, and DoD in particular, in order to cut costs and create a more efficient organization, particularly as we drew down our uniform personnel.

These policies that were employed by the Department of Defense took several different forms and, to be fair, were proscribed in many ways by both Congress and the administration.

First, there was the lowering of the troop ceiling to cut back military end strength. Secondly, the DoD asked for and received, with Congress's blessings, two rounds of base closures and realignments.

Finally, the DoD dusted off an old friend, known as OMB Circular A-76 to implement the third major reform policy initiative. Of course, DoD all along could and would employ so-called re-

ductions in force, or RIFs, to reduce the bureaucracy in order to save money.

In any event, OMB Circular A-76 was employed in tremendous fashion for many reasons that will be clear in a moment.

□ 1415

A-76, as it is generally referred to as a tool to conduct a public versus private competition in a commercial activity in order to determine if those jobs are best performed by the government or by the private sector, initially cost was the sole determinant and, to a large degree, it still is.

More typically, however, the Department of Defense has moved towards a so-called results based assessment in which the winner of the public/private competition is judged on how best they can perform a task based on the quality of the outcome of the work, balanced by price considerations.

For example, if an A-76 study determines that a particular job would be better performed by the private sector, the government agency that conducted the study would be able to lay off those civil service employees based upon that independent empirical data. The particular agency's bureaucrats claim that they are justified in these decisions because numbers do not lie. In the alternative, statistics have shown that when a study is won by the civil servants, remember there is a competition as they reinvent themselves, there is still a 30 percent reduction in cost. This fact alone supports the so-called win/win touted by A-76 proponents.

If the public sector employees are allowed to bid for their jobs at a lower rate and they out bid the private contractor that has been brought in by the government, they are allowed to keep their jobs. So, therefore, a lot of people think that all of a sudden this is a win/win situation.

Sounds great. The problem is that these cost cutting advocates overlook the simple fact that the government is not a business. Could the government be made more efficient? Definitely. More responsive? Undoubtedly. Well, how about more cost effective? Well, it depends on how you measure cost. True, practices that enabled famous \$600 hammers and \$3,000 toilet seats needed to be rooted out but when one looks at hard-to-define requirements such as military readiness, what is inherently governmental, what is the measure of a good value and what about the men and women who make up the civil service, who have long done so out of patriotism and job stability and good benefits and fair play? They are not out to bilk the government or run up costs for profit like many unscrupulous contractors who win these bids point of fact do in the end.

What we are looking at are two distinct but related things. First is the general policy of reducing the Federal civilian workforce and outsourcing

that work to the private sector. The second is the dynamics of A-76 process itself and for both I would like to use the Guam experience on that, because right now, as we speak, the largest BOS contract, so-called Base Operation System contract, to date as a result of the A-76 process is being implemented with Raytheon, the winner, in Guam and effectively putting out of focus about 900 jobs in Guam.

Now, Guam's story on this began with the Base Realignment and Closure Commission in 1995. What the Navy did was that they decided in 1995 that they wanted to close down a unit in the Naval Activities Section of Guam called the Public Works Center, and when the Navy was turned down by the BRAC Commission, allowed to realign it but they were not allowed to close down the Public Works Center, they then decided that they would apply A-76; therefore creating a tremendous sense of loss because the BRAC process is the process that was outlined by Congress and by law to make a fair assessment of what can be closed and what cannot be closed.

When the Navy lost their claim that the Public Works Center on Guam should be closed or realigned downward in dramatic fashion, they didn't say, okay, we tried it in front of the BRAC Commission and we lost. They turned around and then dusted off A-76 and went ahead and did it anyway.

So in the spring of 1997, the Navy announced that they were going to look towards the bundling of all kinds of functions in this particular situation and offer them up to a private contractor or to the public sector. In other words, letting the workers themselves bid in something called a most efficient organization.

The Navy justified using a Base Operating System contract, taking such diverse things as providing day care to loading ordnance to house maintenance, and bundling them all in one contract because they said that this was the way that they would get an economy of scale.

Another cost saving measure that was being considered by the Navy at the time was to use foreign or H-2 workers which were allowed into Guam and therefore it would significantly depress the costs of the contractor, thereby competing more unfairly with the existing civil service.

So after I heard about, in particular, the foreign labor possibility, I introduced an amendment to the Department of Defense reauthorization prohibiting the use of H-2 workers on any Base Operating System contract that would be contracted out in Guam, but the Navy continued on. The Navy continued on with the BOS contract.

Now, the BOS contract was designed to bid out a significant amount of money to one single contractor. In the end, it was Raytheon that won this contract.

Now, the Navy attempted to sell this to the people of Guam saying even

though the likely winner would be a contractor that would not be from Guam, there would be a lot of subcontracting out to local contractors. I did not take them at their face value and I invited the Small Business Administration, and with SBA's help we were successful in garnering approximately \$65 million in small business set-asides.

So even though the Navy was unwilling to do this, we had to bring them in and then get them to say, look, if you are going to privatize this at least try to benefit the private companies in the local community. So we were able to do this.

In the meantime, you had at work the civil service employees who were being asked to consider the possibility of bidding for their jobs that they used to have in what is called a most efficient organization. Imagine if you were employed in a company and the managers of the company came to you one day and said, the only way that you can conceivably hold on to your jobs is that we are going to bid out your jobs against another company, a private company, and if you can prove to us that you can do the work that you do now for less money than the private company is bidding, you will be able to keep your jobs. That is basically what they were confronted with.

Now, in the meantime, the local civil service employees, the American Federation of Government Employees Local 1689 and the local union, is generally well placed to challenge and fight the A-76 process and they have done so from time to time trying to figure out how to be helpful, but they continually asserted that all that was needed, at least some of their leaders continually asserted that somehow or another Congress would simply pass a single amendment that would simply exempt Guam specifically from this process, kind of a silver bullet technique which I told them was not realistic and which in light of all the things that have gone on with all the privatization efforts certainly is unrealistic.

Well, the Navy last fall decided and announced that Raytheon Technical Services was the winner and finally this past January the Navy announced that the base operating support functions would be sent out to the private sector for performance. The in-house servants, these are the people who actually work these jobs, had bid \$600 million for what was approximately a \$900 million operation.

Raytheon, which won the competition, bid at \$321 million. The huge disparity in the bids is testament to the Navy's disenchanting efforts in assisting the local workforce and the inherent weakness in the A-76 process, which there is still inadequate union input.

The study on Guam analyzed some 1,200 positions, 950 at the Public Works Center alone. Many of these workers have pursued the DOD's general priority placement program which enables

alternative Federal employment on a worldwide basis. Others choose early retirement. Those who left who face involuntary separation will earn the so-called right of first refusal for the contracted jobs with Raytheon, meaning that at the end of the day if you cannot find a job somewhere else within the civil service system or you are too young for early retirement, you have the right of first refusal. Raytheon offers you the job, more likely at a rate 20 percent, 30 percent less than what you used to make for the same job, and you have the right to accept it or you have the right to turn it down.

Now, the A-76 process is not the best of methods to mete out savings. However, in some respects it does afford the civil service an opportunity to fight it out and occasionally the MEOs or the civil service employees win in various A-76 studies that have been conducted around the country.

A-76 is criticized by both the public workforce and the unions, as well as the private sector who view the process as favoring the government, not to mention the costs they generally must expend in order to win. It has long been a concern of many Members of Congress, particularly those who sit on the House Committee on Armed Services, that the Department of Defense has placed so high a stake in the outsourcing and privatization process that it is literally not only threatening the livelihoods of those loyal civil service workers who have been employed for the Department of Defense for a long time but it is threatening the very readiness of our military forces.

In 1999, the Department of Defense announced that by fiscal year 2005, over 230,000 positions will have been studied for possible outsourcing. The department estimates that by that time they will have saved some \$11.2 billion and achieve a steady state savings rate beginning in fiscal year 2005 of approximately \$3.4 billion annually. The problem with these numbers, as we have already experienced through careful review in the House Committee on Armed Services, is that they are based on far too many assumptions. Indeed, the individual services often do not account for the costs of performing the study, especially when they extol the anticipated savings. These costs can include the paying of the cost comparison study itself as well as associated costs for voluntary separation incentive pay, early retirement benefits and the general reductions in forces, meaning RIFs.

One of the things that in our case, in Guam's case, on this, which has compounded the tragedy and the impact of this, is that when the Department of Defense carries this out, there are provisions in the U.S. law that the DOD perform an economic impact assessment on the community faced with downsizing from outsourcing. Unfortunately, this law was not passed until after the Navy had decided to go ahead with Guam's outsourcing study. Re-

gardless, the study requirement is not comprehensive and is little more than a review of surmised local economic impact.

If DOD had been required to do an impact study for Guam, it would show that Guam was really a poor model for the Department of Defense to conduct this study on a big base/small base comparison, which was part of their logic. Indeed, even the Navy abandoned this comparison study in favor of continuing forward with Guam's solitary A-76. If the Navy had been required to do this study, it would have shown that in the case of Guam the scale of the economy, which is 150,000 people, roughly about 60,000 people gainfully employed, about 1/6th working directly for the Federal Government, approximately 10,000 in the late 1980s to early 1990s, that any kind of downsizing would have had dramatic impact on the economic future of the island.

For Guam, the job loss was something of unique and dramatic proportions because we are talking about a very large number of workers in a very small community.

Furthermore, it is an erosion of part of the middle class in Guam, which helps sustain the economy, the rest of the economy in Guam, through good salaries and mortgages and all the kinds of consumer purchasing which goes on in Guam.

□ 1430

Furthermore, it had a dramatic impact on the civil service workers themselves far out of proportion to the same process being experienced by other civil service workers.

When you lose your Federal job in Guam, you cannot drive over to the next county to find another Federal job, or find another job at all. If you wanted to stay within the Federal system, it meant that you would have to sell your home and travel at least 3,500 miles to Hawaii, if lucky enough, or perhaps 6,000 miles to the West Coast, or, if very unlucky, 9,000 miles to the East Coast. In fact, people who went through the Navy apprenticeship program and had the promise of gainful employment and learned some very unique skills in their lives, were now faced with the prospect that because of the A-76 process, because of impending RIFs, they now had to uproot their families and move thousands of miles away.

The Navy completely disregards all of this because they say it is not required. Their main concern is the so-called cost savings, which, in the end, they have been unable to document. Now we have not only the impact on the Guam economy and the local economy, but we also have to consider the impact on the workers themselves.

For those workers who choose to stay on island, who choose to stay in the local community and leave the Federal service for a contractor job, they are given the so-called right of first refusal.

Let us just take a look at what is meant by a right of first refusal. The wages for this are calculated by something called a prevailing wage calculator in the Federal system. This measures a wage rate for a particular job, but does not account for the cost of consumer goods that are available on island.

Federal jobs, when you are employed in the Federal job you have your base salary plus you have a cost of living adjustment because of where you are. It depends on whether you are in a high-cost area or in a low-cost area. Guam happens to be a high-cost area. But here we have a situation where the private contractor is not required to pay the COLA, can simply ignore the COLA, and, moreover, is probably going to offer significantly less for the base pay for the same position.

I will give you a few examples of this. Case one is a management level employee working out of the Navy Family Services Section at Commander Naval Force, Marianas. She indicated that they were very busy developing the contract assurances standards for Raytheon. She indicated that this area of operation would be subcontracted. When asked if it was true that Raytheon was renegotiating the contract, she replied, with Family Services they are not meeting their recruitment goal. She added that salary offers to affected civil service staff were at least 50 percent of what they were previously making, if you compute the COLA into it.

