United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 146 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 15, 2000 No. 29

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

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 15, 2000

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. OSE).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 15, 2000.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DOUG OSE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

PRAYER

The Reverend Dr. Richard Camp, Ministry to the National Parks, Boston, Massachusetts, offered the following prayer:

Oh Lord, our Lord, how majestic is Your name in all the Earth. Your never ending providence orders every event, sweetens every fear, and brings real good out of seeming evil. We come to You for the grace another day will require for its duties and events.

Help us to walk in wisdom to those to whom we must give account, to walk in kindness to those with whom we work, and to walk with courage as we seek to do what is right.

Guide the women and men of this Congress today. Give them the vision to see the impact of today's decisions on tomorrow's world. And may the ripple effect of their lives of integrity return to bless them and all people in the days ahead.

God of hope, fill us with joy and peace as we trust in You that, by the power of Your spirit, our whole life and outlook may be radiant with hope. 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 gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY 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.

LEARN FROM OUR MISTAKES

(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, some startling news: Last month the Commerce Department announced that the U.S. trade deficit surged to an all-time high in 1999. The trade deficit rose over 65 percent from 1998, over 65 percent.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. economy is being shipped overseas and the American workers are being left behind unemployed and unable to reach the American dream. And in spite of this indisputable fact, the Clinton administration continues to encourage the expansion of current free trade policy, such as NAFTA, to other nations around the world.

Sadly, the President has also failed to mention another fact that the Commerce Department also announced, and that is that the United States experienced record trade deficits with its NAFTA trade partners last year, as well. Seems obvious to me and many of my colleagues here that NAFTA and similar trade policies have caused more harm than good for our economy and for the American workers.

Let us not make the same mistake twice.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back such ill-conceived trade policies that seem to only trade away American jobs for higher trade deficits.

WE HAVE MEANS TO PROTECT OUR FAMILIES, SUPPORT OUR SENIORS, AND EDUCATE OUR CHILDREN

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

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of senior citizens who cannot afford to pay for their prescriptions. I rise for the children who go to overcrowded and broken down schools. I rise for the people who work full time

Printed on recycled paper.

and still cannot afford health insurance or quality child care. I rise for people who cannot afford to send their children to college. I rise for the 80 percent of the homeless who go to work every day and play by the rules and cannot afford a roof over their heads. I rise to oppose Republican budget priorities that will make the very rich even more rich.

We have the means to protect our seniors, to support our families, and to educate our children and to bring everyone along. This is the moment in history when we can and should do that.

REPUBLICAN BUDGET PLAN PAYS DOWN DEBT

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, would my colleagues go on a huge credit card spending spree if they knew that they would be dead and gone once the bill came due and their children would be responsible for paying it off? Of course not.

Most Americans work hard to make sure that they have some money to leave their children when they die. Most Americans would never dream of leaving their children a pile of debt for their inheritance. But that is exactly what the Federal Government has been doing for years.

For 40 years, when Democrats controlled the Congress, they spent money on more and more Government programs and created bigger and bigger debt and they knew that their children would be the ones saddled with the bill, but they kept spending and borrowing and spending more. That was wrong.

Republicans are putting an end to this kind of spending-now-and-paying-later mentality. One of our priorities in this budget is to pay down the public debt. We want to pay off those bills so our children do not have to.

Let us work together to make sure our legacy to our children is a sound economy, safe neighborhoods, and quality schools instead of decades' worth of bad debt.

INCOME TAX BUSINESS OUT OF CONTROL

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, the income tax business is out of control.

Check this out. Steve and Heidi Salashi of Monroe Falls, Ohio, failed to file a 1997 income tax return with the City. The reason they did so is they only owed 19 cents. Nineteen cents.

Now, if that is not enough to bust your bunions, the City of Monroe Falls took them to court. They face 6 months in jail and a thousand-dollar fine because they even lost the record of the Salashi family, which included, Mr. Speaker, a $25 late fee.

Beam me up. Mr. Speaker, it is time to put a dagger in the heart of income taxes. Our Tax Code is so heavy it would give a King Kong gorilla a hernia.

I yield back the anguish of the American taxpayers.

COLOMBIA AID PACKAGE

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, in Shakespeare's play Julius Caesar, the soothsayer warned Caesar to ''beware of the Ides of March.'' Caesar did not listen and Caesar perished.

Today, on this Ides of March, I bring my colleagues fair warning. If we do not pass the Colombia aid package soon, our friends in Colombia could suffer the same fate as Caesar and our own children could be next.

Mr. Speaker, in fiscal year 1999, Federal agents intercepted nearly 2,800 pounds of heroin and 280,000 pounds of cocaine coming into the United States. And of these amounts, DEA estimates that 80 percent of the coke and 75 percent of the heroin originated in Colombia.

These are staggering figures indeed, but they only represent the seizures. I can assure my colleagues that much more is making it to our streets and to our young people.

Without U.S. help in fighting the drug war, the Colombian Government has little chance of ending the violence and stopping the flow of drugs. With the illegal drug trade providing the insurgents with over $600 million a year in drug money, it is likely that the duly-elected Government of Colombia will fall without our immediate help. Failing to act will stay with our children forever.

REPUBLICAN BUDGET PLAN OUT OF STEP WITH AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it seems that once again the Republican budget would be just another re-run of last year's out-of-step ideas. This is a reckless plan. It fails to extend the life of Medicare by one day. It fails to extend the life of Social Security by one day.

Instead of investing in the future of American families by paying down the national debt, it spends nearly $150 billion on budget busting tax cuts that benefit mostly the wealthy in this country. The Republican plan is out of step with the American people.

In addition, Republicans think that the cost of prescription drugs is a low-income problem. They are wrong. The increasing cost of prescription drugs is putting a massive financial burden on middle-class seniors.

Democrats want to make sure that all seniors are covered. They should not have to be poor to get Medicare coverage for the overwhelming cost of prescription drugs. Americans want a budget that protects Social Security, Medicare, that allows for prescription drug benefits for all seniors.

It seems that the Republican budget once again fails to connect with the needs of middle-class families.

GAS PRICES TOO HIGH—PEOPLE ARE HURTING

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

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, the American people are paying almost $2 a gallon for gas while the Clinton administration is asleep at the wheel. Gas prices are too high, and people are hurting.

Mr. Speaker, why do mothers have to choose between a gallon of gas and a gallon of milk? The American people have to swallow the soaring price of fuel at the pumps, seriously jeopardizing their livelihoods.

Whether it is a tractor-trailer, a delivery van, or a family minivan, gasoline prices are making Californians choke. Still, the Clinton administration has done nothing.

Since 1993, when Al Gore broke the tie in the U.S. Senate to impose this administration's gas tax, U.S. oil production has declined by 17 percent, oil producing jobs have declined by 27 percent, and 36 U.S. refineries have closed their doors.

We need action now, not later, Mr. Speaker. Gas prices need to be lowered now.

STUDENT ATHLETE PROTECTION ACT

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

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, today one of the great events in sports in America begins, March Madness, the NCAA tournament.

While our student athletes are going to be giving it all on the court, the coaches are going to be trying to outthink and out-strategize one another.

But what do these coaches have in common, coaches like Mike Krzyzewski at Duke, Mike Montgomery at Stanford, Bill Guthridge at North Carolina, Roy Williams at Kansas? They all support a bill that the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) and I have introduced called the Student Athlete Protection Act, a bill that seeks to preserve the integrity of college, amateur, and high school sports by imposing a complete ban on betting on college sports, not de minimus bets on pools and offices, but on betting in Las Vegas.

Let us try to protect the magic and the purity of the competition in these sports and support this bill.

WHITE HOUSE E-MAIL CONTROVERSY CONTINUES

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, the White House e-mail controversy continues. Five Northrop Grumman employees were so intimidated by the White House threats of jail that one was nearly fired when she refused to tell her own bosses about the administration's failure to turn over thousands of e-mail messages under subpoena.

Newly obtained information shows the White House threatened to have the five employees jailed after they found and reported a glitch in the White House computer system that prevented the discovery of more than 100,000 White House messages involving campaign finance abuses, Monica Lewinsky, Chinagate, and Filegate.

Mr. Speaker, the Justice Department does not even appear to be interested, does not want to check these e-mails for information about the campaign finance scandal.

Why has Janet Reno, the attorney general, been so silent on this matter?

GUN CONTROL IN AMERICA

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, some months ago I indicated that I would be on the floor on a regular basis bringing to the attention of this Congress and to the American people that 13 children die every day at the hands of a gun. Thirteen children die every day.

But yet this Congress, of which I am a Member, and the House Committee on the Judiciary Conference Committee on Gun Safety and Juvenile Justice, refused to meet.

On the other hand, gun-responsible legislation such as trigger locks, smart gun, and the legislation that I intend to offer that will provide educational programs and incentives to schools, hold parents and adults responsible for children that get guns has not been able to see the light of day.

But, on the other side, the National Rifle Association thinks we can save lives by ugly and undermining advertisement.

Well, Mr. Speaker, they can advertise all day long with all kinds of anecdotes, but they cannot save lives. It is time for the Conference Committee on Gun Safety and Juvenile Justice to meet and to meet now.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say to Mr. Walter Hall that I offer to his family my greatest sympathy.

TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1996

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, it has been 4 years since the enactment of the Telecommunications Act of 1996; and I am pleased to report that cable companies are responding to that Act and are delivering state-of-the-art telecommunication services in Kentucky's First Congressional District, as well as throughout the country.

Charter company has wired Murray State University with cable modems, giving students and faculty high-speed access to the Internet. Charter is also deploying cable modems in the town of Murray, Kentucky, and will offer residential services there in April.

In addition, Mediacom is offering cable modems in Marshall and Calloway counties and continues to upgrade its infrastructure with interactive fiber/coaxial cable facilities.

I am pleased that cable companies throughout the country are helping to fulfill the vision of the Telecommunications Act, which was designed to bring competition, expanded investment, and the delivery of broadband services to all Americans.

□ 1015

WALTER HALL, A MAN WHO NOT ONLY TALKED THE TALK BUT WALKED THE WALK

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

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with great sadness to honor Walter Hall of Dickinson, Texas, who passed away on Sunday at age 92. Walter Hall, known by many as ''Mr. Democrat,'' was a man who not only talked the talk but walked the walk. He was a true visionary, with a vision of a better life for all Americans.

He spent his life fighting for equality, justice, and opportunity. He led the charge to abolish the poll tax, supported equal rights for women, and worked for the Civil Rights Act in 1964 and the Voting Rights Act in 1965.

He was a community activist who negotiated with the City of Houston to supply clean drinking water for Galveston County and is credited with bringing NASA to the Clear Lake area.