In one case, a staff member making \$28,000, not a very high sum of money, per annum base pay, was offered \$17,000 by the contractor. She said that employees have turned the jobs down, and these are positions that require a level of experience that is not easily found anywhere, but in particular in the case of Guam, because of its isolation. Here you had a group of trained civil service employees who knew the job, who understood the job, who had been experienced in the job. They are forced to leave the island by this A-76 process. The contractor comes in and says I can do it for less, does not have the labor pool to identify, and will end up bringing in a lot of people from off island, from off of Guam, resulting in some level of displacement of the population.

What has now started to happen is that employees are being offered match-based pay without COLA, and this has resulted in an erosion of Raytheon's plan, because Raytheon has had to reconsider how they were doing this.

Now, predictably, what does that mean for Raytheon? What would that mean for the contractor? It means that the contractor might likely come back up and increase the amount of money it is going to take to carry out the award, in effect, driving the cost up, so now they are not saving the money they anticipated. It will not be long before in this continuing process that perhaps in 2 or 3 or 4 years of this

privatized contracting system, the cost of conducting, of implementing the contract, might be driven up as high as that originally bid by the civil service workers.

Case two. This refers to the Personal Property Office, which is responsible for packing and movement of service members' and dependents' personal goods. Unlike the case I just gave you, Raytheon will administer this contract.

Interviews were conducted with nine affected employees. These interviews were conducted beginning in mid-February, last month. Of the nine interviewed, only two were given offers with a simple accept or decline scenario. In both cases the employees' base pay is \$28,000, or \$12.68 an hour, and the offers were for \$8.50 an hour, a cut of about one-third. The source indicated that the company representatives are now complaining that there were activities that were being performed out of this particular shop that they were not aware of during the bidding process.

Utilizing the quadrennial review, every 4 years we get a defense review as the progenitor, the Department of Defense has conveniently been provided with a mandate to plow back the anticipated savings into modernization projects. The Department is fond of claiming that through the synthesis of private sector innovations into government operational practices they will be able to mete out the "best value" for the taxpayer. Interestingly, "best value" is not always necessarily the lowest cost.

In A-76 studies, the Pentagon has moved towards results-based work when drafting the Performance-Based Review, formerly the Public Works Statement. This calculus is then used to devise the request for proposal which both the public and private sector then bid on. One of the negative results of this is the creative financing that a contractor employs when devising its bid against the public workforce.

Now, for example, at the Public Works Center in Guam, Raytheon, which won the bid in the public-private competition, now has a dubious plan to hire workers for a 32-hour work week to perform base operation support. Raytheon used the 32-hour configuration to win the bid, claiming that they could accomplish the entire workload that previously was done by the civil service. The goal, they claim, was to hire as many of the former civil service employees as possible. The rub is that, of course, very few of these former workers are taking the positions, because the pay is too low and the benefits are far less.

So if you were bidding for the contract, let us say you worked in the shop and there were 15 of you civil service employees and your work was up for this A-76 review, there are 15 of you, so you are now going to find a way to bid. Well, you anticipate you are going to take a pay cut, and maybe you

will conclude that, well, maybe 13 of us can do what the 15 used to do formerly. But now, in the meantime, the contractor is outbidding, and in this instance has used the strategy of cutting back on 20 percent of the hours, but still giving the illusion that they are giving everybody the right of first refusal.

It is very, very convenient, very effective, to be able to demonstrate and dramatize that you have actually brought costs down. But, in the long run, we know those costs are going to start creeping back up.

So, what is Raytheon going to do? Well, they will have to renegotiate so they can hire workers at a higher rate. This seems almost like Raytheon lowballed the contract in order to win, and is now claiming they cannot comply with the terms. So now they will negotiate for more money.

There is no savings to be had here. The bottom line is that most of Guam's brightest civil service workforce has already left the island, a brain drain, and those who are left are going to have a very difficult time.

Unlike BRAC, there is no job retraining for the displaced. If you were displaced by BRAC, you get some retraining. If you are displaced by A-76, you do not get job training. Guam's experience with the Navy's A-76 is an example of commercial activities administration at its worst. As a result of the dismal salaries and the 32-hour work week, many of Guam's workers are simply not taking the jobs, preferring unemployment insurance, which will pay a higher benefit.

The island has a limited population that cannot accommodate a war-time surge in work. Now, imagine this: Guam has a service of what we normally refer to as forward-deployed bases. It has to have a surge capacity, because if something happens in East Asia that brings about a conflict, there will be a dramatic increase in the nature of resupply and logistics work in Guam, not only in terms of munitions and ordnance, but also just in terms of providing supplies for American forces that could potentially be used in a conflict in East Asia.

What has A-76 done? Well, A-76 has depleted the capacity of a civilian workforce in Guam to be able to deal with such a contingency.

Furthermore, by this A-76 process, and this applies nationally, you are taking people that are younger and basically driving them out of the civil service, and the people who are going to be in the priority placement system are going to be older and they are going to be moving around from position to position within the civil service, thereby creating a general aging in the civil service workforce. Not that there is anything wrong with having an older workforce, but, in the process of managing your human resources, you want to have a natural progression of people who are older, who in turn mentor those who are younger, and who in

turn mentor those who are younger still.

Well, we are taking the middle out of that as a result of this A-76 process. The employees who decide to stay on island and who leave the civil service are permitted, as I said earlier, with a right to first refusal for private sector jobs. But we have seen this is not very meaningful when the positions being offered are far below what they were previously earning.

The local Navy command on Guam is not to blame for the inherent weaknesses of the A-76 process. In fact, I would have to say they have done a very decent job in advertising their civil service employees with regard to benefits, Separation Incentive Pay, VERA, and Priority Placement Programs. However, the methods of employment and application of the A-76 rules and procedures were applied haphazardly by Navy's Pacific Division in Hawaii, with little regard for the human toll. Their desire to save money is so egregious, apparently, among some people, that they misinterpreted what functions should be exempt.

I am just going to give one example here before I make my conclusion. One of the things when you conduct a study like this is that you are supposed to make an assessment of what kind of activity constitutes "inherently governmental." What does it mean to say that we are able to contract out everything except these positions, because they are inherently governmental?

Now, when you ask that question in terms of the Department of Defense, what is "inherently governmental?" Well, one would assume that those things which are inherently governmental are those items, those activities, which directly contribute to the war-fighting capability and readiness of our Armed Services.

In Guam's case, in this A-76 process which I have just outlined, PACDIV's assessors nominated Guam's ordnance shop for the cutting board. Now, Guam has a huge facility currently called Naval Magazine which supplies ordnance for the fleet, which is the largest magazine, largest ordnance storage facility, of the Navy in the entire Pacific.

□ 1445

But the Navy, some of these guys who are driven by this desire to save money, decided that moving around ordnance was somehow not connected to war-fighting capability or the preparation for war-fighting. Sometimes in the Committee on National Security we talk about the state of readiness; and this is an area, ordnance, where I think that if we do not have trained civil service employees with proven records, patriotic records, not dependent upon contractors who may or may not find the workers, who then have to deal with, well, what if we have a big surge of activity, we are going to have to charge even more.

So we have all of these factors, and the Navy decided that the RFP for ord-

nance needed to be let out. But it is even more incompetent than this particular issue because now the Navy has admitted that they inaccurately calculated the work data for the ordnance activity which they have contracted out; and now, today, Navy and Raytheon are renegotiating to increase the scope of the work and, guess what, move up the cost.

So there we have it, Mr. Speaker. What we have here is an example of how not to do an A-76 study, an example of how an A-76 commercial study cannot only negatively impact a community in terms of its economic base, but also deal with an almost unconcern with the human toll, the individual experience of the civil service worker, and in the process, not really understand what is inherently governmental.

We had a hearing, a joint hearing between the Subcommittee on Civil Service and the Subcommittee on Readiness over in the Committee on Armed Services last week. When I asked the question of DOD officials, what does the term "inherently governmental" mean for defense operations, and they said, well, every service kind of defines it its own way. Well, if you have the motivation to cut costs as the primary motivator in making the decision on A-76, "inherently governmental" is going to be defined in a way that is going to hurt readiness and is going to be damaging to the security and defense of this country.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, in light of these fallacies and problems which have occurred on Guam and which occur in other places as well with the Navy's A-76, I am calling for two things: one, I am calling for the Navy to explore halting the implementation of this contract, exploring every possible avenue to stop and take a breather on this contract until many of these grievances and miscalculations can be reassessed. Secondly, I am calling upon the U.S. General Accounting Office to conduct an audit into the way the Navy organized, planned, and conducted this outsourcing study on Guam with seemingly little regard to the impact on the small isolated community that, relative to its population, has a dramatically significant role in the readiness of the U.S. military in the western Pacific.

Finally, our beleaguered civil servants are beginning to emerge as a kind of endangered species. As times and practices change, they too will have to adapt in order to remain relevant in the national defense arena. In spite of this, they should not have to endure negative fallout as a result of DOD's panacea called outsourcing, notwithstanding their own admitted skepticism.

The DOD must do better in bridging the benefits gap to alleviate displaced employees, especially when, inevitably, many will lose their livelihoods. In the end, all DOD may be left with is reduced readiness, a degraded military capability, and an exiled civil service

workforce that collectively contributes to the weakening of America's national security policy.

□

#### U.S. GOVERNMENT SHOULD HONOR COMMITMENT TO MILITARY RETIREES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of Florida). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WALDEN) is recognized for 30 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, my purpose in rising this afternoon is threefold. I would like to share with my colleagues a story that is virtually unparalleled in illustrating the difficulty many military retirees face in the effort to have their government fulfill its promise of lifelong health care.

Second, I want to salute the extraordinary efforts of a retired service member in my district, Mr. Len Gagne of Ashland, Oregon, whose selfless devotion to his fellow service members has endured long after the Government's commitment to them waned.

Finally, I want to highlight the importance, indeed the absolute necessity, of honoring our Nation's commitment to provide lifelong health care coverage to our military retirees.

Here on this picture next to me are some of the 2,500 military retirees in Oregon's Rogue Valley, all of whom entered the armed services with the explicit promise of lifelong medical care following their retirement. As most of my colleagues know, due to downsizing and the subsequent lack of space available at many military medical facilities, that promise has not been kept.

Thirteen years ago, Len Gagne and a number of retirees pictured here banded together to form a courier service to help military retirees from the region obtain prescription drugs more easily. Living in rural Oregon where the majority of military retirees live hundreds of miles from the nearest military facility makes getting prescriptions filled difficult.

The group began a service to get prescription drug orders filled at the Army Medical Center at Fort Lewis, Washington. Now, the prescription orders for these men and women were sent to Eugene, Oregon, and then to Fort Lewis where they were later picked up by volunteers and driven back to Oregon. All of the costs associated with this distribution effort were borne by the private individuals and not by the Government. So unorthodox was this service that the prescriptions were stored and distributed out of a member's home for several years before the use of facilities at the Naval Reserve Center in Central Point, Oregon were made available.

About 8 years ago, the makeshift prescription delivery service shifted facilities when Beale Air Force Base, located 13 miles east of Marysville, California, became Oregon's primary care location. Twice a month, courier trips were

made to Beale, eventually filling as many as 2,200 prescriptions per month. In total, the volunteer couriers, who used their own vehicles and never accepted a dime of government reimbursement, covered more than 25,000 miles a year. The selflessness of these men and women allowed many older retirees who could not otherwise have made the trip the opportunity to get the prescription drugs they needed.

Mr. Speaker, I have been disappointed to learn that this practice has become widespread among military retirees, a practice that they should not have to go through to get the prescriptions this government guaranteed them.

Mr. Gagne's operation continued until last year when authorities at Beale shut down the courier service, as many military facilities across the United States have been forced to do so in recent years. Prescriptions were no longer filled for those who did not appear at Beale in person. But because many of these men and women are either too elderly or too ill to make the taxing journey to Beale or Fort Lewis, this cut-off essentially closed the door on life-saving prescription drugs for these retirees, some of whom have dedicated over 30 years of service to this great country of ours.