He was a man of humble beginnings, who became a man of great fortune and power. He served as a mentor for many young people interested in politics and was a close friend to President Lyndon Johnson and Speaker of the House Sam Rayburn. However, despite all his clout, he remained a man of the people, honest and forthright. He will be sorely missed.

EDUCATION REFORM MUST BE TOP PRIORITY

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

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, Alexis de Toqueville wrote in his famous work Democracy in America that in America there cannot be enough of knowledge, for all knowledge benefits both those who possess it and those who do not.

Alexis de Toqueville is quoted all the time, and there is good reason for it. His commentary here on the value of knowledge, about how education is important to everyone, is an example of his wisdom. Education is an issue that is important to those with children and to those who are not parents.

If a generation of American school children is receiving an inferior education, that is a serious concern for all of us. Of course, the reality is that our Nation's public schools include excellent schools, some that are unremarkable and others that are simply a disgrace.

It is the general trend toward mediocrity, the systematic dumbing down of curricula, textbooks, and standards, that I find most alarming.

I know that millions of parents agree, and that is why education reform must be a top priority for this Congress.

AMERICANS MANAGE TO BALANCE THEIR CHECKBOOKS EACH MONTH, AND WE SHOULD DO THE SAME

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate my remarks with the remarks of my colleague from Galveston County today with the death of Walter Hall. One, he is a great American but also a great Texan.

Let me say what I am really here for is that here we go again. It seems like Yogi Berra said, deja vu all over again. We are counting our surplus eggs before they have hatched. Like kids who have taken their parents' credit cards and are on a buying spree, my Republican colleagues are busy spending a budget surplus that does not exist yet. It is just a wish and a prayer.

Instead of paying down the $5.5 trillion national debt and securing the future of Social Security and Medicare, they want another tax cut. It is strange, for the first time this last 10 days we are actually having the Department of Treasury paying off part of our national debt, first time in recent history; but their efforts would stop this. We should be using the surplus to ensure that Social Security and Medicare will rest on a financially sound foundation well into the next century. My Republican friends, though, are proposing billions in tax cuts that would take this away. We need to do better. The American people need to do better. We need to do better.

THIS BUDGET IS A QUESTION OF VALUES

(Mr. MENENDEZ asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, the budget is not just a question of numbers. It is a question of values. With Republicans ready to yet again propose a $150 billion tax cut for the wealthy, they have made their values very clear. They value giving a millionaire a tax break while our seniors struggle to pay for their prescription drugs. They value giving the wealthy a tax cut while mortgaging our children's future to pay for it.

We Democrats have a different set of values. We value the commitment we have made to preserving Social Security and Medicare. We value the years of hard work our seniors have labored to build this country and the right they have to be able to enjoy their golden years without having to choose between the drugs they need and the retirement that they deserve. We value our Nation's children, who deserve a debt-free future, which is why we Democrats are fighting to use the surplus to pay down the national debt.

That is why this budget is a question of values, and that is why we Democrats are ready to fight alongside our Nation's working families for the values they deserve.

WENDELL H. FORD AVIATION INVESTMENT AND REFORM ACT FOR THE 21ST CENTURY

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 438 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 438

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 1000) to amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize programs of the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSE). The gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purposes of debate only.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Committee on Rules met and granted a standard rule for consideration of the conference report to accompany H.R. 1000, the Wendell H. Ford Aviation Investment and Reform Act for the 21st Century. As is customary for all conference report rules, the rule waives all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration.

Mr. Speaker, Robert Louis Stevenson once wrote, ''For my part, I travel not to go anywhere but to go. I travel for travel's sake. The great affair is to move.''

This Nation's proud history is filled with the deeds and adventures of great explorers and brave pioneers whose journeys were often more fascinating than their destinations.

As we continue to explore, pioneer and grow, the people of a young nation no longer travel just for adventure or, as Stevenson opined, solely for travel's sake. We began traveling for a much simpler purpose. We traveled to get somewhere.

We never stop finding a way to do it safer, faster and cheaper.

Whether it was the trailblazers of the Old West laying rails across a new frontier or immigrants from the Old World digging the ditches of a new canal; the growth, prosperity and opportunities of this great Nation have been intertwined with our ability, as a people, to move.

Throughout that history, this Congress has been called upon for its leadership and sometimes its help to make certain that the transportation needs of this country and its citizens were met safely, efficiently, and adequately.

Often that work is not easy, and I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) for his efforts and his diligence.

Mr. Speaker, air travel is as critical to our Nation's economy as its future, just as surely as wagon trains and railroads were to expanding our land and our prosperity.

Issues affecting airline, airport and aviation safety have been of paramount concern over the years, and this Congress has been working to find the solutions to those issues and problems.

Our Nation's travelers have rightfully called for a greater safety and an end to needless delays and uncertain schedules. The airline industry has called out for increased safety measures, much-needed radar modernization and funding for airport construction projects.

The Wendell H. Ford Aviation Investment and Reform Act for the 21st Century provides for critical changes to improve competition, reforms the Federal Aviation Administration, helps small communities and large airports alike, and most important, makes our skies safer.

Mr. Speaker, the safety of our skies and our citizens must remain a paramount concern of this Congress. This bill goes a long way toward improving airline safety by increasing investment for FAA's facilities and equipment budget by almost 50 percent so that the agency can modernize our antiquated air traffic control system.

Additionally, H.R. 1000 provides the FAA sufficient funding to hire and retain the air traffic controllers, maintenance technicians and inspectors necessary for the safety of the aviation system.

Mr. Speaker, this bill helps airline passengers and their families by strengthening the provisions of the Aviation Disaster Family Assistance Act that was created following the tragic Value Jet and TWA 800 crashes.

Those terrible tragedies left already fearful family members without timely or accurate information, something that should never happen again.

Additionally, this bill spurs needed competition on behalf of American consumers. In my own district in Upstate New York, the high cost of air travel has been an ongoing concern, as we earned the dubious distinction of being one of the costliest areas in the Nation to travel by air. This region of the State, as do others across the Nation, needs greater airline competition and lower airline costs.

H.R. 1000 addresses much of that concern, by setting a dated elimination of slot restrictions at O'Hare, LaGuardia and Kennedy Airports, allowing smaller communities better access to New York and Chicago, as well as immediate access for regional jets.

The bill also creates a new funding program to help small, underserved airports market and promote their air service and for the first time funds general aviation airports.

As our reliance on air travel for business and commerce, vocations and vacations continues to grow, this bill provides the assistance needed for burgeoning airports across the Nation.

In my own region, the Buffalo and Rochester Airports will see funds from the Airport Improvement Program more than double, as will most others across the United States.

Mr. Speaker, this bill not only accomplishes a great deal on behalf of competition, growth, and safety in America's aviation system, it is a product of deliberation and consensus reflecting both the complexities and agreement of the two Houses of this Congress, as well as the executive branch.

In conclusion, I would like to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the ranking member, for their hard work on this measure. I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to insert into the RECORD a series of correspondence between the chairman and the ranking member of the Committee on Rules and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure concerning application of section 106 of the conference report to accompany H.R. 1000.

COMMITTEE ON RULES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 10, 2000.

Hon. BUD SHUSTER,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR BUD: The Rules Committee is planning to meet on March 14th to grant a rule for the Conference Report to accompany H.R. 1000, the Wendell H. Ford Aviation Investment and Reform Act of the 21st Century (AIR21). Since the conference report contains provisions establishing new points of order in the rules of the House and Senate, we would appreciate you responding to the enclosed questions prior to the hearing. Your responses will help us to develop a legislative history that will assist in the implementation of the points of order contained in the legislation. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

DAVID DREIER.
JOSEPH MOAKLEY.

QUESTIONS TO CHAIRMAN SHUSTER REGARDING THE APPLICATION OF SECTION 106 OF THE CONFERENCE REPORT TO ACCOMPANY H.R. 1000

1. How is the Chair to interpret the language in section 106 of the conference report with regard to a limitation amendment to a general appropriation bill? In particular, how should the Chair interpret ''cause total budget resources in a fiscal year for aviation investment programs described in subsection (b) to be less than the amount required by subsection (a)(1)(A) for such fiscal year''? (Section 106(c)(1))

2. Is there statutory discretion for the FAA to reprogram funds in the event of an amendment that limits funding for a project? If so, where is the statutory discretion?

3. How is the Chair to interpret the language in section 106 of the conference report with regard to a supplemental appropriations bill or a continuing resolution?

4. How is the Chair to interpret the language in section 106 of the conference report with regard to an ''across-the-board'' cut?

5. What calculations would the Chair have to undertake in determining whether the point of order applies to a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion or conference report?

6. To what extent should the Chair rely on estimates from outside entities? (e.g. Budget Committee, CBO, OMB).

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 14, 1999.

Hon. DAVID DREIER,
Chairman, Committee on Rules, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to your letter of March 10, 2000, regarding the Conference Report on H.R. 1000, the Wendell H. Ford Aviation Investment and Reform Act of the 21st Century (AIR 21), attached are responses to the questions you sent to develop a legislative history that will assist in the implementation of the points of order contained in the legislation.

Please let us know if you need any further information. With warm personal regards, we remain,

Sincerely,

BUD SHUSTER,
Chairman.
JAMES L. OBERSTAR,
Ranking Democratic Member.

Attachment.

1. How is the chair to interpret the language found in section 106 of the Conference Report with regard to a limitation amendment in a general appropriations bill? In particular, how should the chair interpret ''cause total budgetary resources for a fiscal year for aviation investment programs described in subsection (b) to be less than the amount required by subsection (a)(1)(A) for such fiscal year''? (Section 106(c)(1))

The points of order in (c)(1) and (c)(2) should not restrict the ability of Members to offer amendments on appropriations bills that would have the effect of limiting funding for an aviation project or activity that would otherwise be funded from the Trust Fund.

The aviation statutes permit great flexibility in the permissible uses of funds (see question 2, infra). Therefore, if the Congress adopted an otherwise valid funding limitation on any aviation project or activity, then the aviation statutes permit sufficient flexibility such that the funds that would otherwise have been obligated on that project could be obligated on another project. As a result, a project limitation amendment would not ''cause total budget resources'' to be below the level specified by subsection (a)(1)(A) and would not be subject to the point of order in subsection (c)(1).

However, it is possible that a limitation amendment could be offered to an appropriations bill that would trigger the point of order. For example, a limitation amendment to reduce funding for aviation investment programs below the guaranteed levels would be subject to a point of order.

It is intended that these points of order will be triggered when action is taken that would cause the total budgetary resources that have been or will be made available from the Trust Fund or for capital programs to be less than the amounts specified in AIR 21. With respect to the point of order in section (c)(1), the intent of the word ''cause'' is that this point of order should lie against any specified legislative action (or proposal) that would have the direct or indirect effect of reducing the amount that has been or will be made available to be obligated from the Trust Fund below the level specified in subsection (a)(1)(A). A similar analysis would be used for the point of order in section (c)(2).