Around the time Mr. Gagne learned of the cut-off at Beale, he devised a plan to continue providing the medicines that he and his fellow service members needed, a strategy that was as innovative as it was selfless. Len learned of a policy that allowed military retirees whose prescriptions are filled at a base being closed under the Base Realignment and Closure, BRAC, plan to be eligible for permanent mail delivery of prescription medicines. He also learned that McClellan Air Force Base, located nine miles east of Sacramento, would be closing in July of 2000. Though the Rogue Valley retirees lived literally hundreds of miles away from McClellan, Len reasoned that if they could demonstrate their dependence on the pharmacy service at that base, according to the policy, their supply of prescriptions would be secure.

So, Mr. Gagne arranged bus trips to transport groups of retirees to the closing base where they signed statements of dependency on its pharmacy. Again, the people pictured in this photograph on display in the House Chamber are a part of that group that went on the bus trip. Now, we have to understand the distance from Medford, Oregon, to Sacramento is 309 miles, roughly the distance between Washington, D.C. and New Haven, Connecticut, or Greensboro, North Carolina, if one wanted to go south.

Imagine, Mr. Speaker, having to go from Washington, D.C. to Connecticut or North Carolina to get your prescriptions filled. Imagine, a nearly 620 mile round trip every time you wanted to go to the drugstore. Well, they chartered buses at \$1,150 per trip, all paid for by themselves; and approximately 40 peo-

ple at a time made the 16-hour round trip to McClellan, where they got a 3-month supply of medicines and thereby qualified for the BRAC pharmacy benefit.

The retirees and dependents pictured here, many of whom are decorated combat veterans of World War II, are seen standing outside the McClellan clinic during one such trip. I am told that Mr. Gagne's ingenuity in organizing these trips is probably without precedent. No other retirees have ever traveled en masse to a closing base simply to qualify for the BRAC benefit. It goes without saying that it is appalling that these retirees are forced to find loopholes in the system simply to gain what they were promised by this government years ago.

Mr. Speaker, the basic contract that binds a professional military to the government it serves is an uncomplicated one. It is an understanding which assumes that in exchange for a life spent in service to the Nation, the government has certain fundamental obligations to its retirees. In the United States, these obligations have traditionally meant a reasonable retirement wage and promise of lifetime access to health care. In return, the American people are ensured of their defense by a group whose dedication to duty is the very definition of professionalism throughout the world, a group whose members have laid down their lives by the hundreds of thousands in defense of the ideals and freedoms we so often invoke in this House.

The hallowed bonds between the Government and the military are straining in ways that are becoming ominously apparent with each passing year. This strain is manifest in the thousands of loyal soldiers on food stamps whose condition is often alluded to in this very Chamber, but remains uncorrected. It is obvious in the declining enlistment and re-enlistment rates that have caused a near panic among senior military officials; and I submit to my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, that a government unconcerned about busloads of aged retirees traveling hundreds of miles at their own expense for basic medicines is not a government committed to strengthening those bonds. For how can we ask our service members to continue to perform their vital duties while the Government fails to uphold its fundamental responsibility to care for those who have served in the past.

It is examples such as the one I have related that compelled me to cosponsor the Keep Our Promise to Americans Military Retirees Act. I urge my colleagues who have not yet done so to join us in advancing this essential piece of legislation. The men and women of the United States military who provide the very blanket of security under which we spend our lives deserve no less. It is nothing short of outrageous that military retirees across this Nation are forced to undergo such adversity simply to get what was

promised to them in the first place. I urge my colleagues to restore the military's faith in the government it serves and renew our commitment to our retired service members.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to extend my personal gratitude to Len Gagne and those who assist him and the thousands of men and women like him whose commitment to their comrades is matched only by their devotion to the Nation they so tirelessly serve.

□

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. GIBBONS) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. NEY, for 5 minutes, March 14.

□

#### SENATE BILL AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

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

S. 1653. An act to reauthorize and amend the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation Establishment Act; to the Committee on Resources.

S. Con. Res. 95. Concurrent resolution commemorating the twelfth anniversary of the Halabja massacre; to the Committee on International Relations.

□

#### SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 376. An act to amend the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 to promote competition and privatization in satellite communications, and for other purposes.

□

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 14, 2000, at 12:30 p.m., for morning hour debates.

□

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

6544. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the

Department's final rule—Nectarines and Peaches Grown in California; Revision of Reporting Requirements [Docket No. FV99-916-3FR] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6545. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Spearmint Oil Produced in the Far West; Salable Quantities and Allotment Percentages for the 2000-2001 Marketing Year [Docket No. FV00-985-1 FR] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6546. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule—Rehabilitation Short-Term Training—received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6547. A letter from the Deputy Executive Secretariat, Administration for Children and Families, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Head Start Program (RIN: 0970-AB87) received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6548. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Regulation of Short-Term Natural Gas Transportation Services, and Regulation of Interstate Natural Gas Transportation Services [Docket Nos. RM98-10-000 & RM98-12-000; Order No. 637] received February 25, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

6549. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting a report stating that for the quarter beginning on October 1, and extending through December 31, 1999, the NRC had no instance of denying the public any documents containing safeguards information; to the Committee on Commerce.

6550. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of State, transmitting a report which sets forth all sales and licensed commercial exports pursuant to section 25(a)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2765(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

6551. A letter from the Executive Director, Committee For Purchase From People Who Are Blind Or Severely Disabled, transmitting the Committee's final rule—Procurement List Additions and Deletions—received January 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6552. A letter from the Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for the Woundfin and Virgin River Chub (RIN: 1018-AD23) received January 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6553. A letter from the Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Status for the Plant *Plagiobothrys hirtus* (Rough Popcornflower) (RIN: 1018-AE44) received January 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6554. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of

the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic; Closure [Docket No. 970930235-7235-01; I.D. 021400A] received February 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6555. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Department's final rule—Summer Flounder Fishery [Docket No. 981014259-8312-02; I.D. 121699B] received January 27, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6556. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Atlantic Highly Migratory Species Fisheries; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna [I.D. 1201199C] received January 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6557. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747-400 and 767 Series Airplanes Powered by Pratt & Whitney PW4000 Series Engines [Docket No. 99-NM-114-AD; Amendment 39-11462; AD 99-26-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6558. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737-600, -700, and -800 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99-NM-134-AD; Amendment 39-11469; AD 99-26-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6559. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99-NM-361-AD; Amendment 39-11502; AD 2000-01-5] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6560. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; International Aero Engines AG V2500-A1 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 98-ANE-76-AD Amendment 39-11446; AD 99-25-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6561. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Gulfstream American (Frakes Aviation) Model G-73 (Mallard) and G-73T Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99-NM-141-AD; Amendment 39-11296; AD 99-19-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6562. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Investment Division, Small Business Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Small Business Investment Companies—received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Small Business.

6563. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations Management, Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule—National Service Life Insurance (RIN:

2900-AJ78) received February 14, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

6564. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Return of information as to payments to employees [Rev. Rul. 2000-6] received January 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6565. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Publicity of information [Rev. Proc. 2000-13] received January 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6566. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Determination of Underwriting Income [TD 8857] (RIN: 1545-AU60) received January 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6567. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Section 1504(d) Elections—Deferral of Termination [Notice 2000-7] received January 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6568. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Application Procedures for Qualified Intermediary Status Under Section 1441; Final Qualified Intermediary Withholding Agreement [Rev. Proc. 2000-12] received January 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6569. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Communications Excise Tax; Prepaid Telephone Cards [TD 8855] (RIN: 1545-AV63) received January 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6570. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Rulings and determination letters [Rev. Procedure 2000-7] received January 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

□

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1443. A bill to provide for the collection of data on traffic stops; with an amendment (Rept. 106-517). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. CANADY: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2372. A bill to simplify and expedite access to the Federal courts for injured parties whose rights and privileges, secured by the United States Constitution, have been deprived by final actions of Federal agencies, or other government officials or entities acting under color of State law; to prevent Federal courts from abstaining from exercising Federal jurisdiction in actions where no State law claim is alleged; to permit certification of unsettled State law questions that are essential to resolving Federal claims arising under the Constitution; and to clarify when government action is sufficiently final to ripen certain Federal claims arising under the Constitution; with an amendment (Rept. 106-518). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ARCHER: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 984. A bill to provide additional

trade benefits to certain beneficiary countries in the Caribbean, to provide assistance to the countries in Central America and the Caribbean affected by Hurricane Mitch and Hurricane Georges, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 106-519 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:

H.R. 984. Referral to the Committees on International Relations, Banking and Financial Services, the Judiciary, and Armed Services 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. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 3904. A bill to prevent the elimination of certain reports; to the Committee on Science.

By Mr. HOUGHTON (for himself, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, and Mr. BECERRA):

H.R. 3905. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the provision taxing policyholder dividends of mutual life insurance companies and to repeal the policyholders surplus account provisions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mrs. JONES of Ohio):

H. Con. Res. 276. Concurrent resolution strongly urging the President to file a complaint at the World Trade Organization against oil-producing countries for violating trade rules that prohibit quantitative limitations on the import or export of resources or products across borders; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOYER (for himself, Mr. WYNN, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. DAVIS of Virginia):

H. Con. Res. 277. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

H. Con. Res. 278. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the 19th annual National Peace Officers' Memorial Service; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

□

**ADDITIONAL SPONSORS TO PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS**

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

- H.R. 740: Mr. DEFAZIO.
- H.R. 1237: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mrs. FOWLER, Ms. PELOSI, and Mr. MICA.
- H.R. 1389: Mr. UPTON and Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.
- H.R. 1532: Mr. PAYNE.
- H.R. 2321: Mr. SANDERS.
- H.R. 2356: Mr. POMEROY and Mr. BILBRAY.
- H.R. 2635: Mr. DOOLITTLE and Mr. GOODLING.

- H.R. 2697: Mr. TRAFICANT.
- H.R. 2965: Mr. LEVIN.
- H.R. 3270: Ms. MCKINNEY.
- H.R. 3304: Mr. ISTOOK.
- H.R. 3305: Mr. PAUL.
- H.R. 3306: Mr. PAUL and Mr. ISTOOK.
- H.R. 3439: Mr. HERGER, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. BARR of Georgia, and Mr. BRADY of Texas.
- H.R. 3485: Mr. ANDREWS.
- H.R. 3519: Mr. CASTLE and Mr. BENTSEN.
- H.R. 3544: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Mr. BENTSEN.
- H.R. 3580: Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. FROST, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. GOODE, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. WALSH, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SHOWS, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. OWENS, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut.
- H.R. 3591: Mr. KANJORSKI, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. DIXON, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. BACA, Mr. SHOWS, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. SANCHEZ, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky.
- H.R. 3608: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
- H.R. 3809: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts and Mrs. MALONEY of New York.
- H.R. 3816: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
- H.R. 3849: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. NORWOOD, and Mr. CRANE.
- H.R. 3891: Mr. HINCHEY.
- H. Con. Res. 262: Mrs. TAUSCHER and Mr. LARGENT.
- H. Res. 420: Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### AUTHORIZING THE USE OF THE CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR THE GREATER WASHINGTON SOAP BOX DERBY

**HON. STENY H. HOYER**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 13, 2000*

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to once again introduce a resolution for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby to hold its race along Constitution Avenue. This bill will permit the 59th running of the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby, which is to take place on the Capitol Grounds on Saturday, June 24th, 2000.

This resolution authorizes the Architect of the Capitol, the Capitol Police Board, and the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby Association to negotiate the necessary arrangements for carrying out running of the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby in complete compliance with rules and regulations governing the use of the Capitol Grounds.

In the past, the full House has supported this resolution once reported favorably by the full Transportation Committee. I ask for my colleagues to join with me, and Representatives ALBERT WYNN, CONNIE MORELLA, JIM MORAN, and TOM DAVIS, in supporting this resolution.

From 1992 to 1999, the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby welcomed over 40 contestants which made the Washington, DC race one of the largest in the country. Participants range from ages 9 to 16 and hail from communities in Maryland, the District of Columbia and Virginia. The winners of this local event will represent the Washington Metropolitan Area in the National Race, which will be held in Akron, Ohio on July 22, 2000.

The Soap Box Derby provides our young people with an opportunity to gain valuable skills such as engineering and aerodynamics. Furthermore, the Derby promotes team work, a strong sense of accomplishment, sportsmanship, leadership, and responsibility. These are positive attributes that we should encourage children to carry into adulthood.

The young people involved spend months preparing for this race, and the day that they complete it makes it all the more worthwhile.

### FORMER UAW PRESIDENT UNDER- STANDS THAT PNTR FOR CHINA IS IN AMERICA'S NATIONAL IN- TEREST

**HON. DOUG BEREUTER**

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 13, 2000*

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, as the debate on providing China with Permanent Normal Trade Relations (PNTR) status conditioned on China's entry into the World Trade

Organization (WTO) intensifies, I recommend to my colleagues and submit for the RECORD the following commentary written by Leonard Woodcock in the Los Angeles Times on March 9, 2000. A key lieutenant in the 1930's drive to unionize the U.S. auto industry, Mr. Woodcock rose in the union ranks to become president of the United Auto Workers union from 1971–1977. Later that decade he served as the United States Ambassador to China. Indeed, Mr. Woodcock is uniquely qualified to judge from a labor perspective the merits and impact of providing China with PNTR in the context of the United States-China WTO bilateral accession agreement. He supports the agreement and PNTR status for China. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is hard to understand why other labor leaders and their Democratic supporters in Congress cannot be as supportive as is the former president of the United Auto Workers, Leonard Woodcock.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Mar. 9, 2000]

EVOLUTION DOESN'T OCCUR OVERNIGHT  
WTO AGREEMENT: ORGANIZED LABOR SHOULD  
SUPPORT IT. IT'S IN BOTH U.S. AND CHINESE  
INTERESTS

(By Leonard Woodcock)

The recent U.S.–China World Trade Organization bilateral accession agreement appears to be good for workers in both countries. I was privileged, as U.S. ambassador to China, to sign the 1979 trade agreement that provided for most-favored-nation trade status to China and have, as a private citizen, been involved with this issue for many years.

American labor has a tremendous interest in China's trading on fair terms with the U.S. The agreement we signed with China this past November marks the largest single step ever taken toward achieving that goal. The agreement expands American jobs. And while China already enjoys WTO-based access to our economy, this agreement will open China's economy to unprecedented levels of American exports, many of which are high-quality goods produced by high-paying jobs.

There is reason to fear unfair trade practices. Yet this agreement actually provides better protections than our existing laws allow. It stipulates 12 years of protections against market surges and provides unusually strong anti-dumping laws—which aim to counter unfairly priced imports—for 15 years.

I have, therefore, been startled by organized labor's vociferous negative reaction to this agreement. The reality is that the U.S. as a whole benefits mightily from this historic accord. The AFL–CIO argues that nothing in this agreement demands that free trade unions be formed in China. Yet the WTO does not require this of any of its 136 member countries, and the WTO is the wrong instrument to use to achieve unionization.

We should, instead, be asking a more important question: Are Chinese workers better off with or without this agreement? The answer is that this agreement, in a variety of ways, will be enormously beneficial to Chinese workers.

On a subtle level, the changes the agreement requires of China's economic system will work in favor of investment by Western firms and take away some of the key advan-

tages Asian firms now enjoy in China. Every survey has demonstrated that working conditions and environmental standards in plants run by West European and North American firms are usually better than those in Asian and in indigenous Chinese firms.

The greater foreign presence also will expose Chinese workers to more ideas about organization and rights. That is perhaps one reason why almost every Chinese political dissident who has spoken out on this issue has called the U.S.–China WTO agreement good news for freedom in China.

The trade deficit with China is a troublesome one to the labor movement. We need to put it in perspective in two ways. First, if we were to block access of goods from China to the U.S., this would not increase American jobs. That is because the Chinese exports—mostly toys, tools, apparel, cheap electronics, etc.—would be produced in other low-wage countries, not in the U.S. Yet if China stopped buying from us, we would lose about 400,000 jobs, mostly high-wage.

Second, a large portion of exports from "China" are goods produced in the main in Hong Kong, Taiwan and Southeast Asia. The major components are then shipped to China for final assembly and packaging, but the entire cost of the item (often only 15% of which was contributed in China) is attributed to China's export ledger. Exports to the U.S. from Hong Kong and Taiwan have declined over the past decade almost as fast as imports from China have increased. Yet the companies making the profits are in Hong Kong and Taiwan, and they will simply shift their operations to Vietnam or elsewhere if we close down exports from China.

Americans are broadly concerned about the rights and quality of life of Chinese citizens. My perspective on this serious issue is influenced by my experience in the U.S. In my lifetime, women were not allowed the vote, and labor was not allowed to organize. And, in my lifetime, although the law did not permit lynching, it was protected and carried out by legal officeholders. As time passed, we made progress, and I doubt if lectures or threats from foreigners would have moved things faster.

Democracy, including rights for workers, is an evolutionary process. Isolation and containment will not promote improved rights for a people. Rather, working together and from within a society will, over time, promote improved conditions. The U.S.–China WTO agreement will speed up the evolutionary process in China. American labor should support it because it is in our interests, and it is the interests of Chinese workers too.

### PROFESSOR HELLE PORS DAM: A DISTINCTIVE INSIGHT ON AMER- ICAN CULTURE AND THE LAW

**HON. TOM LANTOS**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 13, 2000*

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to urge my colleagues to take notice of the work of a talented Danish scholar, Professor Helle

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

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Porsdam of Denmark's Odense University. Dr. Porsdam's book, *Legally Speaking: Contemporary American Culture and the Law*, which was recently published by the University of Massachusetts Press, offers evidence of her extraordinary perceptiveness in her analysis of American culture.

In *Legally Speaking*, Dr. Porsdam discusses the social impact of the law in the United States. Whereas many European and Asian nations find symbols of their national identity in royalty or an established church, Americans look to an institution far more consistent with our egalitarian roots: our system of justice. Despite our frequent frustrations with the legal profession—ambulance-chasing lawyers, legal “sharks,” frivolous lawsuits, the O.J. Simpson trial—the law epitomizes our most cherished civil ideals of fairness and equality. When a citizen is wronged, we look to the courts to make things right. When a crime is committed, the courts offer our sole vehicle for judgment and punishment. When our rights are violated, our courts can restore them. For this reason, Dr. Porsdam contends, the law serves more than just a functional purpose for the American people: it is a “civil religion” in which we place a particular kind of faith. The courts arbitrate more than just lawsuits and criminal cases; they pass judgment on our hopes and dreams as well.

Dr. Porsdam's book analyzes America's moral investment in the legal system, and it further demonstrates how this facet of our national identity has permeated our culture. From *The People's Court* to *L.A. Law*, from Tom Wolfe's *Bonfire of the Vanities* to Scott Turow's *Presumed Innocent*, the evidence of our society's attraction to judicial institutions is overwhelming. Dr. Porsdam carefully and thoughtfully explores the connections between the allure of the law and our faith in it.

The perceptiveness of Dr. Porsdam in *Legally Speaking* has earned the endorsement of scholars across our country. Lewis D. Sargentich of Harvard Law School noted that the book is “full of valuable insight.” Her “emphasis on the symbolic, unifying, aspirational side of law in American life, and her showing of this aspect of law through a close look at a series of contemporary ‘cultural texts,’ combine to produce a unique scholarly contribution.” Maxwell H. Bloomfield, the author of *American Lawyers in a Changing Society*, was equally effusive, praising Dr. Porsdam's work as “an innovative and engaging study exploring the pervasive influence of law in the shaping of contemporary American culture. It is a strikingly original piece of work for which no comparable models exist.”

Mr. Speaker, I could not agree more with these distinguished scholars. I urge my colleagues to join me in reading *Legally Speaking* and in appreciating the brilliant observations of Dr. Helle Porsdam.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. LOIS CAPPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 13, 2000*

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, March 8, 2000, I was on a plane returning from my district and was unable to attend votes. Had I been here I would have made the

following votes: Rollcall Nos. 29—“aye”; 30—“aye”; 31—“aye”; 32—“aye”; and 33—“aye”.

#### IN RECOGNITION OF THE BROOKLYN CHINESE-AMERICAN ASSOCIATION'S TWELFTH ANNIVERSARY

### HON. NYDIA M. VELAZQUEZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 13, 2000*

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Brooklyn Chinese-American Association (BCA) in honor of its Twelfth Anniversary.

An ancient Chinese proverb states: “If you want 1 year of prosperity, grow grain. If you want 10 years of prosperity, grow trees. If you want 100 years of prosperity, grow people” Twelve years ago, the Brooklyn Chinese-American Association did just that. The Association started out as a small, social services agency with a mission to provide assistance to the growing Asian-American community in Sunset Park, Borough Park and Bay Ridge sections of Brooklyn.

Since then, the Asian-American community has seen tremendous growth and recent estimates show that more than 200,000 people of Asian descent now live throughout the borough. As a result, Sunset Park and its surrounding neighborhoods are commonly known as “Brooklyn Chinatown.”

BCA has expanded throughout the years to meet the growing need of Asian-Americans by providing day care and senior centers, with a main community center and ten other service sites in Sunset Park, Borough Park, Bay Ridge, Sheepshead Bay and Bensonhurst.

Through its programs and services, BCA provides assistance to more than 800 individuals a day. Stepping into a new Millennium and its thirteenth year of community services, offering a wide array of new programs including comprehensive bilingual social services and other programs to meet the growing challenges in this new century.

What started out as a small agency has flourished into the largest community-based, multi-human services community development organization, providing assistance to Asian-Americans throughout the borough of Brooklyn as well as other parts of the city.

I congratulate BCA on its Twelfth Anniversary and wish the Association continued prosperity as it offers members of the Asian-American community guidance today, tomorrow and into the future.

#### HONORING VETERANS ON THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE KOREAN WAR

SPEECH OF

### HON. RUSH D. HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 8, 2000*

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, recently, the House of Representatives joined together in a bipartisan fashion to pass House Joint Resolution 86, legislation recognizing the 50th anniversary of the Korean war and commending the

bravery and patriotism of the 5.72 million men and women who fought bravely in that conflict. I have spoken with many New Jerseyans who served in the Korean war, and I can tell you, this tribute is long overdue.

Too often we hear the Korean war referred to as the “forgotten war,” because it was sandwiched between this Nation's victory in World War II and the Vietnam war. Because of that, the over 55,000 men and women who lost their lives in the Korean war, and those who served, sometimes do not receive the recognition and gratitude that they are owed. I am hopeful that Congress' passage of this legislation will serve as a first step towards reversing that gross inequity.

Victory during World War II signaled the beginning of a world where the United States shouldered the role of undisputed leader of the free world. America was the only democratic power capable of responding to the spreading advances of communism when North Korea commenced its attack on the south. With the aid of the Soviet Union and China, North Korea thought they would swiftly and easily unite the Korean peninsula under communist rule. Only through the blood and sacrifice of men in a thousand dark battles, was the tide turned and freedom restored.