2. Is there statutory discretion for the FAA to reprogram funds in the event of an amendment that limits funds for the project? If so, where is the statutory discretion?

Yes, the FAA has statutory discretion to reprogram funds to other projects. Sections 48101 and 44502 of title 49 provide a broad authorization for the use of Facilities and Equipment funds. If such funds are prohibited from being used for a certain project, then the FAA may use those funds for a variety of other authorized purposes within the Facilities and Equipment program. Sections 48103 and 47104 of title 49 provide a similarly broad authorization for the use of Airport Improvement Program (AIP) funds. In addition, section 47117(f) (as redesignated by section 104(g) of AIR 21), permits any amount of obligation authority that cannot be used by the airport sponsor to which it has been apportioned to be used instead for other airport development projects through the AIP discretionary grant program.

3. How is the Chair to interpret the language in section 106 of the Conference report with respect to a supplemental appropriations bill or a continuing resolution?

The points of order in section 106 apply to any bill, joint resolution or conference report. They make no exception for supplemental appropriations bills or continuing resolutions.

Section 106 would apply to a supplemental appropriations bill, but would only be incurred if that bill would either cause total budgetary resources out of the Aviation Trust Fund to fall below that year's estimated taxes plus interest, or if the sum of the appropriations for the capital programs fell below the levels set forth in AIR 21.

With respect to a continuing resolution, the points of order in section 106 are intended to ensure that the amounts intended to be made available for a fiscal year are in fact made available. Therefore, if a continuing resolution is adopted making short-term funding available for FAA programs, it is not expected that any points of order in Section 106 would be at issue. However, if a continuing resolution were to attempt to undermine the funding guarantees in AIR 21, then the points of order in section 106 would be at issue.

4. How is the Chair to interpret section 106 with respect to an across-the-board cut?

The points of order in Section 106 would apply to any bill making an across-the-board cut if it would undermine the funding guarantees in AIR 21.

5. What calculations would the Chair have to undertake in determining whether the point of order applies to a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion or conference report?

In a bill making general appropriations for transportation programs, the Chair would need to make a series of simple calculations to determine whether either or both points of order apply.

For the point of order in subsection (c)(1), the Chair would first need to determine the amount of total budget resources being made available. Subsection (b)(1) defines the term ''total budget resources'' and these headings are easily identifiable in each appropriations bill. Obviously, any amounts would need to be netted against any provisions which reduce the amounts made available in the bill.

After the Chair determines the amount of total budget resources being made available, he would need to compare it to the level of receipts plus interest for that year. Subsection (b)(2) defines the term ''level of receipts plus interest'' to mean the level of excise taxes and interest estimated to be credited to the Trust Fund in the President's Budget baseline projections for that year.

In general, for the point of order in subsection (c)(2), the Chair will need to determine whether the sum total of budget resources for Facilities and Equipment and Grants-in-Aid for Airports provided in that same, or previous measures, for that fiscal year is at least equal to the sum of the authorized levels for those programs for that fiscal year. The authorized levels for Facilities and Equipment and Grants-in-Aid for Airports are found in sections 48101 and 48103, respectively, of title 49, United States Code.

6. To what extent should the Chair rely on estimates from outside entities? (e.g. Budget Committee, CBO, OMB)

For the routine evaluation of the points of order, the Chair would rely on estimates from all appropriate entities. To the extent a dispute arises over the level of receipts and interest in the President's Budget, it is intended that the Chair be advised of amounts and levels by the Congressional Budget Office.

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS FROM CHAIRMAN DREIER AND RANKING MEMBER MOAKLEY

1. The first point is the question #1, where you mention ''direct and indirect effect of reducing the amount that has been or will be made available to be obligated from the Trust fund . . .''. Please elaborate on what you mean by an indirect effect? Are you talking about an indirect effect that is based in aviation funding (such as an FTE amendment) or do you mean an indirect effect based on more general discretionary spending?

2. The second point is in question #3, where you state how the point of order would apply to a continuing resolution. you seem to state that a short term continuing resolution would not be affected by the section 106 points of order. Short term C.R.s are meant to be a noncontroversial band-aid so Congress can work on the larger appropriation bills. However, your last sentence in your response to question #3 states that if a C.R. ''were to attempt to undermine the funding guarantees in AIR 21, then the points of order in section 106 would be at issue.'' Would our typical short term C.R. ''undermine funding guarantees,'' or do you mean the long term, year-long C.R.s?

RESPONSES TO FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS FROM CHAIRMAN SHUSTER AND RANKING MEMBER OBERSTAR

Follow up to Question #1

We believe that the point of order would be triggered by any action that would directly or indirectly cause budget resources to be less than set forth in AIR 21. We mean indirect to refer to any action that might be taken which would undermine the funding guarantee. There are many ingenious ways that could be devised to undermine the funding guarantee, and we want the point of order to apply to any action which would accomplish this.

For example, an amendment which would have the effect of deeming an operations account activity to be a facilities and equipment account activity would be an indirect way of undermining the guarantee.

Follow-up to Question #3

Technically, the points of order in Section 106 of AIR 21 apply to any continuing resolution funding FAA programs. In the circumstance of the typical short-term continuing resolution making appropriations for days or a few weeks at the start of a fiscal year while Congress completed its work, we would not raise, nor would we object to a rule waiving the points of order. In the case of a longer continuing resolution, we would have to evaluate them on a case-by-case basis. As we have stated, the intent of the points of order is to prevent undermining the funding guarantees in AIR 21. We would look at any longer CR to determine if it would in practice undermine the funding guarantees.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me this 30 minutes and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution waives all points of order against the conference report and its consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I support the underlying bill and want to praise the chairman and the ranking member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, as well as the chairman and the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Aviation, for the extraordinary work that they have done to ensure that America's aviation system will remain safe and competitive as we enter the 21st century.

Generations of taxpayers have spent millions of dollars ensuring that our aviation system is the envy of the world, but that superiority is by no means certain unless we act.

Many communities now find themselves cut off from the booming economy as a result of the inability to move their goods and services where they need to go. This problem has enormous economic implications for certain regions of the country, including my own. I have said it before and I will say it again, that economic development cannot occur without affordable, accessible air transportation.

My district of Rochester, New York, and, of course, my great interest in Buffalo is the largest per capita exporting city in the United States and last year 1.2 million people flew out of our airport.

My district, Rochester, contains Fortune 500 companies such as Eastman Kodak, Xerox Corporation, Johnson & Johnson, and Bausch and Lomb. Of equal importance are the hundreds of small and mid-sized high technology firms that have been growing in our region over the past several years. These companies are now critical to the lifeblood of our community, but many firms are either moving out or choosing to expand in other regions of the country due to exorbitant airfares and the inability to get a decent flight schedule.

A relatively young and growing Rochester-based firm recently wrote to me that high airfares to and from Rochester are the primary reason that it froze professional positions in its local office and opted instead to expand its mid-Atlantic offices.

□ 1030

Trends like this can and do enormous damage to any community. Rochester is like many mid-sized communities that somehow got left out of the benefits promised by deregulation. To be blunt, deregulation failed us. During the 1960s, 13 air carriers served our region, affording consumers choices and creating a competitive environment and produced reasonable fares. Now there is one dominant carrier, four additional carriers and a few very small ones that effectively serve our region, and my constituents pay some of the highest air fares in the country.

Major airline carriers have clipped the wings of any start-up carrier, and while more than one carrier may service our region, they do not compete among themselves on most routes. The result has been the creation of a de facto monopoly on individual routes that are gouging business people and consumers when they fly. For example, Mr. Speaker, one can fly from Rochester to Chicago round trip for $1,200 to the penny on any airline serving Rochester that will take you there.

Congress can and must level the playing field for start-up carriers so that they can compete with the major carriers. Low-cost airlines formed after deregulation are the primary source of price competition in other areas of the country, and Rochester is a prime example of what happens without this pressure.

Two years ago I pledged to my constituents to confront this problem head on in the Congress. I authored legislation and called on the Department of Transportation and the Department of Justice to get tough on the predatory behavior of major carriers. I have testified numerous times before my House and Senate colleagues and conducted hearings in Rochester with Secretary of Transportation Rodney Slater.

As we are here today, the Department of Justice has launched a full-blown antitrust investigation into the behavior of the major carriers. The Department of Transportation for the first time in 20 years is looking at measures to prevent anticompetitive behavior. Thirty-six States' Attorneys General are pressing their State courts into action, and comprehensive legislation before us today will provide additional airport capacity and help to improve large and small airports to ensure that we have fair competition.

Moreover, a new start-up airline, JetBlue, will be serving Rochester in the coming year. I was pleased to be in Buffalo for their inaugural flight to New York City, and I was also pleased to help ensure JetBlue's access to the slot-controlled John F. Kennedy Airport in New York City and look forward to the relief their flights will provide in our community.

Let me speak a moment about the slot issue, although this has been alleviated in this report. Slots refer to the landing and take-off rights for each flight. The slot provisions included in the underlying bill are critical to this debate, and I am delighted that the measure begins to undo the damage created by the current system.

Currently, major carriers have a stranglehold on these slots, effectively preventing low-cost carriers from entering the market. In the 18 years since airline deregulation, major airlines have increased their grip on access to slots at major airports. The four slot-controlled airports in the country, LaGuardia and Kennedy Airports in New York, O'Hare in Chicago and National Airport near Washington, the dominant airlines use their control of slots to squeeze out the smaller carriers and consumers are being crushed in the process.

When these slots were first distributed, DOT made clear to the airlines the slots were government property owned by the American people. The government reserved the right to reclaim them at a future date to promote fair competition. With the growing move by large airlines to consolidate slots, this action is long overdue, and I am delighted to see it in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, again, I want to commend the chairman and ranking member of both the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and the Subcommittee on Aviation for their extraordinary work and for standing firm in the conference on our behalf. I will not call for a recorded vote. I urge my colleagues to support the legislation that the resolution makes in order.

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

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE).

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

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) for deferring to me because I have to be in a markup. I really appreciate the courtesy.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot support this conference report, as my friend from Pennsylvania knows. My concerns about this bill are the same as those I have expressed for many years. I believe this bill will increase safety hazards for those flying into O'Hare and for my constituents who live under O'Hare's increasingly congested flight paths. I believe this will help create massive gridlock and delays at O'Hare and across the Nation.

Compressing more aircraft operations into the extremely limited capacity at O'Hare compromises safety and poses a significant risk of an air tragedy. I do not now dispute the fact that demand has grown. However, this demand has outgrown the capacity of O'Hare to safely handle this growth.

We know that at current levels of operations, we are shoehorning too many flights into O'Hare, creating recurrent near misses and near catastrophes at an overloaded airport. To paraphrase one senior pilot, ''O'Hare is an accident waiting to happen.''

Adding more flights will only increase the already unacceptable safety hazards at O'Hare. The only way to shoehorn more flights into the airport is to increase the operations frequency in bad, low visibility weather, typically by squeezing the operations closer together in time and space; that is, reducing separation distances between aircraft, converging triple arrivals in fog and rain. Murphy's law tells us that it is only a matter of time before this increased jamming of flights results in a disaster.

The only way to safely address the Chicago metro region's critical capacity shortfall is to build a third airport. A third airport is the only safe, sound and effective response of the public's need for more flights.

To those who argue that lifting of the slot rule will increase competition, I challenge you to show the specific facts that demonstrate that lifting the slot rule will actually increase competition. We have had a slot exemption on the books since 1994 to allow new competition at O'Hare, 6 years, yet the overwhelming majority of added flights under this exemption have gone to the affiliates of two major airlines.

So, if you want to increase competition, why not do it in the safest, and I emphasize safest, most logical effective way possible. The answer to effectively creating real time competition in the Chicago region is a new regional airport of sufficient size to allow new entrants to come in with a critical mass of flight operations. That means the capacity to grow and accommodate thousands of flights daily, capacity that can only be obtained at a new metro Chicago airport.

Mark my words: Congress' action in lifting the slots will create an air traffic logjam of nightmare dimensions at O'Hare. We all know O'Hare already has a national reputation for delays. Thousands of stranded travelers frequently sleep overnight on temporary army cots at ''Camp O'Hare.'' Yet Congress' action in lifting the slot limits will cause these already intolerable delays to skyrocket, not only for passengers on new flights, but for passengers on all the flights into and out of O'Hare.

Mr. Speaker, there will come a day when the chickens come home to roost on the failures in this bill. It is my fondest wish that I will not have to be the one standing in this House in the wake of a major catastrophe at O'Hare to tell my colleagues ''I told you so.''

Another unfortunate aspect of this bill is it is a tax increase. It raises the passenger facility charge on each ticket from $3 to $4.50. So those of you that campaign as tax slashers, ax the taxes, had better explain this to your folks, because this is a tax increase.

O'Hare field will have flight increases in the year 2002 while LaGuardia's increases do not occur until 2007. I cannot explain this differential. I can only speculate.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to reply to a few of the statements made by my colleague the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE).

First of all, in regards to the safety at O'Hare airport, the high density rule was never put in place because of safety, it was put in place for other reasons. About 6 or 7 months ago at a public hearing I had the Secretary of Transportation and also the head of the FAA, and I asked them about safety concerns at O'Hare airport. Both of them made mention of the fact that the high density rule was never put in place for any kind of safety rules whatsoever, it was put in place for other reasons. They had both recommended that the high density rule be removed at O'Hare airport. I asked them if removing the high density rule in the year 2000 would create any safety problems. Both of them testified, absolutely not.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), who has opposed the lifting of the high density rule, was successful in having us move the date from 2000 back to 2002. There was a slow phase-in period at O'Hare airport from 2000 to 2002, and we can thank the lobbying by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) on behalf of that for that being in the bill.

The gentleman mentioned the increase in the passenger facility charge going from $3 to $4.50. We on the Federal level simply give the local airport authorities the ability to increase this passenger facility charge. We do not impose a new tax upon the flying public. But this increase in the PFC really will aid and assist the residents around O'Hare airport more than anyone else because it will enable us to soundproof more homes, more schools, more churches around O'Hare airport.

Also the lifting of the high density rule will allow us to put more flights into O'Hare airport when people are not sleeping. At the present time, because of the high density rule, many flights have been scheduled during the night hours and the early morning hours. Lifting the high density rule will spread the flights out more during the course of the daytime operation of O'Hare airport, thereby giving the sleeping quality around O'Hare a considerable increase.

So I understand the objections of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), but I think if you look at it in the short run and the long run, it is not only good for competition, it is really good for all the residents around O'Hare Airport.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, the House passed AIR 21 by an overwhelming vote of 316 to 110. Then we went to conference with the Senate, and the Senate had several significant objections to the bill. For several months we negotiated in good faith.

As a result of that negotiation, the very leaders of the Senate who were opposed when we went into the conference, and I refer specifically to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, Senator STEVENS, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Budget, Senator DOMENICI, the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Transportation Subcommittee, Senator SHELBY, the leaders in opposition as a result of our negotiating and compromising in good faith, have all become vigorous supporters of this legislation, and, indeed, cast their vote last week in the Senate for this legislation. Indeed, the vote in the Senate was an overwhelming 82 to 17.

But we did have to compromise. We had to compromise, and, as Henry Clay said many years ago, compromise is honorable, because in compromise, while you always give up something, you get something in return.

This legislation, with the overwhelming support it now has, does several things. First, we guarantee that the budget resources provided each year for the Aviation Trust Fund will equal this year's estimated receipts and interest. In other words, we unlock the Aviation Trust Fund, and, of course, without any tax increase.

Second, we guaranteed that the capital accounts, facilities and equipment,

and the grants in aid to airports, will be fully funded each year from the trust fund. Now, this carries out the intent of Congress in establishing the trust fund, that the capital needs be met before the trust fund revenue can be used for operating accounts.

Third, the program has been structured in a way to ensure a significant general fund contribution, although the exact amount of that contribution will be left up to the Committee on Appropriations. This was an area of significant compromise.

□ 1045

The House did not achieve our guaranteed general fund contribution that we wanted; but in another way, we created a mechanism by which general fund money can be available.

Fourth, the conference report contains strong and enforceable mechanisms to ensure that the funding guarantees are honored. Again, this was an area of compromise. The House dropped its insistence on off-budget or firewalls and agreed to use points of order as an enforcement mechanism.

Now, this agreement to use points of order was predicated on the commitment of the House leadership not to waive those points of order in situations where the guarantees would be undermined. In a March 8 letter to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the chairman of the Committee on Rules, the Speaker of the House wrote, ''I support these funding guarantees. I will oppose efforts to undermine these guarantees during the full term of the bill. If such an effort were to occur, I would oppose waiving any points of order enforcing the funding guarantees. The House-passed position on this matter was off-budget status for the aviation trust fund. In agreeing to the conference report, the House conferees made significant procedural concessions to the Senate premised on my assurance that as Speaker, I would oppose efforts to waive the section 106 points of order against any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion or conference report, or amendment thereto. I am determined to follow through on this commitment, and I know I can count on the support of the Committee on Rules.''

In response, in reply to the Speaker's letter, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) indicated his full support for the Speaker's position. He stated, and I quote, ''In recognition of the fact that section 106(C)(3) was removed from the conference report, you can count on my full support for your position.''

While the funding guarantees and the enforcement mechanisms should in and of themselves provide sufficient assurance that the increased aviation funding called for in AIR 21 will materialize, our overall agreement on the conference report provided additional assurances. Both the House and Senate leadership have agreed to ensure that the fiscal year 2001 budget resolution fully fund AIR 21, both trust fund and general fund, for the full term of the bill, while not reducing funding for other transportation function 400 programs.

This ensures that the Committee on Appropriations will receive an allocation sufficient to fund aviation in fiscal year 2001 at about $12.7, $2.7 billion over the enacted fiscal year 2000 levels.

In closing, let me thank the chairman of the Committee on Rules and our leadership for this strong support. I understand the Speaker, once again, along with the majority leader, will be vigorously supporting this legislation.

Let me say to my good friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), he is absolutely right. There would be safety problems at O'Hare, but those safety problems would exist if this bill does not pass. It is the passage of this bill which provides for increased safety for O'Hare through modernization of the air traffic control system; and indeed, for that reason, the bill should be passed. It helps O'Hare; and indeed, there is no tax increase in this bill. What we do, particularly those of us who are conservative Republicans like my good friend, the gentleman from Illinois, we turn back to the local authorities, the local elected officials, the local airport authorities. It is their decision to decide whether or not there should be an increase in passenger facility charges. That is good conservative orthodoxy, and it is one more reason why this legislation should be passed.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have the opportunity to speak in favor of the AIR 21 conference report today. I want to commend the leadership of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure; the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR); the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN); and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) for driving this through the hurdles and the barriers. They have done a tremendous job, I believe.

As a Member of Congress from New Jersey and a frequent flyer, I am often reminded of the shortfalls in our Nation's aviation infrastructure. There are many days when I spend far more time on the tarmac at Newark International Airport than in the air. Despite the hard work and the immense effort of the men and women who work there, every year Newark Airport is one of the worst airports in the Nation in delays. This long-standing problem with delays can only be solved with airport improvements and investment.

For people like me who use Newark International Airport, these new funds translate into other tangible improvements. For example, new airport improvement program funds can be used to improve Newark's existing runways and make improvements that will reduce delays. More funding for the facilities and equipment program will mean improved air traffic control equipment for a facility in desperate need of a new tower.

Additionally, about $3.8 billion will be provided for hub airports like Newark, which will allow it to acquire new radar like the ASDE–3 radar due to come on-line soon. Increased funding also translates to more noise abatement projects.

When it comes to addressing the priorities of America's airports, air noise has long taken a back seat behind infrastructure and technology concerns. We must move methodically on this complex issue. But to the human beings who live near airports, this matter could not be more important. I am talking about the quality-of-life issues near airports. It is time to make it a priority.

Most importantly, increasing the budget of the FAA operations will allow the agency to more efficiently design and implement important airspace-critical initiatives. That is why the National Airspace Redesign must be made a national priority.

Mr. Speaker, I implore the House not to move expeditiously on the subject of airport noise while we are trying to redesign the system. This is what makes sense. This is the safe way to go.

Completion and implementation of the redesign of the entire air traffic control system will result in fewer delays and fewer headaches for those on the ground. Having begun in New Jersey and Newark, the comprehensive airspace redesign is essential to Newark and its surrounding airports.

That is why I have offered the amendment to the House report that expresses the sense of the Congress that the administrator of the Federal Aviation Authority should complete and begin implementation of a comprehensive national airspace redesign as soon as practicable. This amendment has been included in the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all to vote in favor of this conference report. We owe it to our constituents who must deal with air noise traffic daily, day in and day out.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I want to start out by commending the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the ranking member of the committee, the two most effective combination leaders in the House. I know why the gentleman from Pennsylvania is: he is a Pitt grad. I cannot figure out what the secret of the gentleman from Minnesota is yet.

I want to commend the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN), my very good friend, and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI), who has done a great job.