The determination that America showed in Korea set in motion the events that ultimately led to the fall of the Berlin Wall and the end of Soviet communism. By standing up for freedom and democracy in South Korea we sent a clear message that where democracy was threatened, the United States would stand firm. Here in Washington, DC, the inscription at the Korean Memorial reminds us that “freedom is not free,” and that the young American men and women who have been willing to pay the price for freedom are owed a tremendous debt of gratitude. We must remember their sacrifices.

Mr. Speaker, the brave men and women who served in the Korean war fought not for personal gain, but rather to insure freedom for all generations to come. We must not forget what their blood bought. I hope my colleagues will join with me to honor and call attention to our nation's Korean war veterans.

#### MILITARY RECRUITERS SHOULD BE WELCOME IN HIGH SCHOOLS

### HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 13, 2000*

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member highly commends and submits for the RECORD an editorial from the March 7, 2000, Norfolk Daily News expressing concern that some public high schools do not cooperate with military recruiters while allowing universities and colleges on campus. High school students should have a full range of postsecondary options presented to them, in order to make an informed decision about life after high school.

[From the Daily News, Mar. 7, 2000]

COOPERATION IS IMPORTANT DUTY—RECRUITERS DESERVE WELCOME FROM ALL OF NATION'S PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS

Members of the Senate Armed Services Personnel subcommittee heard testimony recently that many high schools refuse to cooperate with military recruiters. It is important for members of Congress to find out

why this is so, and whether a more cooperative attitude can be encouraged.

With the Army, Navy and Air Force falling short of their recruitment goals in the past year and new peacekeeping demands being put on U.S. forces, it is important that enlistments in the all volunteer force be encouraged.

Much is being done to improve pay and benefits, to improve military housing and shorten long tours of foreign duty. Provision of enlistment incentives that include funds for later college training has helped the services and the educational institutions as well.

In this free society, it may not be possible to do much about some people described by Sgt. 1st Class Elizabeth Green, an Army Reserve recruiter in Los Angeles. She told the Senate subcommittee that when visiting one of the high schools in her recruiting area, she is regularly greeted by parents who protest her presence.

Recruiters from each of the services agreed that about half of the schools bar military representatives and also refuse access to student directories that would allow correspondence with prospective enlistees. By contrast, the recruiters noted, colleges that seek to recruit high school students get full cooperation.

It is a difference in treatment that should not exist. Public high schools have a special burden to ensure their graduates the broadest possible career opportunities. Military service is an important option, and each of the branches ought to be welcomed to career days or any other similar events.

Sen. Charles Robb, D-Va., a member of the subcommittee that heard testimony from the recruiters, suggested that legislation be considered to provide some inducement for schools to cooperate with recruiters.

A different approach could be in order. With federal money playing an increasing, though still minor, role in public education, Washington ought not consider more rewards for cooperating but impose funding cuts for failure to do so. That would get more attention.

While little is said these days about patriotic duties and an obligation all Americans have to help protect the nation from overt aggression and terrorists, a fundamental duty of citizenship needs to include support of the nation's military services.

IN HONOR OF PROCEED'S 30TH ANNIVERSARY AND MS. HAYDEE LOPEZ FOR 25 YEARS OF DEDICATED SERVICE TO THE ORGANIZATION

**HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 13, 2000*

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize PROCEED on its 30th Anniversary and Ms. Haydee Lopez on her retirement after twenty-five years of service and commitment to the organization.

Based in Elizabeth, New Jersey, PROCEED has assisted the underprivileged in the City of Elizabeth and Union County through comprehensive programs since 1970. As the organization prepares to celebrate this milestone, it is also honoring the accomplishments and dedication of Ms. Haydee Lopez, a woman who defines the vision and the promise of the organization.

Joining PROCEED in 1975, Ms. Lopez served as both the force and the heart behind

the organization. Described as a leader, an optimist, and a believer, Ms. Lopez always set the standard at PROCEED, never hesitating to purchase supplies or necessities for clients with her own resources, or to work for "gratis" when the budget faced a financial crisis.

Ms. Lopez has served the Hispanic community, the constituents of PROCEED, and her fellow workers with pride, devotion, and professionalism. Whether acting in her capacity as Executive Secretary, Acting Executive Director, or Financial Officer, Ms. Lopez always made those around her feel that they were valued.

Ms. Lopez is happily married and the mother of two children and four grandchildren. She was born in Ponce, Puerto Rico, and moved to Elizabeth in 1970.

I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating PROCEED on its 30th anniversary and to thank Ms. Haydee Lopez for her unyielding dedication to the Elizabeth community. All of your efforts on behalf of PROCEED are truly remarkable and I wish you a happy retirement.

MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE ACT

SPEECH OF

**HON. EARL BLUMENAUER**

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 9, 2000*

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, it's time for a minimum wage increase, it's time to help family businesses.

We are playing out the next round of inappropriate tax cuts, this time under the guise of helping minimum wage workers. A discussion on the minimum wage and small business taxes is appropriate. We must increase the minimum wage so that it at least keeps up with inflation. We can provide tax assistance to those who need it. But the two efforts should not be linked. This is a political exercise that guarantees that nothing will pass. It invites a veto.

A two-year minimum wage bill would pass and swiftly become law. Oregon's experience has shown that you can have healthy economic growth and a higher minimum wage. As Oregon's wage rate was phased in from 1997 to 1999, 57,000 welfare recipients found jobs, a 33% reduction in the total welfare caseload. Total unemployment in our state has dropped from 6% to 4.7% since Oregon's wage rate increased to \$6.50 an hour over a year ago, to become the highest minimum wage in the nation.

I am eager to work for tax reform for those who need it most: closely-held businesses, farms and woodlots. The Democratic alternative would increase the current \$1.3 million estate tax exclusion to a \$4 million per family exclusion. We could pass this kind of targeted tax bill tomorrow, but we can and should do more. The current estate tax often forces sale of assets, cutting of timber or even sale of the business itself to pay the tax. We should permanently exempt closely-held family businesses and farms from estate taxes so long as the assets stay within the family or the same closely-held ownership.

The Republican tax bill does not target those who need the most help. Only 1/6 of the benefits go to "small business." The majority of taxpayers would only see about a \$4 tax

cut. Worse, the Republican tax bill commits over a hundred billion dollars in tax breaks without a budget and without guaranteed protections for Medicare and Social Security. This is a dangerous game.

I urge the Republican leadership to stop playing politics. Don't force a bill that doesn't stand a chance of being enacted into law. Give Congress the chance to vote a fair minimum wage increase up or down. Allow a proposal to help family businesses and farms to stay in the family. These are two proposals the American people support and deserve.

ORANGE COUNTY SPIKERS SENIOR VOLLEYBALL TEAM

**HON. LORETTA SANCHEZ**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 13, 2000*

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to congratulate the Orange County Spikers Seniors Volleyball Team for winning the bronze medal at the U.S. National Senior Olympics in Orlando, Florida. The Spikers were the only 55 and older team representing the State of California to be invited to participate in this event. I commend them for all of their hard work and dedication.

This team was formed two years ago, and has since won every Southern California Senior Olympics Tournament in Orange County, San Diego, Palm Springs, and Los Angeles.

Their valiant performance serves as a wonderful example for exercising seniors. As an avid sports fan, I appreciate hearing the exciting news and cannot wait to learn of future Spikers' successes and achievements.

I would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge each team player. The Spikers' roster includes manager, Harold Shiffer; coach Jim Godfrey; and players Gale Kinell, Allen Brown, Vladimir Von Rauner, Neale Davis, Al Barta and Ruben Hernandez.

Please join me in extending my sincere congratulations to the Orange County Spikers. These hard-working individuals have brought pride to their community and they deserve our praise for their perseverance and commitment.

NUCLEAR AGE PEACE FOUNDATION

**HON. LOIS CAPPS**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 13, 2000*

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw my colleagues' attention to the following article by David Krieger, President of the Nuclear Age Peace Foundation in Santa Barbara. Although I do not agree with all of the views stated in this op-ed, it is a thoughtful and provocative article and merits a close reading. The Nuclear Age Peace Foundation does important work in the struggle to wage peace and end the threat of nuclear war, and I commend their work in this area.

[From the Santa Barbara News-Press]  
THE MOST IMPORTANT MORAL ISSUE OF OUR TIME

(By David Krieger)

There are many reasons to oppose nuclear weapons. They are illegal, undemocratic,

hugely expensive and they undermine rather than increase security. But by far the most important reason to oppose these weapons is that they are profoundly immoral.

Above all, the issue of nuclear weapons in our world is a deeply moral issue, and for the religious community to engage this issue is essential. For the religious community to ignore this issue is shameful.

I have long believed our country would become serious about providing leadership for the elimination of nuclear weapons in the world only when the churches, synagogues and mosques became serious about demanding such leadership.

The abolition of nuclear weapons is the most important issue of our time. I do not say this lightly. I know how many other important life-and-death issues there are in our world. I say it because nuclear weapons have the capacity to end all human life on our planet and most other forms of life. This puts them in a class by themselves.

Although I refer to nuclear weapons, I don't believe these are really weapons. They are instruments of mass annihilation. They incinerate, vaporize and destroy indiscriminately. They are instruments of portable holocaust. They destroy equally soldiers; the aged and the newly born; healthy and the infirm.

Nuclear weapons hold all creation hostage. In an instant they could destroy this city or any city. In minutes they could leave civilization—with all its great accomplishments—in ruins. These cruel and inhumane devices hold life itself in the balance.

There is no moral justification for nuclear weapons. None. As Gen. Lee Butler, a former commander in chief of the U.S. Strategic Command, has said: "We cannot at once keep sacred the miracle of existence and hold sacrosanct the capacity to destroy it."

That nuclear weapons are an absolute evil was the conclusion of the president of the International Court of Justice, Mohammed Bedjaoui, after the court was asked to rule on the illegality of these weapons.

I think it is a reasonable conclusion—the only conclusion a sane person could reach. I would add that our reliance on these evil instruments debases our humanity and insults our Creator.

Albert Einstein was once asked his opinion as to what weapons would be used in a third world war. He replied that he didn't know, but if there was a third world war, a fourth world war would probably be fought with sticks and stones. His response was perhaps overly optimistic.

Controlling and eliminating these weapons is a responsibility that falls to those of us now living. It is a responsibility we are currently failing to meet.

Ten years after the end of the Cold War, there are still some 36,000 nuclear weapons in the world, mostly in the arsenals of the U.S. and Russia. Some 5,000 of these weapons remain on hair-trigger alert, ready to be launched on warning and subject to accident or miscalculation.

Today arms controls is in crisis. The U.S. Senate recently failed to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, the first treaty voted down by the Senate since the treaty of Versailles. Congress has also announced its intention to deploy a National Missile Defense "as soon as technologically feasible." This would abrogate the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, a cornerstone of arms control. The Russian Duma has not yet ratified START II, which was signed in 1993.

Efforts to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons are also in crisis. There is above all the issue of Russian "loose nukes." There is no assuredness that these weapons are under control. There is also the new nuclear arms race in South Asia. There is also

the issue of Israel possessing nuclear arms—with the implicit agreement of the Western nuclear weapons states—in their volatile region of the world.

The Non-Proliferation Treaty is also in crisis. This will become more prominent when the five-year review conference for the treaty is held this spring. Most non-nuclear weapons states believe that the nuclear weapons states have failed to meet their obligations for good faith negotiations to achieve nuclear disarmament. More than 180 states have met their obligations not to develop or acquire nuclear weapons. The five nuclear weapons states, however, have failed to meet their obligations for good faith efforts to eliminate their nuclear arsenals.

The U.S. government continues to consider nuclear weapons to be essential to its security. NATO has referred to nuclear weapons as a "cornerstone" of its security policy.