I am here for a little promotion, and I am here to talk about some business. This is good for America. The chairman has finally opened up some money. I pushed hard for general aviation because I have a small airport, and I want to get money for my district.

Second of all, I have now developed the longest runway between Newark and Chicago, Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Canada, and Louisville, Kentucky that has hardly no commercial flight. I am open for a cargo hub. I beat the hell out of Japan and China, and if my colleagues want me to stop doing that, give me a call. I want them to drop their cargo off in Youngstown.

Now, to my business. According to the Flight Safety Foundation, the number one cause of airplane disasters is situational awareness. Pilots do not know where they are. The Traficant amendment, which I thank my colleagues for including, includes the study and the utilization of a new technology called Enhanced Visual Laser Guidance Systems.

Now, I say to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON), here is how it works. The pilot is 20 miles out, he sees a red light blinking, he is too far right. He sees a green light blinking, he is too far left. He goes to where he sees the amber light, he goes right at it, and he lands in the same spot every time if it is zero density, no visibility.

Now I want to talk about the disastrous deaths of the people on that Arkansas flight. I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, this is the testimony: the pilot said he approached in dense fog. He circled towards the runway. At the last minute, he visually saw the runway and made that split second decision that he believed he could land his craft safely. He misjudged and made a bad decision. The plane landed long, which meant he landed further on the runway than he normally would have had he had visibility. But second of all, he hit a light stanchion, the light stanchion destroying the plane, bursting into flames, all died.

The Traficant amendment says it costs nothing to put it on an airplane. It is put in each airport. If it is deadbang fog, the pilot will see that runway, and there is no need for light stanchions. The cold cathode lights do not reflect and the lights can even be seen.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the Pitt graduate, for accepting my language; and I thank the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), although he did not listen to my speech. I am still trying to figure out how he is so effective with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER).

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. BALDACCI).

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding me this time. I also would like to congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the chairman of the committee; the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the ranking member; and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN), the subcommittee chairman; and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI), the ranking member.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Aviation, this has been one of the most important issues for us to address, especially in Maine. Deregulation of the airlines has benefited many America communities; but in many places it has created some challenges, no more so than in Bangor, Maine, where we were fortunate enough to hold a Subcommittee on Aviation hearing with the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) and the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS) and other Members that were there to listen to the testimony of Bangor International Airport and listen to the hardships the communities have in trying to make sure not only that they get quality service but they get service to make sure that every part of America has an opportunity at quality and dependable jet service.

Bangor has been very challenged by that deregulation. The declining availability of flights has caused other problems: increased reliance on small, noisy and uncomfortable prop planes, and people are forced to drive to Manchester or Boston, far away, in order to get connective flights.

This legislation is going to be able to double the appropriations that those kinds of airports get so that they can provide the improvements to be able to draw carriers, get dependable service, and make sure that the people whom we represent get that quality service and dependable service, without having to make those long, arduous trips and endangering public health and safety.

This bill is going to be able to address it. It is going to be a 3-year authorization. It is going to double that appropriation that was there before, not only to the primary airports in Bangor, Presque Isle, and in Portland, but also general aviation airports. It is going to make sure that a lot of those small general aviation airports get the needed infusion of resources to do an even better job.

Also, it does reinforce the importance of the trust fund. I think our work on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure has been to resurrect those trust fund laws to make sure that the taxes, whether it is on roads, rails or air, are going into a trust fund and those resources are going back to what those taxes and fees were first assigned for. I think this does that.

I compliment the committee and the bipartisan nature of our work. I am really pleased at the work by Secretary Slater and by FAA Administrator Jane Garvey.

□ 1100

The bipartisan nature of our committee and the working partnership of it I think is truly a model for other committees in this Congress.

I compliment all of those, including the staffs of both sides who have worked so hard to bring this about, because it could not have been done without them. It may look easy, but it is a lot of hard work by an awful lot of people.

So it is critical that we maintain our focus on a balanced transportation infrastructure. I believe that this legislation does this. I encourage all Members to support this, it is badly needed, and to make sure we get this out there as soon as possible.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON).

(Mr. JACKSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today and urge a no vote on this rule. This up and coming Saturday in my congressional district, several thousand people will be marching, not only against this conference report but against the use of the passenger facility charge in the city of Chicago and in the northeastern Illinois region.

This conference report increases the passenger facility charge from $3 to $4.50. However, it fails to ensure that PFC funds earned will be used in the way Congress originally intended.

The stated purpose of the PFC act was to, and I quote, ''enhance safety * * * or capacity of the national air transportation system; reduce noise * * * from airports; and furnish opportunities for enhanced competition among or between the carriers.''

Appropriate use of PFCs has been an ongoing problem since they were instituted in 1990. The city of Chicago currently collects the $3 ticket tax to the tune of about $100 million a year, although much of this revenue stream is not being used as Congress intended, to increase capacity.

Instead, the city has used PFCs in a number of ways:

To finance a $2.2 billion cosmetic facelift at O'Hare Airport. And even without the flight restrictions offered, the lifting of those flight restrictions offered in this legislation, that $2.2 billion has not increased capacity at O'Hare Airport by one new flight;

To finance a $700 million terminal expansion at Midway Airport. The airport of the gentleman from Illinois, its longest runway is 6,446 feet, and therefore, no Series V or VI airplanes will ever land there. The $700 million at his airport for terminal expansion will not increase the size of the aircraft that land at his airport by 1 foot.

There are future plans to use PFCs in my city to finance highways leading to O'Hare Airport. Why should passengers flying on airplanes be paying for highways with passenger facility charge dollars? Because the traffic jams getting to the airport because of the growth in the northeastern part of our city and State is all concentrated in one area, with none of it working its way south.

Rather than using Federal taxes to enhance capacity, safety, or competition, Chicago is also spending $1.7 billion to enhance existing monopolies, without creating room for even one new flight, capacity being defined using at least four factors: runway length, space between runways and taxiways, airspace, spacing between aircraft, weight and restriction of the aircraft. Absolutely none of this money in the city of Chicago is being used for runway length or runway expansion. I associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE).

So despite soaring ticket prices, service by airlines to and from O'Hare is being systematically reduced, particularly to smaller cities. Due to rising fares and reduced services, the major airlines at O'Hare Airport are posting record profits, led by whooping 63 percent earnings gained by United Airlines in the fourth quarter of last year.

That is in part because then Congressman Rostenkowski pushed legislation through which created a $3 passenger facility charge or ticket tax, no matter what they choose to call it in this Congress it is a tax, to pay for a new airport, an airport that was never built.

However, the Governors of our State, Jim Edgar and Jim Ryan, quickly proposed building a new airport in and around my congressional district, where the growth and economic impact would greatly benefit my constituents.

Instead of using the resources for a much needed purpose, these resources are going to enhance existing monopolies at existing monopolistic airports. I urge my colleagues to vote no on this rule.

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

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

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule and the conference report on AIR–21.

I would like to start by taking this opportunity to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI), and the other members of the conference committee for moving this legislation forward to ensure that our Nation's aviation system remains the finest and the safest in the world. That is our overarching objective, to maintain an aviation system that continues to be the finest and safest in the world.

AIR–21 offers a certain and responsible level of funding for aviation infrastructure funding. It also offers some good news for the environment.

I would like to draw my colleagues' attention to a provision that will, for the first time, provide Federal assistance to help airports address increasingly difficult air quality problems. I introduced legislation last year known as the Airport Air Quality Improvement Act. I am proud to say that this legislation has been incorporated into AIR–21 and is now part of the conference agreement.

My legislation is a pilot program under which the Secretary of Transportation is to issue grants to ten airports for the acquisition of low emission vehicles, equipment, and related infrastructure support. Grant selection will be targeted at airports submitting plans that will achieve the greatest pollution reductions per dollar of funds provided.

The ten airports selected would be required to match the up to $2 million Federal grant for each on a 50/50 basis. These airports will be located in areas not attaining Federal Clean Air Act standards.

Airports are now frequently the single largest source of pollution within their State or region. The operation of cars and trucks and buses and vans may account for up to 50 percent or more of airport emissions. This pilot program will promote the expanded use of natural gas and electric vehicles and equipment at our Nation's airports, helping to reduce smog-forming pollutants, greenhouse gases, and toxic air contaminants.

I am particularly pleased that this approach has not only drawn the support of our committee's bipartisan leadership, but also has been supported by groups including the National Conference of Mayors, the Union of Concerned Scientists, the Natural Gas Vehicle Coalition, the Electric Vehicle Association of the Americas, and virtually all of the major automobile manufacturers.

I would like to take a moment to acknowledge the leadership of the Natural Gas Vehicle Coalition in assembling the group of diverse interests which worked hard to make this initiative a reality. My staff and I look forward to working with the Secretary of Transportation, the FAA administrator, and their staffs toward the prompt and successful implementation of this Clean Air Act program.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to point out that AIR–21 includes another provision that I have championed to provide whistle-blower protection for both FAA and airline employees so they can reveal legitimate safety problems without fear of retaliation.

I have worked closely with my colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), over the past two congresses to ensure that aviation workers can blow the whistle on safety problems without looking over their shoulders and fearing retribution.

I am proud to see this much needed protection included in the conference agreement. AIR–21 makes sense for the flying public, it makes sense for the Nation's airports, and it makes sense for the environment. That is a winning combination. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Aviation.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Once again, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding this time to me.

I would like to address some of the issues that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON) brought up. He is very much interested in building a third airport in the Chicagoland area in order to create economic development and job creation within his congressional district, which I understand and which I appreciate.

But we do not build an airport to create economic development and cause job creation, we build an airport because we need additional capacity. Obviously, no one believes, other than a small group of people, that we need additional capacity in the Chicagoland area at the present time. Not one single carrier, passenger or freight, has been willing to go into a third airport located within the area of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. JACKSON). We all know that the carriers are the ones who really wind up footing the largest portion of the bill to create a new airport.

The gentleman talks about the misuse of the PFC. I believe this statement is totally and completely untrue. The PFC has been utilized for what it is supposed to be utilized for. Some areas of the country have tried to utilize it for other purposes. In this new AIR–21 bill, we have tightened what the PFC can be utilized for. In my own community around Midway Airport and around O'Hare Airport, it has been used extensively for noise reduction in homes, in churches, in schools.

The gentleman talks about not having competition at O'Hare Airport. At O'Hare Airport we have the two largest carriers in the world operating, American and United Airlines. They are in a fierce competition. Their competition drastically reduce prices at O'Hare Airport. They have flights from Chicago to Washington National starting at 6:30 a.m. running until 8 p.m. each and every day, every hour on the hour and every hour on the half-hour. This is terrific, terrific competition. The lifting of the high density rule will improve this competition.

And last but not least, it was not Dan Rostenkowski that pushed through the House of Representatives a PFC. The man who spearheaded it, the man who saw the wisdom in doing it, the man

that had the vision to do it, is sitting right behind me. At the time he was the chairman of the Subcommittee on Aviation. Today he is the ranking member of the full Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR). I also worked with him, but he was the man that did it. Dan Rostenkowski was busy taking care of tax matters at that time.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY).

(Mrs. KELLY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and the conference report.

Though the effort to get this rule and conference report to the floor has been a lengthy one, let there be no mistaking that our fundamental purpose here for undertaking this initiative is to ensure the safety of the traveling public.

The legislation before this body today represents a level of commitment to this purpose that is unprecedented. While safety has always been a priority while formulating aviation policy, it is clear that efforts to provide adequate resources for this intention have fallen sometimes very short, having seen firsthand the antiquated equipment many of our air traffic controllers must use in keeping our skies safe, for instance, at Stewart Airport in my district.

I cannot overstate the importance of making sure that the days of reliance on this ancient and antiquated equipment must be limited.

By ensuring a strong and viable funding source for aviation investment, this bill marks a significant stride in making safety a priority in practice, not just in rhetoric.

I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN), and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) for their leadership on this issue, and I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting the rule and the bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. JONES).

Ms. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), for yielding this time to me. I rise in support of the rule.

What does AIR–21 mean to the Eleventh Congressional District of Ohio? It is paramount to the continued service delivery of goods and services for our Nation's travelers. Further, I believe it is a step in the right direction for America.

I come from the city of Cleveland, that houses the Cleveland-Hopkins Airport. My father worked for 38 years as a skycap for United Airlines. I watched as a child the growth and expansion of Cleveland Hopkins Airport. But currently, it is unable to perform simultaneous landings because of inadequate runway space.

□ 1115

I know Cleveland is not the only city with limited runway space, and I would urge my colleagues who even represent small and medium-sized airports to support this rule and legislation. It will provide money for runways and other equipment at airports. It ensures the FAA has funding to hire and retain air traffic controllers, maintenance technicians, and safety inspectors. It authorizes funding to improve the training of airport screeners and requires cargo airlines to install collision avoidance systems on aircrafts.

This is the first comprehensive legislation we have had in recent memory that addresses many of these issues. Specifically, I am very happy that this will be the first time that explicitly racial discrimination in air travel will be prohibited. It is a long time coming, and it ought to be handled.

Furthermore, other projects that will be protected, it will protect funding for letters of intent and makes it clear that it is not necessary that an airport assess a passenger facility charge in order to get a letter of intent.

Because of the shortness of time and the number of people who would like to speak, I just urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the rule.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD).

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule on this vital piece of legislation, the conference report on AIR 21. Specifically, I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI), ranking members, for including provisions in this bill that will bring fairer treatment to families of victims involved in airline disasters on the high seas. These provisions will have a similar effect to the intent of my bill, the Airline Disaster Relief Act, which passed the House 412 to 2.

This compromise language will allow families who have lost loved ones in aviation disasters over international waters to seek more categories of compensation previously ineligible under the 1920s Death on the High Seas Act.

It specifically addresses the inequities faced by families like those in Montoursville, Pennsylvania, a town in my district who lost 22 family members in the TWA Flight 800 disaster of July 1996.

The time has come to create one level playing field and one process for airline crash claims. The current treatment of land and sea crash victims as separate and unequal must come to an end. I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) for their efforts to bring justice out of disaster.

A small part of the legacy that the victims of TWA–800 will have through the efforts of their families is that the laws of the greatest Nation on Earth will be changed for the better. With passage of this bill, no longer will a parent be told by our Nation's legal system that longitude and latitude will determine the value of their children.

I want to thank my colleagues for their compassion for the families of airline crash victims and the excellent work that they accomplished in crafting this bill.

I urge my colleagues to pass this rule and this bill. It is the just and right thing to do.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, every Member here owes appreciation to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN), and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) for today's bill.

What we are doing with this bill is to try to do with AIR 21 what we are trying to do with TEA 21. It is time to do for air what we are trying to do for surface transportation. Our committee has guaranteed the integrity of the Aviation Trust Fund and, therefore, the improvements in our airports that the American people have long awaited.

If you see large increases in this bill, such as the 50 percent increase for the FAA, it will seem less large when we consider the antiquated and obsolete nature of our traffic control system.

This bill is wonderfully comprehensive. There is not a Member here who will not be affected, because the reach is to small and large jurisdictions alike.

There has been increasing pressure on large hubs and airports. Members are aware of the pressure at National, Dulles, and Baltimore because they use these airports themselves and feel that pressure. Two measures directly affect these airports.

I do regret that the slots at National, an already overburdened airport, were raised to 24. I am pleased and very grateful that our committee tried to keep them to six, because this is a greatly overtaxed airport, surrounded by residences and businesses.

I want to thank our conferees for resisting the proposal of the Senate, the other body, for 48 slots. So, it is now only 24 slots. As much as I regret that number, I know the kind of fight our conferees had to make in order to get only 24.

I certainly want to say how grateful I am that the committee has eliminated the requirement that Federal appointees to the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority here in this region, be confirmed before receiving any Federal money or proceeding with new facilities. The Members have seen what that has meant in delays to reviving these airports, particularly National and Dulles. It has been very painful for all concerned.

We have made it easier for millions of Americans who use these airports and for Members themselves, by allowing this airport region to operate as other airports do. I very much appreciate the work of the committee and of the conferees in particular.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining on both sides of the aisle.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). The gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) has 6 minutes remaining. All time has expired for the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER).

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

Mr. Speaker, to close, this bill not only accomplishes a great deal on behalf of competition, growth, and safety in America's aviation system, it is a product of deliberation and consensus, reflecting both the complexities and agreement of the two Houses of this Congress as well as the Executive Branch.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying bill.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 438, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 1000) to amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize programs of the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 438, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of March 8, 2000, at page H649.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) each will control 30 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that both the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) support the conference report. If that is the case, then under rule XXII, I ask that I be assigned one-third of the time in opposition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) supports the conference report. Does the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) also support the conference report?

Mr. OBERSTAR. Yes, I do, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under clause 8(d)(2) of rule XXII, one-third of the time will be allotted to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) in opposition.

Each of the three gentlemen will control 20 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this conference report. The greatest aviation system in the world is hurdling toward gridlock and potential catastrophes in our skies, and this bill will make those skies safer, reduce flight delays, and increase competition by modernizing our air traffic control system and improving our airports.

But we would not be here today but for the tremendous bipartisan support in this House and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI), and the unanimous support of our committee as AIR 21 worked its way through the House and passed overwhelmingly 316 to 110.

When we went to the Senate, we found that there was very strong opposition by some to certain provisions of our legislation. Indeed, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, Senator STEVENS, opposed it; the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Budget, Senator DOMENICI, opposed it; and the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Transportation Subcommittee, Senator SHELBY, opposed it.

Because of their strong opposition, we negotiated in good faith, and we negotiated to remove and change the provisions that the appropriators found objectionable. As a result of that, I am so pleased to report that those very Senators who started out in opposition to the House bill, because of our compromises, ended up vigorously supporting the bill.

So I am a bit mystified, I must admit, that we still seem to have some opposition from appropriators in the House after the negotiations we conducted with the leading appropriators in the Senate and got their strong support. They voted for the bill as well as the chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

I also would be remiss if I certainly did not mention the strong support of both the majority leader and the minority leader in the Senate as well as Senator GORTON, Senator ROCKEFELLER, Senator HOLLINGS, and Senator WARNER, recognizing some of the problems we have here locally with the Reagan National Airport. So as a result of negotiation and good faith, these very Members who started out in opposition came around to support this bill.

By unlocking the Aviation Trust Fund, this conference report provides $40 billion over the next 3 years for aviation investment programs, $33 billion of which is from the trust fund, and $7 billion from the general fund. As a result, funding for airport improvement will increase by more than 50 percent without any tax increase. This will allow allocations for commercial passenger airports, and cargo airports to double. This money can be used to improve safety and increase capacity, leading to more air service and lower fares.

I also want to emphasize with regard to the problem we had on slots, again, we compromised in good faith. In Chicago, we delayed the increase in slots, and not only did so, but also provided for more capability for small airports to be able to have access to O'Hare.

In Washington, Reagan Airport, where the Senate was proposing 48 more slots, we cut it in half to 24. This could allow a growing airport, like Bloomington, Illinois, to obtain nonstop service to Reagan National and western hubs, like Salt Lake City, to obtain nonstop service there. So we acted in good faith there. We also sat down and, indeed, in my office met with Members of the New York delegation and worked out a compromise there.

So while this bill is not everything we would like it to be, it is not everything that passed this House overwhelmingly, it is indeed a compromise, a compromise which has extraordinary bipartisan support.

For the first time, general aviation airports will receive their own individual allocations. The bill also increases funding for air traffic control modernization by almost 50 percent. This money will be used to buy radar, computers, and other navigation equipment that is needed to ensure a safe and expeditious flight.

Indeed, beyond the money that is so badly needed, we provide fundamental reform in this bill. We create for the first time a chief operating office of the air traffic control system. We provide a five-member oversight board to oversee air traffic control.

So the reform provisions in this bill are very important, along with the increased investment required to modernize and take care of the extraordinary expansion which we see. We have gone from 230 million passengers a year flying before deregulation, 600 million last year, 665 million this year, and over a billion passengers flying commercially in America by the end of this decade. That does not even touch upon the extraordinary growth in cargo, which is projected to more than double, having already increased by 74 percent over the past 10 years.

□ 1130

The bill also gives State and local governments the flexibility and the

discretion to increase passenger facility charges by up to $1.50. And, again, this is a compromise. The House said $3; the Senate said zero. We arrived at this enormously complicated scientific compromise of $1.50.

It is important to emphasize particularly to my fiscally conservative, like-minded colleagues that this is conservative orthodoxy. We are returning to local government, to locally elected airport authorities, this decision. It is not a decision being made here in Washington. It is one that lets them make that decision. Beyond that, these standards should allow the FAA to process PFC applications expeditiously without first undertaking a lengthy rulemaking.

But this bill, as I have emphasized, is more than money. It deals with modernization and reform. And while we phase out the slots, as I have already mentioned, we do it in a way that takes into consideration, in a compromise, the interests of the New York delegation, the Illinois delegation, and the Virginia delegation. And so, indeed, in that respect, it is as well a compromise.

In addition, the important safety initiatives in this bill are of great importance, requiring the installation of collision avoidance devices on cargo aircraft, installing emergency locator devices on small jet aircraft, penalties for the use of bogus parts, whistleblower protection for the airline and FAA employees.