Russia recently proposed that the U.S. and Russia go beyond the START II agreement and reduce their strategic nuclear arsenals to 1,500 weapons each. The U.S. declined, saying it was only prepared to go down to 2,000 to 2,500 weapons each. Such is the insanity of our time.

Confronting this insanity are four efforts I will describe briefly.

The New Agenda Coalition is a group of middle-power states—including Brazil, Egypt, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, Sweden and South Africa—calling for an unequivocal undertaking by the nuclear weapons states for the speedy and total elimination of their nuclear arsenals. U.N. resolutions of the New Agenda Coalition have passed the General Assembly by large margins in 1998 and 1999, despite lobbying by the U.S., U.K. and France to oppose these resolutions.

A representative of the New Agenda Coalition recently stated at a meeting at the Carter Center: "A U.S. initiative today can achieve nuclear disarmament. It will require a self-denying ordinance, which accepts that the five nuclear weapons states will have no nuclear weapons in the foreseeable future. By 2005 the United States will already have lost the possibility of such an initiative." I agree with this assessment. The doors of opportunity, created a decade ago by the end of the Cold War, will not stay open much longer.

The Middle Powers Initiative is a coalition of eight prominent international non-governmental organizations that are supporting the role of middle power states in seeking the elimination of nuclear weapons. The Middle Powers Initiative recently collaborated with the Carter Center in bringing together representatives of the New Agenda Coalition with high-level US policymakers and representatives of civil society. It was an important dialogue. Jimmy Carter took a strong moral position on the issue of nuclear disarmament, and you should be hearing more from him in the near future.

Abolition 2000 is a global network of more than 1,400 diverse civil society organizations from 91 countries on six continents. The primary goal of Abolition 2000 is a negotiated treaty calling for the phased elimination of nuclear weapons within a timebound framework. One of the current efforts of Abolition 2000 is to expand its network to over 2000 organizations by the time of the Non-Proliferation Treaty Review Conference this spring. You can find out more about Abolition 2000 on the web at [www.wagingpeace.org](http://www.wagingpeace.org).

A final effort I will discuss is the establishment of a U.S. campaign for the elimination of nuclear weapons. The Nuclear Age Peace Foundation has hosted a series of meetings with key U.S. leaders in the area of nuclear disarmament. These include former military, political and diplomatic leaders, among

them Gen. Butler, Sen. Alan Cranston, and Ambassador Jonathan Dean.

I believe we have worked out a good plan for a Campaign to Alert America, but we currently lack the resources to push this campaign ahead at the level that it requires. We are doing the best we can, but we are not doing enough. We need your help, and the help of religious groups all over this country.

I will conclude with five steps that the leaders of the nuclear weapons states could take now to end the nuclear threat to humanity. These are steps that we must demand of our political leaders. These are steps that we must help our political leaders to have the vision to see and the courage to act upon.

Commerce good faith negotiations to achieve a Nuclear Weapons Convention requiring the phased elimination of nuclear weapons, with provisions for effective verification and enforcement.

De-alert all nuclear weapons and de-couple all nuclear warheads from their delivery vehicles.

Declare policies of No First Use of nuclear weapons against other nuclear weapons states and policies of No Use against non-nuclear weapons states.

Ratify the comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and reaffirm commitments to the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty.

Reallocate resources from the tens of billions of dollars currently being spent for maintaining nuclear arsenals to improving human health, education and welfare throughout the world.

The future is in our hands. I urge you to join hands and take a strong moral stand for humanity and for all Creation. We do it for the children, for each other, and for the future. The effort to abolish nuclear weapons is an effort to protect the miracle that we all share, the miracle of life.

Each of us is a source of hope. Will you turn to the persons next to you, and tell them, "You give me hope," and express to them your commitment to accept your share of responsibility for saving humanity and our beautiful planet.

Together we will change the world!

A TRIBUTE TO ELINOR  
GUGGENHEIMER

HON. NITA M. LOWEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 13, 2000

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my great admiration for Elinor Guggenheimer, a remarkable human being and community leader who this year receives the Maggie Kuhn Award from Presbyterian Senior Services.

A woman of boundless compassion, great intelligence, and exceptional ability, Ms. Guggenheimer has touched countless lives in the New York area through a variety of professional and civic activities, while also promoting the cause of equality and social justice throughout the Nation.

Ms. Guggenheimer has always been a pioneer, recognizing the unique needs of young people and the elderly years before these causes attracted broad popular support. She founded the Day Care Council of New York in 1948 and the Day Care and Child Development Council of America in 1958, drawing attention to our shared responsibility to nurture children. And she founded the Council of Senior Centers and Services in 1979, establishing

a true intergenerational commitment to senior citizens.

Ms. Guggenheimer was also a pioneer in her own life—demonstrating through her personal example that women had the same capacity for leadership as men. She was the first woman to serve on the New York City Planning Commission—one of many posts, including Consumer Affairs Commissioner, from which she helped temper the sometimes harsh character of New York with a gentle spirit and a true love for her neighbors.

Ms. Guggenheimer's commitment to equal opportunity is equally evident in her founding of several influential women's organizations, including the New York Women's Forum, the National Women's Forum, and International Women's Forum, and the New York Women's Agenda.

Like so many others, I feel personally indebted to Elinor Guggenheimer for all she has done to improve our nation and celebrate our most cherished ideals. I am proud to join in recognizing Ms. Guggenheimer and confident that her works will remain an inspiration for many years to come.

---

#### MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE ACT

SPEECH OF

**HON. MICHAEL P. FORBES**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 9, 2000*

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I rise before you to urge all of my colleagues to vote to raise the minimum wage to \$6.15 over a 2-year period.

The cost of living on Long Island is extremely high. Long Islanders are burdened by high property taxes, high State taxes, and extremely high housing prices. Currently, the median price for a house on the Island is approximately \$200,000. In addition, Long Island has the highest electric rates in the United States.

Unfortunately, when all of these factors are combined, many people, who have lived on Long Island all their lives and are now raising their families there, can no longer afford to live on the Island.

These people are our child care workers, our home health workers, our nursing aides and other service workers, and many are single mothers. These workers who are vital to our communities are making minimum wage or slightly above. By raising the level of the minimum wage in 2 years, we can help give these Long Islanders a chance and keep them and their families in our communities.

In talking to the Long Island Housing Partnership, an organization that helps low-income families buy homes, I learned that a two-parent family, in which both parents are making the current minimum wage, cannot qualify to buy new affordable housing that will be built in East Patchogue, Long Island. This hard-working family's income is too low to qualify. This family cannot even afford to rent an apartment at this rate.

Let's give Long Island families a fighting chance. Vote to raise the minimum wage in two increments.

#### MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE ACT

SPEECH OF

**HON. PATRICK J. KENNEDY**

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, March 9, 2000*

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, we are here because America needs a raise. For too long, many Americans have been working too hard for too little. They work more and more but take home less and less. This isn't the American way.

In America an honest day's work deserves an honest day's pay. That's what the minimum wage is all about.

Today, pay is not keeping pace with expenses. The work day is still 8 hours. Workers still punch the clock 5 days a week. The same work still needs to get done. And the same job is done—but at the end of the week, when it's time to go through the bills, the pay check doesn't go as far as it used to.

The Traficant-Martinez substitute that we will have a chance to vote on later today, will help working families' wages go farther. The substitute will increase the minimum wage by 1 dollar over 2 years. In two incremental steps it will raise the total wage to \$6.15. This modest increase will provide a higher standard of living for 12 million low-income working families.

Many of us do not realize the face of today's minimum wage worker. When we last increased the minimum wage, we found that nearly 60 percent of workers who benefited were women and 71 percent of those who were lifted up by the wage increase were adults.

In my district in Rhode Island, it is families like the O'Neill family who could use an increase in the minimum wage. The O'Neill family is headed by a single mother with three children who works fulltime as a child care worker. Despite her hard work, Ms. O'Neill barely makes ends meet.

Her weekly salary barely covers the rent, food, utilities, clothing, and a student loan that was taken out so that Ms. O'Neill could learn emergency medical training and become a better day care worker.

The Traficant-Martinez substitute will help families like the O'Neills. It may not help them to have a new car or a 2-week vacation, but it will help them to make ends meet.

Again, the Traficant-Martinez substitute is the only way to bring a wage increase to deserving families without delay and I urge my colleagues to support it.

---

#### HONORING JUDGE JOE BROWN

**HON. HAROLD E. FORD, JR.**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 13, 2000*

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Judge Joe Brown of Memphis.

Judge Brown has served as a distinguished jurist and community leader, and has demonstrated the law to millions of Americans via his television program. He is a nationally recognized figure with a reputation for outspoken and hands-on problem solving with urban

youth. He is also well-known for his innovative sentencing policies in addition to leading the re-opening of the case against James Earl Ray in the death of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

A graduate of UCLA, Judge Brown became the first African American prosecutor in Memphis. Currently, he unselfishly spends a large portion of his weekends in the toughest neighborhoods in Memphis, following up on probationers and helping teens stay out of trouble.

Judge Brown has displayed exemplary dedication not only to the law, but also to the youth in Memphis and across the nation. His accomplishments have earned him a place among our nation's finest as the newest member of the Phi Alpha Delta Law Fraternity International. Congratulations to Judge Brown.

---

#### A BILL TO REPEAL SECTION 809, WHICH TAXES POLICYHOLDER DIVIDENDS OF MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE COMPANIES, AND TO REPEAL SECTION 815, WHICH APPLIES TO POLICYHOLDERS SURPLUS ACCOUNTS

**HON. AMO HOUGHTON**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 13, 2000*

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleague from Massachusetts, Mr. NEAL, together with a number of other colleagues, in introducing our bill, "The Life Insurance Tax Simplification Act of 2000." The bill repeals two sections of the Internal Revenue Code which no longer serve valid tax policies goals.

This Congress has taken a major step forward in rewriting the regulatory structure of the financial services industry in the United States. This realignment is already having a positive impact on the way life insurance companies serve their customers, conduct their operations and merge their businesses to achieve greater market efficiencies. Unfortunately, the tax code contains several provisions which no longer represent valid tax policy goals, and in fact are carry-overs from the old tax and regulatory regimes that separated the life insurance industry from the rest of the financial world and differentiated between the stock and mutual segments of the life insurance industry. Today, the lines of competition are not between the stock and mutual segments of the life insurance industry. Rather, life insurers must compete in an aggressive, fast moving global financial services marketplace contrary to the premises underlying these old, outmoded tax rules.

In 1984 Congress enacted Section 809, which imposed an additional tax on mutual life insurers to guarantee that stock life insurers would not be competitively disadvantaged by what was then thought to be the dominant segment of the industry. Section 809 operates by taxing some of the dividends that mutual life insurers pay to their policyholders. When Section 809 was enacted, mutual life insurers held more than half the assets of U.S. life insurance companies. It is estimated that within a few years, life insurers operating as mutual companies are expected to constitute less than ten percent of the industry.

Section 809 has not been a significant component of the substantial taxes paid by the life

insurance industry, including mutual companies. But it has been extremely burdensome because of its unpredictable nature and complexity. The tax is based on a bizarre formula under which the tax of each mutual life insurer increases if the earnings of its large stock company competitors rise—even when a mutual company's earnings fall. The provision has been criticized by the Treasury Department and others as fundamentally flawed in concept. The original rationale behind the enactment of Section 809 no longer exists, and mutual life insurers should not pay taxes based on the earnings of their competitors or solely because they exist in the mutual form. Accordingly, the bill would repeal Section 809.