In the negotiation on the most contentious budgetary issues, which we finally worked out and now have the vigorous support of both the budget and the appropriators in the Senate on, the key elements of that compromise are as follows: there is a strong and enforceable guarantee that the budget resources provided each year from the airport and airway trust fund will equal that year's trust fund receipts and interest, as estimated by the President's budget. In other words, the Aviation Trust Fund is unlocked, just as we did with the highway trust fund. We now put the trust back in the trust fund.

There is a strong and enforceable guarantee that the capital accounts, the facilities and equipment and AIP, will be fully funded each year from the trust fund. This carries out the original intent of the Congress in establishing the trust fund, that capital needs be met before trust fund revenue can be used for operating accounts.

Now, there is no guaranteed general fund contribution. We gave in on this point. Thus, the FAA will have to compete with other agencies for its operating budget requirements. However, the program has been structured in a way that will result in a significant general fund contribution each year, although the exact amount will be determined by the appropriation committees, not by us.

The House dropped its insistence on off-budget or fire walls, even though those provisions passed this House overwhelmingly 316 to 110. In a good compromise effort we dropped it and agreed to use points of order to enforce the guarantees. The House Republican leadership has promised not to waive these points of order, and I entered their statements in the record during the debate on the rule.

The Committee on Appropriations will retain full control and oversight over the appropriated accounts and will be able to shift funds between the capital accounts. I am pleased that both the Senate and House leadership have agreed to ensure that the fiscal 2001 budget resolution fully funds the AIR 21 trust fund and general fund for the full term of the bill. This means that there will be no reduction in funding for Coast Guard or Amtrak. While this result is not all that the House wanted, it is a fair compromise and one that the chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget and Committee on Appropriations also support.

Indeed, I am again reminded of the great Henry Clay's statement that honorable compromise is the way to get things done. Everybody loses something, but everybody gains something as well; and that is what we bring here today.

And, finally, I take great pride in the fact that this is a totally bipartisan bill. When AIR 21 passed the House by an extraordinary vote, both the Speaker, the majority leader and the minority leader voted for it. I can again report today that the Speaker and the majority leader on our side vigorously support this bill. It is an example of strong bipartisan support to do what is right for the American people.

I urge a ''yes'' vote on the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, to the weary air traveler who is spending more time sitting in airports rather than flying on airplanes, help is on the way. At last, our aviation system is going to get the help it needs. With AIR 21, the money the traveling public pays in ticket taxes will finally be dedicated solely to improving the safety and efficiency of our aviation system. This legislation will make our skies safer, modernize air traffic control, reduce flight delays, and boost airline competition. This legislation will revitalize our overburdened aviation system.

The Wendell H. Ford Aviation Investment and Reform Act for the 21st Century (AIR 21) is a three-year bill that will increase aviation investment by $10 billion over current levels, with the lion's share of the funding going to radar modernization and much-needed airport construction projects. The total authorized funding for federal aviation programs for 2001–2003 will be $40 billion over the next three years, $33 billion of which will be guaranteed from the trust fund, while $6.7 billion will be available to be appropriated from the general fund.

AIR 21 will benefit all sectors of the airport and airway system.

AIR 21 WILL MAKE OUR SKIES SAFER

Increases the FAA's facilities & equipment budget by almost 50 percent so that the agency can modernize our antiquated air traffic control system;

Increases investment for runways and other equipment at airports that will enhance safety;

Provides the FAA sufficient funding to hire and retain the air traffic controllers, maintenance technicians, and safety inspectors necessary for the safety of the aviation system;

Creates a cost-sharing program for airports and airlines to purchase air traffic control equipment;

Authorizes funding to improve the training of airport screeners;

Makes runway incursion prevention devices and wind shear detection devices eligible for AIP funding;

Requires cargo airlines to install collision avoidance systems on their aircraft;

Provides whistleblower protection for both the FAA and airline employees so they can reveal legitimate safety problems without fear of retaliation;

Ensures that funding is available to raise safety standards at small airports.

AIR 21 IMPROVES COMPETITION

Provides substantially more money to build terminals, gates, taxiways, and other infrastructure to stimulate competition at airports;

Increases access and competition to Chicago O'Hare by abolishing slots in 2002;

Increases access and competition to New York LaGuardia and Kennedy airports by abolishing slots in 2007;

Creates 24 new slots at Washington Reagan National Airport. Twelve of the new slots may be used for flights within the 1,250 mile perimeter; 12 may be used for flights outside of the perimeter.

AIR 21 PRESERVES THE ENVIRONMENT

Increases funding for noise abatement projects;

Streamlines environmental laws;

Establishes guidelines for air tours over our national parks.

AIR 21 HELPS SMALL COMMUNITIES

Increases funding for non-hub airports from $500 thousand to $1.0 million per year;

For the first time, funds general aviation airports;

Doubles the small airport fund;

Creates a new discretionary set-aside for reliever airports;

Authorizes a contract tower cost-sharing program so that small airports can get the benefits of air traffic control services;

Creates an incentive program to help airlines buy regional jets if they agree to use them to serve small airports;

Creates a new funding program to help small, under-served airports market and promote their air service;

Phases out slot restrictions to provide smaller communities better access to New York and Chicago.

AIR 21 IMPROVES LARGE AIRPORTS

Doubles the amount of the annual passenger funding for primary airports (airports with 10,000 or more passengers per year);

Raises the cap on the amount of annual funding that a large airport can receive from $22 million to $26 million;

Doubles the funding for cargo airports;

Raises the cap on the Passenger Facility Charge (PFC) $1.50 so that an airport has the flexibility to proceed on its own with those improvement projects that cannot be funded through the Federal Airport Improvement Program. PFC's can only be used to fund airport projects that increase safety and competition or for noise abatement.

AIR 21 HELPS PASSENGERS AND PILOTS

Reforms the management of the FAA's air traffic control system by creating an oversight board similar to the one established in the recent IRS reform legislation;

Strengthen the provisions of the Aviation Disaster Family Assistance Act that was created following the Valujet and TWA 800 crashes;

Allows pilots to appeal an emergency revocation of their license to the safety board.

AIR 21 REFORMS THE FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION

Important changes are made in the management structure of the FAA to ensure that money is spent wisely.

A management board is created to oversee the air traffic control modernization program. The Secretary would be expected to consult with Congress in choosing members of this board, although formal advice and consent is not required.

AIR 21 RESTORES THE TRUST IN THE AVIATION TRUST FUND

Ensures that aviation taxes are preserved for aviation improvements.

Funds aviation capital programs at their full levels.

Results in a general fund contribution of $6.7 billion.

AIR 21 CONFERENCE AGREEMENT FUNDING LEVELS '01–'03

[Compared to FY 2000 enacted level (dollars in millions)]

	Enacted		Authorized		'01–'03 Total
	2000	2001	2002	2003	
Operations	5,893	6,592	6,886	7,357	20,835
Airport Improvement Program (AIP)[1]	1,896	3,200	3,300	3,400	9,900
Facilities and equipment	2,045	2,657	2,914	2,981	8,552
Research, engineering, & development (RE&D)[2]	156	237	249	255	741
FAA total budget resources	9,991	12,686	13,349	13,993	40,028

[1] Amount for AIP in FY 2000 is the enacted obligation limitation, as reduced by the Government-wide across-the-board cut contained in the FY 2000 Consolidated Appropriations Act. The authorized level of contract authority provided by AIR 21 for FY 2000 is $2.475 billion.

[2] RE&D is not authorized in FY 2003. Amount shown above for FY 2003 is an estimate.

The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATKINS) requested $3.9 million to strengthen the runway and taxiways at the McAlester Regional Airport in McAlester, Oklahoma.

These improvements are required for the airport to accommodate C–130 aircraft associated with activities at the defense ammunition center located in McAlester.

This is the type of project that we now expect to be constructed under the increased AIP program.

Section 132 of the conference report allows DOT to approve 20 innovative financing projects at small- or non-hub airports for the following types of projects: (1) Payment of interest, (2) Commercial bond insurance, (3) Flexible non-federal share, and (4) Use of AIP entitlement funds to service debt on an earlier terminal development project.

The fourth proviso in this section—concerning the use of entitlement dollars for terminal debt—was added to the final conference report in lieu of a similar provision (included in the original House-passed air-21 bill at Mr. MICA's request) to assist Daytona Beach International Airport in coping with it's terminal debt service.

It is therefore my view that Daytona Beach Airport is well positioned to be selected as an innovative financing project under section 132.

Mr. Speaker I would like to thank all the House conferees who made such significant contributions to our deliberations. The gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI), the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EWING), the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN), the gentleman from New York (Mr. QUINN), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. BASS), the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PEASE), the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI), the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO), the gentlewoman from Missouri (Ms. DANNER), the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD), the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL), the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS), the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS), the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE), the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL).

I would like to thank the staff who worked so hard to ensure the success of this legislative effort:

From the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Jack Schenendorf, Mike Strahn, Roger Nober, David Schaffer, Rob Chamberlin, Adam Tsao, John Glaser, Chris Bertram, Sharon Barkeloo, David Ballof, Stacie Soumbeniotis, Tricia Loveland, Colleen Corr, Michele Mihin, Kathy Guilfoy, Alex Del Pizzo, Tricia Law, Scott Brenner, and Jimmy Miller.

Former Committee Staff now with the FAA: Donna McLean, David Traynham, Paul Feldman, and Mary Walsh.

From the House Legislative Counsel: David Mendelsohn and Curt Haensel.

From the Senate: Jim Sartucci, Keith Hennesey, Mark Buse, Ann Choiniere, Mike Reynolds, Sam Whitehorn, Kerry Ates, Brett Hale, and Julia Kraus.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is nothing less than a great tribute to our chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER). He has been a warrior for keeping faith with the traveling public, whether highways, transitways or airways, and for fully investing the trust funds, the revenues that we agreed to tax people for to deposit in trust funds for surface and air transportation; to make sure that those funds are invested as intended in the compact between the traveling public and its government.

He has been a champion, and I salute him for the success he has achieved here in negotiating between the Senate and the House, the role that we together played with the administration in coming to this agreement, and to achieving this outcome that will result in significantly greater investment in aviation from those taxes derived from the traveling public.

It is also fitting that this is a tribute to former, now retired, Senator Wendell Ford. It was my great pleasure to work with Senator Ford for many years on aviation issues, during which I came to have a great appreciation for his dedication to improving air travel, capacity, safety, and security. His persistent country, down-home wisdom and his folk humor kept us always on track and on message, and he deserves the recognition of having this bill, ultimately this law, named in his honor.

Aviation is the most rapidly growing sector of our Nation's economy. It is, in fact, a $600 billion sector of our economy. It is the element that makes America a leader worldwide in technology. Every modern nation on the face of this earth, every industrialized country, every country seeking to be an industrialized nation patterns its aviation development after the United States.