Section 815 was added to the Code as part of the 1959 changes to the life insurance companies tax structure. Before 1959, life insurance companies were taxed only on their investment income. Underwriting (premium) income was not taxed, and underwriting expenses were not deductible. The change in 1959 provided that all life insurance companies paid tax on investment income not set aside for policyholders and on one-half of their underwriting income. The other half of underwriting income for stock companies was not taxed unless it was distributed to shareholders. The amount of that income was called a "policyholders surplus account" or "PSA". No money was set aside; a PSA was and is just a bookkeeping entry. Mutual companies were not required to establish PSAs. The 1959 tax structure sought to tax the proper amount of income of stock and mutual companies alike and the PSA mechanism helped implement that goal.

In 1984, Congress rewrote the rules again. Both stock and mutual companies were subjected to tax on all their investment and underwriting income. In this context, dividend deductions for mutuals were limited under Section 809, and the tax exclusion for a portion of stock company's underwriting income was discontinued. Congress made a decision not to tax the amount excluded between 1959 and 1984. Rather the amounts are only taxed if one of the specific events described in the current Section 815 occurs (principally dissolution of the company).

The bill would repeal the obsolete Section 815 provision. Since 1984, the Government has collected relative small amounts of revenue with respect to PSAs as companies avoid the specific events which trigger PSAs taxation. There is not a "fund," "reserve," "provision" or "allocation" on a life insurance company's books to pay PSA taxes because, under generally accepted accounting principles, neither the government nor taxpayers have ever believed that significant amounts of tax would be triggered. Nevertheless, the continued existence of the PSAs does result in a burden on the companies in today's changing financial services world—a burden based on bookkeeping entries made from fifteen to forty years ago to comply with Congress' then vision of how segments of the life insurance industry should be taxed. In addition, the Administration has made recent proposals to require that PSA balances be taxed, even though no triggering event has taken place—thus another cloud of uncertainty.

The repeal of these two provisions, Sections 809 and 815, would provide certainty, less

complexity, and remove two provisions from the Internal Revenue Code, which no longer serve a valid tax policy goal in the life insurance tax structure of the Internal Revenue Code. We urge our colleagues to join us in co-sponsoring this legislation

TRIBUTE TO U.S. ATTORNEY  
GENERAL EDWARD LEVI

**HON. RAY LAHOOD**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 13, 2000*

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of myself and my colleague, ROBERT MATSUI, I would like to pay tribute today to the life of former U.S. Attorney General Edward Levi. It is with great sorrow that I acknowledge his passing, but it is with great privilege and honor that I speak about him today.

U.S. Supreme Court Justice John Paul Stevens recently said of Mr. Levi, "Wisdom, wit, a quiet grace and tireless willingness to strive for excellence have seldom been combined in such measure in one individual." I could not have summed up a man who has meant so much, to so many, better myself.

Author, professor, devoted father, and husband, Edward Levi is remembered by most as the U.S. Attorney General who helped to rebuild the Justice Department after Watergate and the resignation of President Richard Nixon. But, moreover, he was a man who accomplished more in his lifetime than most people dream of.

Starting out during World War II as a special assistant in the U.S. Attorney General's office, Mr. Levi returned to his alma mater of the University of Chicago in 1945 to assume a professorship in their distinguished school of law. While at the university, Mr. Levi quickly rose through the ranks becoming the Dean of the Law School in 1950, provost in 1962, and president of the distinguished university in 1968, a position he held until 1975. He was the first member of the Jewish community to serve as a leader of a major U.S. university.

In 1975, Mr. Levi was praised for his evenhanded response to the student uprising that culminated in the takeover of the school's administration building. His unique sense and display of leadership surrounding this incident did not go unnoticed. He was quickly appointed to the position of U.S. Attorney General, a post he served from 1975–1977. Former President Ford, said, "Ed Levi, with his outstanding academic and administrative record at the University of Chicago, was a perfect choice. \* \* \* When I assumed the Presidency in August 1974, it was essential that a new attorney general be appointed who would restore integrity and competence to the Department of Justice." Mr. Levi did just that.

Mr. Speaker, words certainly cannot do justice to the life of this fine individual. He was an exemplary individual, and it goes unsaid that his unmatched leadership will be missed. I want to express my condolences to the Levi family, particularly his wife Kate, sons John, David, and Michael, and brother Harry. Let us not forget his impressive accomplishments, but above all, let us never forget the

kind-hearted man behind the distinguished titles.

IN MEMORY OF RODNEY D.  
HANSON

**HON. ROBERT W. NEY**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 13, 2000*

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory of Rodney D. Hanson, who passed away on February 22, 2000. Rodney was born on June 24, 1945, the son of Harry R. and Doris A. Hanson.

Rodney was a graduate of Hamline University in St. Paul, MN, and later received a masters of arts degree in English from Ohio University. He received his juris doctorate degree from the Ohio State University College of Law. Rodney was a partner in the law firm of Thomas, Fregata, Myser, Hanson and Davis. Rodney also worked hard to serve the community. He was a member of St. Mary's Church in St. Clairsville, where he served as a lector. He was also a member of the Knights of Columbus and the St. Clairsville Sunrise Rotary Club. Rodney served as a trustee and president of the board of the Belmont-Harrison Juvenile District. He further served the public as a member and past president of the Belmont County Bar Association and a member of the Ohio State Bar Association in which he was a member of the School Law and Law Library Committees.

Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to pay my last respects to a gentleman who gave so much of himself to his community, his church, and his family. Rodney will be missed by all whose lives he touched. I am honored to have represented him and proud to have been able to call him a friend.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. BILL McCOLLUM**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Monday, March 13, 2000*

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, on March 9, 2000, I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on rollcall vote No. 39 on H. Res. 434, which provided for the consideration of H.R. 3081 and H.R. 3846; "no" on rollcall vote No. 40, on motion to recommit H.R. 3081 with instruction; "yes" on rollcall vote No. 41, passage of H.R. 3081 the Wage and Employment Growth Act; "no" on rollcall vote No. 43 on agreeing to the Traficant amendment which would provide for the increase in the minimum wage to occur over a 2-year period instead of a 3-year period; "no" on rollcall vote No. 44 on motion to recommit H.R. 3846 with instructions; "no" on rollcall vote No. 45 on final passage of H.R. 3846 which amended the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 and increased the minimum wage.

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 14, 2000 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

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

Appropriations  
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee  
To hold hearings to examine issues dealing with Alzheimer Disease.  
SD-216

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

United States Senate Caucus on International Narcotics Control  
To hold hearings to review the annual certification process.  
SD-215

Environment and Public Works  
Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee  
To hold hearings on General Services Association's fiscal year 2001 Capital Investment and Leasing Program, including the courthouse construction program.  
SD-406

Appropriations  
Legislative Branch Subcommittee  
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2001 for the Secretary of the Senate, and the Sergeant at Arms.  
SD-116

10:30 a.m.  
Indian Affairs  
To hold hearings on S.2102, to provide to the Tembisa Shoshone Tribe a perma-

nent land base within its aboriginal homeland.  
SR-485

2 p.m.  
Environment and Public Works  
Superfund, Waste Control, and Risk Assessment Subcommittee  
To hold hearings to examine the current status of cleanup activities under the Superfund program.  
SD-406

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs  
Housing and Transportation Subcommittee  
To hold oversight hearings on HUD's Public Housing Assessment System (PHASE).  
SD-628

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  
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business; to be followed by hearings on the nomination of Thomas N. Soaker, 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 oversight hearings to examine Department of Energy's management of health and safety issues surrounding DOE's gaseous diffusion plants in Tennessee and Ohio.  
SD-342

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 Pachytene, Ohio.  
SD-342

2 p.m.  
Judiciary  
Antitrust, Business Rights, and Competition Subcommittee  
To hold oversight hearings on certain antitrust issues.  
SD-226

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

Energy and Natural Resources  
Water and Power Subcommittee  
To hold hearings on H.R.862, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to implement the provisions of the Agreement conveying title to a Distribution System from the United States to the Clear Creek Community Services Dis-

trict; 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 Solan County Water Agency, California, to use Solan Project facilities for impounding, storage, and carriage of nonproject water for domestic, municipal, industrial, and other beneficial purposes; S.2091, 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; 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.  
SD-366

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

Energy and Natural Resources  
To hold hearings on the nomination of Thomas A. Fry, III, of Texas, to be Director of the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior.  
SD-366

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

Judiciary  
Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.  
SD-226

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.  
SD-216

10:30 a.m.  
Governmental Affairs  
Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.  
SD-342

2 p.m.  
Judiciary  
Constitution, Federalism, and Property Rights Subcommittee  
To hold hearings to examine racial profiling within law enforcement agencies.  
SD-226

2:30 p.m.  
Foreign Relations  
Business meeting to mark up the proposed Technical Assistance, Trade Promotion and Anti-Corruption Act.  
SD-419

Energy and Natural Resources National Parks, Historic Preservation, and Recreation Subcommittee To hold oversight hearings to examine the status of monuments and memo- rials in and around Washington, D.C. SD-366	Appropriations Defense Subcommittee To hold hearings on proposed budget es- timates for fiscal year 2001 for the De- partment of Defense, focusing on Air Force programs. SD-192	10 a.m. Appropriations Defense Subcommittee To hold hearings on proposed budget es- timates for fiscal year 2001 for the De- partment of Defense, focusing on Army programs. SD-192
MARCH 28	2:30 p.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 cer- tain land into trust for that Band. SR-485	APRIL 6
9:30 a.m. Commerce, Science, and Transportation Communications Subcommittee To hold hearings to examine the current state of deployment of hi-speed Inter- net technologies, focusing on rural areas. SR-253	MARCH 30	9:30 a.m. Appropriations VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Sub- committee To hold hearings on proposed budget es- timates for fiscal year 2001 for the De- partment of Veterans Affairs. SD-138
Small Business To hold hearings to examine the extent of office supply scams, including toner- phoner schemes. SD-562	9:30 a.m. Appropriations VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Sub- committee To hold hearings on proposed budget es- timates for fiscal year 2001 for the De- partment of Housing and Urban Devel- opment. SD-138	APRIL 8
Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Children and Families Subcommittee To hold hearings on child safety on the Internet. SD-430	Energy and Natural Resources To hold hearings on S.882, to strengthen provisions in the Energy Policy Act of 1992 and the Federal Nonnuclear En- ergy Research and Development Act of 1974 with respect to potential Climate Change; and S.1776, to amend the En- ergy Policy Act of 1992 to revise the en- ergy policies of the United States in order to reduce greenhouse gas emis- sions, advance global climate science, promote technology development, and increase citizen awareness. SD-366	10 a.m. Appropriations Defense Subcommittee To hold hearings on proposed budget es- timates for fiscal year 2001 for the De- partment of Defense, focusing on med- ical programs. SD-192
Appropriations Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee To hold hearings to examine issues deal- ing with mind body and alternative medicines. SD-192	APRIL 11	9:30 a.m. Appropriations Interior Subcommittee To hold hearings on proposed budget es- timates for fiscal year 2001 for the De- partment of Energy. SD-138
10 a.m. Appropriations Transportation Subcommittee To hold hearings to examine the imple- mentation of the Driver's Privacy Pro- tection Act, focusing on the positive notification requirement. SD-192	Appropriations Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee To hold hearings on proposed budget es- timates for fiscal year 2001 for the Na- tional Institutes of Health, Depart- ment of Health and Human Services. SD-124	10 a.m. Energy and Natural Resources To hold hearings on S.282, to provide that no electric utility shall be required to enter into a new contract or obligation to purchase or to sell electricity or ca- pacity under section 210 of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978; S.516, to benefit consumers by pro- moting competition in the electric power industry; S.1047, to provide for a more competitive electric power indus- try; S.1284, to amend the Federal Power Act to ensure that no State may estab- lish, maintain, or enforce on behalf of any electric utility an exclusive right to sell electric energy or otherwise un- duly discriminate against any con- sumer who seeks to purchase electric energy in interstate commerce from any supplier; S.1273, to amend the Fed- eral Power Act, to facilitate the transi- tion to more competitive and efficient electric power markets; S.1369, to en- hance the benefits of the national elec- tric system by encouraging and sup- porting State programs for renewable energy sources, universal electric ser- vice, affordable electric service, and en- ergy conservation and efficiency; S.2071, to benefit electricity consumers by promoting the reliability of the bulk-power system; and S.2098, to fa- cilitate the transition to more com- petitive and efficient electric power markets, and to ensure electric reli- ability. SD-216
2:30 p.m. Energy and Natural Resources National Parks, Historic Preservation, and Recreation Subcommittee To hold oversight hearings on the incin- erator component at the proposed Ad- vanced Waste Treatment Facility at the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory and its po- tential impact on the adjacent Yellow- stone and Grand Teton National Parks. SD-366	10 a.m. Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions To hold hearings on medical records pri- vacy. SD-430	
MARCH 29	2:30 p.m. Energy and Natural Resources Forests and Public Land Management Sub- committee To hold oversight hearings on the Presi- dent's October 1999 announcement to review approximately 40 million acres of national forest lands for increased protection. SD-366	APRIL 4
9:30 a.m. Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Business meeting to consider pending calendar business. SD-430	APRIL 5	9:30 a.m. Indian Affairs Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business; to be followed by hearings on S.611, to provide for admin- istrative procedures to extend Federal recognition to certain Indian groups, and will be followed by a business
Appropriations Interior Subcommittee To hold hearings on proposed budget es- timates for fiscal year 2001 for the De- partment of the Interior. SD-124	9:30 a.m. Appropriations Interior Subcommittee To hold hearings on proposed budget es- timates for fiscal year 2001 for the Bu- reau of Indian Affairs and Office of the Special Trustee, Department of the In- terior. SD-138	APRIL 12
Energy and Natural Resources Business meeting to consider pending calendar business. SD-366		
10 a.m. Governmental Affairs To hold hearings on how to structure government to meet the challenges of the millennium. SD-342	9:30 a.m. Indian Affairs To hold hearings on S.612, to provide for periodic Indian needs assessments, to require Federal Indian program evalua- tions. SR-485	
Governmental Affairs To hold hearings on meeting the chal- lenges of the millennium, focusing on proposals to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the Federal Govern- ment. SD-342		

meeting to consider pending committee business.

SR-485

Appropriations  
VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2001 for the Corporation for National and Community Service, Community Development Financial Institutions, and Chemical Safety Board.

SD-138

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 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

The Senate was not in session today. It will next meet on Monday, March 20, 2000, at 12 noon.

### Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

#### AUTHORIZATION—DEFENSE

*Committee on Armed Services:* Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support concluded hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 2001 for the Department of Defense and the Future Years Defense Program, focusing on the Services' Infrastructure accounts and Real Property Maintenance Programs and the National Missile Defense Construction request, after receiving testimony from Randall A. Yim, Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Installations; Mahlon Apgar IV, Assistant Secretary of the Army for Installations and Environment; Maj. Gen. Robert L. Van Antwerp, Jr., USA, Assistant Chief of Army Staff for Installation Management; Robert B. Pirie, Jr., Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Installations and Environment; Rear Adm. Louis M. Smith, USN, Commander, Naval Facilities Engineering Command; Maj. Gen. Harold Mashburn, Jr., USMC, Assistant Deputy Chief of Marine Corps Staff for Installations and Logistics; Ruby B. DeMesme, Assistant Secretary of the Air

Force for Manpower, Reserve Affairs, Installations and Environment; Maj. Gen. Earnest O. Robbins II, USAF, The Civil Engineer, Department of the Air Force; and Lt. Gen. Ronald T. Kadish, USAF, Director, Ballistic Missile Defense Organization.

#### VALLES CALDERA PRESERVATION ACT

*Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:* Subcommittee on Forests and Public Land Management concluded 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, after receiving testimony from Representatives Wilson and Tom Udall; Barry T. Hill, Associate Director, Energy, Resources and Science Issues, General Accounting Office; James Lyons, Under Secretary of Agriculture for Natural Resources and Environment; Larry Finfer, Assistant Director for Communications, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior; Raymond Gachupin, Jemez Pueblo, Jemez, New Mexico; Denny Guiterrez, Santa Clara Pueblo, Espanola, New Mexico; Gregory Nibert, Hinkle Law Firm, Roswell, New Mexico; Frank Bond, Simons, Cuddy, and Friedman, and Palemon Martinez, Northern New Mexico Stockman's Association, both of Santa Fe, New Mexico; and Dave Simon, Albuquerque, New Mexico, on behalf of the National Parks and Conservation Association.

---

## House of Representatives

### Chamber Action

**Bills Introduced:** 2 public bills, H.R. 3904–3905, and 3 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 276–278, were introduced. **Page H931**

**Reports Filed:** Reports were filed today as follows: H.R. 1443, to provide for the collection of data on traffic stops, amended (H. Rept. 105–517);

H.R. 2372, Private Property Rights Implementation Act of 1999, amended (H. Rept. 106–518); and

H.R. 984, Caribbean and Central America Relief and Economic Stabilization Act, amended (H. Rept. 106–519). **Pages H930–31**

**Speaker Pro Tempore:** Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he designated Representative Miller of Florida to act as Speaker pro tempore for today.

**Page H923**

**Inspector General for the House of Representatives:** The Chair announced the joint appointment by the Speaker, Majority Leader, and Minority Leader of Mr. Steven A. McNamara of Sterling, Virginia, to the position of Inspector General for the United States House of Representatives for the 106th Congress. **Page H923**

**Senate Messages:** Message received from the Senate today appears on page H923.

**Referrals:** S. 1653 was referred to the Committee on Resources and S. Con. Res. 95 was referred to the Committee on International Relations. **Page H929**

**Quorum Calls—Votes:** No quorum calls or recorded votes developed during the proceedings of the House today.

**Adjournment:** The House met at 2:00 p.m. and adjourned at 2:58 p.m.

## Committee Meetings

### ERISA REFORM PROPOSALS

*Committee on Education and the Workforce:* On March 10, the Subcommittee on Employer-Employee Relations concluded hearings on "A More Secure Retirement for Workers: Proposals for ERISA Reform." Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

### BIENNIAL BUDGETING

*Committee on Rules:* On March 10, the Committee continued hearings on Biennial Budgeting: A Tool for Improving Government Fiscal Management and Oversight. Testimony was heard from Jack Lew, Director, OMB; Dan Crippen, Director, CBO; Sue Irving, Associate Director, Budget Issues, GAO; and Lou Fisher, Senior Specialist, Separation of Powers, Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress. Hearings continue March 16.

### ENERGY DEPARTMENT—BUDGET AUTHORIZATION REQUEST

*Committee on Science:* On March 10, the Subcommittee on Energy and Environment continued hearings on Fiscal Year 2001 Budget Authorization Request: Department of Energy—Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy; Fossil Energy; and Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Energy: Dan W. Reicher, Assistant Secretary, Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy; William D. Magwood, IV, Director, Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology; and Robert S. Kripowicz, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary, Fossil Energy.

### SUPPORT TO MILITARY OPERATIONS

*Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence:* On March 10, the Subcommittee on Technical and Tactical In-

telligence met in executive session to hold a hearing on Support to Military Operations. Testimony was heard from departmental witnesses.

## COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR TUESDAY, MARCH 14, 2000

### Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

### House

*Committee on Appropriations,* Subcommittee on Interior, on Department of Energy—Fossil Energy, 2:15 p.m., B-308 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, on Public Witnesses, 10:00 a.m. and 2:00 p.m., 2358 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government, on Customs Service, 9:30 a.m., 2359 Rayburn, and on Federal Law Enforcement Training Center, 2 p.m., 2362-B Rayburn.

*Committee on Armed Services,* Subcommittee on Military Procurement and the Subcommittee on Military Research and Development, joint hearing on Navy and Marine Corps programs, 1 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

*Committee on Banking and Financial Services,* to mark up H.R. 1776, American Homeownership and Economic Opportunity Act of 2000, 2 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

*Committee on Commerce,* Subcommittee on Energy and Power and the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, joint hearing on safety and security of the new National Nuclear Security Administration, 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Telecommunications, Trade, and Consumer Protection, hearing on the Telecommunications Merger Act of 2000, 10 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

*Committee on Government Reform,* Subcommittee on the Census, oversight hearing on the 2000 Census: Status of Key Operations, 2 p.m., 2203 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources, to continue hearings on HHS Drug Treatment Support: Is SAMHSA Optimizing Resources? 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

*Committee on the Judiciary,* to continue markup of H.R. 1283, Fairness in Asbestos Compensation Act of 1999; and to mark up the following bills: H.R. 1304, Quality Health-Care Coalition Act of 1999; and H.R. 3660, Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act of 2000, 2 p.m., 2141 Rayburn.

*Committee on Resources,* Subcommittee on Forests and Forest Health, oversight hearing on Forest Service Road Management Policy, 2 p.m., 1334 Longworth.

Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands, hearing on H.R. 2557, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a feasibility study on the inclusion in Biscayne National Park, Florida, of the archaeological site known as the Miami Circle; and H.R. 3084, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contribute funds for the establishment of an interpretative center on the life and

contributions of President Abraham Lincoln, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

*Committee on Rules*, to consider the following: H.R. 3843, Small Business Reauthorization Act of 2000; and the Conference Report to accompany H.R. 1000, Wendell H. Ford Aviation Investment and Reform Act for the 21st Century, 6:30 p.m., H-313 Capitol.

*Committee on Small Business*, Subcommittee on Government Programs and Oversight and the Subcommittee on Benefits of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, joint hearing with respect to Public Law 106-50, Veterans En-

trepreneurship and Small Business Development Act of 1999, 10 a.m., 311 Cannon.

*Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence*, executive, hearing on fiscal Year 2001 JMIP/TIARA, 2 p.m., H-405 Capitol.

### Joint Meetings

*Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe*, to hold hearings on the protection of human rights advocates in Northern Ireland, 10 a.m., 2255 RHOB.

*Next Meeting of the SENATE*

12 noon, Monday, March 20

*Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES*

12:30 p.m., Tuesday, March 14

## Senate Chamber

**Program for Monday:** Senate will be in a period of morning business, during which two Senators will be recognized.

## House Chamber

**Program for Tuesday:** Consideration of Suspensions:

1. H.R. 3845, Small Business Investment Corrections Act of 2000;
2. H.R. 3699, Joel T. Broyhill Postal Building in Merrifield, Virginia;
3. H.R. 3701, Joseph L. Fisher Post Office Building in Arlington, Virginia; and
4. H.Res. 431, Humanitarian Assistance to the Republic of Mozambique.

## Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

## HOUSE

Bereuter, Doug, Nebr., E283, E284  
Blumenauer, Earl, Ore., E285  
Capps, Lois, Calif., E284, E285  
Forbes, Michael P., N.Y., E287  
Ford, Harold E., Jr., Tenn., E287

Holt, Rush D., N.J., E284  
Houghton, Amo, N.Y., E287  
Hoyer, Steny H., Md., E283  
Kennedy, Patrick J., R.I., E287  
LaHood, Ray, Ill., E288  
Lantos, Tom, Calif., E283  
Lowey, Nita M., N.Y., E286

McCollum, Bill, Fla., E288  
Menendez, Robert, N.J., E285  
Ney, Robert W., Ohio, E288  
Sanchez, Loretta, Calif., E285  
Velazquez, Nydia M., N.Y., E284



# 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](http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs), by using local WAIS client software or by telnet to [swais.access.gpo.gov](http://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](mailto: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.