They want to acquire our air traffic control technology, they want to fly to our shores, to our airports, and operate in our airspace. They want to be a partner with us, whether it is code sharing or in development of new technology or investment in airports. We are the leader. But we will not be the leader if we do not make the investments in modernizing the air traffic control system, if we do not make the investment in expansion of our airport capacity. We will not be able to handle the growth that is projected toward a billion air travelers in the U.S. airspace alone.

Today, worldwide, over a billion people travel by air, but 650 million of those travel in the U.S. airspace. That means that nearly two-thirds of all air travel in the entire world occurs in the U.S. airspace, and that is the safest airspace in the world. And it does not happen by accident. It happens because year after year the FAA does its job overseeing the airlines, the airlines do their part, and our air traffic control system maintains safety in the air and on the ground for aircraft maneuvering at airport terminals.

But we cannot expect to make those investments in expansion of airside capacity, in runways and taxiways, or in the efficiency of the air traffic control system without sustained investment, without a dedicated revenue stream; and this legislation gives us that dedicated revenue stream.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make just one comment about the high-density rule which was discussed during debate on the rule. Lifting of the high-density rule under this legislation, ultimately, in 2 years at O'Hare, will mean new

service, with new economic impact at O'Hare in the amount of over $1.3 billion. It will produce net consumer benefits of well over $630 million.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Aviation, has spent long hours crafting the language we know today as the modification of the high-density rule. And I give him great credit for his dedication, his hard work, his perception of what needs to be done and how to accommodate the concerns of airport neighbors to minimize noise impact but also maximize the capacity of this world's greatest airport, this treasure that we know as O'Hare. The gentleman deserves great credit and appreciation from all who travel through that airport and whose lives and livelihoods are dependent upon it.

Affected airlines, when the HDR is ultimately lifted, will be able to freely set schedules in cooperation with each other, with the FAA, and with the airport. Availability of gates and air traffic control flow management will act as controls on the number of flights a carrier will schedule for a particular time period. Under no circumstance will the FAA allow more departures or arrivals than controllers can safely manage. In other words, the 130 per-hour arrival and departure rule will remain in effect, but it will be managed in the interest of safety not on the basis of some other considerations.

That is extremely important. This airport must be freed from these constraints so that our national air traffic system can operate to its maximum capacity, which it will do when, ultimately, the high-density rule is lifted.

Mr. Speaker, this conference report is an important step toward restoring faith with the American people. This bill, the Wendell H. Ford Aviation Investment and Reform Act for the 21st Century (AIR 21), unlocks the aviation trust fund and ensures that we will make critical investments in our nation's transportation system and future economic growth and development.

The demand for aviation has grown dramatically over the last several decades, a trend that is expected to continue for the foreseeable future. In 1998, 656 million passengers flew commercially, twice the number that flew in 1980. Over the next ten years, this number of passengers is expected to grow to almost 1 billion a year. In addition, the air cargo market is growing faster than any other sector of the aviation industry.

It is crucial that the capacity of the U.S. aviation system keep pace with this ever growing demand and it is our job to make sure there is sufficient funding to provide for the needed capacity. Unfortunately, aviation funding levels have fallen short of late and demand is growing faster than the system can handle.

We have seen evidence of this in the increasing number of delays experienced in the last few years. In 1999, the U.S. recorded more flight delays than in any year. Delays through October 1999 were up 22.6% over 1998. Delay is costly: in 1999 alone, delay cost the airline industry and the air travelling public over $6 billion. If we don't act now and ensure adequate funding for our air traffic control system (ATC) and the nation's airports we will reach gridlock in our aviation system.

In the U.S. the General Accounting Office (GAO) has estimated the capital development needs at the country's 3,304 airports to be $10 billion annually. The current sources of funding leave an annual gap of $3 billion. Moreover, this estimate does not take into account the needs that will soon arise, such as accommodating larger aircraft; addressing airport access issues and terminal expansion; dealing with environmental problems; and providing for technological advances, such as GPS/WAAS.

Taking care of the airport needs alone will not be enough to ensure that our aviation system will be able to accommodate the growing demand. We must also make sufficient investments in our ATC system. Modernizing the ATC system is a very demanding and costly enterprise. The FAA operates over 30,000 pieces of equipment: 470 air traffic control towers, 176 terminal radar control facilities (TRACONS) and 21 enroute centers (ARTCCS). The U.S. air traffic control system is the world's most vast and complex, operating 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. It serves half the people using commercial airlines in the entire world. As I have said before, modernizing the ATC system is like rebuilding your car, while driving down the freeway at 65 miles an hour.

Modernizing our ATC system is not only important for capacity or efficiency purposes, but for safety. Currently, the U.S. ATC system is the safest in the world, but maintaining this level of safety will require continued investments. As the airspace becomes more densely populated, we will need to improve the information available to controllers and pilots. More accurate navigation and surveillance equipment combined with automation tools will increase the margin of safety for every flight. Better weather detection and prediction equipment, common situational awareness for pilots and controllers, and improved communication systems will also raise the bar of safety in our air traffic control system. We must simultaneously maintain the current systems and ensure a safe transition to new technology.

Aviation safety and efficiency also requires that the FAA has the resources to hire, train and compensate the air traffic controllers, safety and security inspectors, and maintenance technicians to ensure that the system is operated safely, 365 days a year. This year, significant reductions in the operations budget of the FAA, which affects staffing, training and travel, are making it more difficult for FAA to inspect airlines and improve aviation safety and maintain security. The FAA cannot sustain high levels of aviation safety and security with such funding uncertainties and shortfalls.

AIR 21 begins to address the needs of our aviation system. This bill will ensure that the attention and focus our interstate highway system has received over the years is extended to aviation. As DOT Secretary Slater has said: ''Aviation will be to the 21st Century, what the Interstate was to the 20th.'' As we did in the 20th Century, it is time to meet the challenges of the new Century.

AIR 21 meets four pressing challenges of our aviation system: Enhancing capacity and access at our nation's airports; accelerating the modernization of the air traffic control system; promoting competition in the airline industry; and increasing safety in the aviation system.

H.R. 1000, with its provisions on both AIP and PFC's, will help fill the need for airport development. An AIP funding level averaging over $3 billion annually, along with the ability to raise PFC's by $1.50 for projects significantly reducing congestion, safety, noise or enhancing competition, will mean that there is a balanced financing package in place to ensure that airports will be able to meet the tremendous growth in aviation over the next ten years. AIR 21 also establishes a new entitlement program for general aviation airports that will help meet the needs of smaller communities.

Modernizing the air traffic control system has been a constant struggle for the FAA. There have been successes: the Voice Switching and Control System (VSCS), the Display System Replacement (DSR), and the Host and Oceanic Computer System (HOCSR) have been put in place successfully at 20 enroute centers across this country. But too often, other programs, like Standard Terminal Automations Replacement System (STARS) and Wide Area Augmentation System (WAAS), end up being delayed and overbudget.

There is no single answer to these problems. Accordingly, H.R. 1000 proposes a number of changes to improve the acquisitions systems at the FAA. First, by providing sufficient and stable budgets, averaging around $2.8 billion a year for air traffic control equipment—a dedicated revenue stream, paid for by air travellers—managers at the FAA will be able to plan and manage programs more efficiently. Tony Broderick, former FAA Assistant Administrator for Regulation and Certification, asked the key question in this regard: ''We would never expect a business to run efficiently if the funding stream fluctuated widely, so why do we expect this of FAA managers?''

With stable funding in place, and procurement and management flexibility for FAA managers, we will ask for more of them. An air traffic control management board, created by this bill, will increase the focus on FAA acquisitions managers' performance, holding them accountable for meeting schedule and budget targets. We cannot use problems at the FAA to justify inaction. Instead, we must make the necessary reforms and the necessary investments in safety and air traffic control equipment.

AIR 21 also takes steps to extend the benefits of deregulation to more of the American

traveling public. Deregulation has saved air travelers billions of dollars over pre-deregulation pricing. However, we also know that the quality and frequency of service to some communities has declined and that some consumers—because of single carrier dominance at major hubs—pay too much.

This bill creates a program to help small and medium size communities obtain and receive better air service. Secondly, it provides that large and medium hub airports that are dominated by one or two airlines must file a competition plan before they receive AIP grants or have a PFC application approved. Airports have already begun looking at ways to enhance competition through different leasing arrangements for gates, and requiring a competition plan should accelerate that process.

H.R. 1000 also sunsets the High Density Rule at three of the four slot-controlled airports in this country. This will help increase competition at these airports. A 1995 Department of Transportation study concluded that the net benefit to consumers from lifting the HDR at these three airports would be over $700 million a year from fare reductions and improved service. The largest benefits will be at Chicago O'Hare International Airport. Furthermore, as more effective air traffic management techniques are developed and new technology introduced, these annual benefits will grow.

All of these benefits of this bill will mean nothing if we fail to address safety issues. The funding increases in the bill will mean that FAA will have the resources to hire, train and compensate the air traffic controllers, safety and security inspectors, and maintenance technicians necessary to operate the system safely on a daily basis. In addition, funding will be set aside to help small airports enhance their safety standards. Further, no airport will be permitted to impose a PFC above $3 without ensuring that their ''airside'' safety needs are being met.

AIR 21 also addresses the problem of collisions between aircraft and other vehicles on the runway surface. H.R. 1000 would authorize $3 million annually, beginning in 2001, to ensure steady, persistent effort to reduce these incidents. H.R. 1000 also includes important safety legislation to provide whistle blower protection to FAA and airline employees so they can reveal safety problems without fear of retribution. Finally, cargo airlines would be required to install collision avoidance devices by December 21, 2002.

AIR 21 is the bill that will allow you to say that you have honored the agreement with a passenger who pays that tax. With your vote, you will help ensure that the U.S. has the safest, most secure and efficient aviation system in the world as the second century of aviation begins to be seen on the horizon.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, to explain why this piece of legislation is a turkey and wrongheaded.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I want to join with the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) in paying tribute to the chairman of the committee. He certainly has shown his effectiveness in getting this bill through the process.

I suppose it is difficult in an election year for Members to vote against projects that might show up in their districts sometime between now and the election. In fact, I would say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), that I probably would like to have some of the money in my own district. But, I am hoping, for a number of reasons, that we are not going to pass the bill this year.

I would like to say this. I know that the authorizing committee sometimes wonders where I stand. I believe that the funds that go into a trust fund for a specific purpose should be protected and should be used by that trust fund only for those purposes. By the same token, I am strongly of the opinion that the trust fund or the authorizing legislation should not be able to mandate other spending. We have a difficult enough time in keeping our spending numbers down as low as we can without mandating more spending. This bill mandates certain amounts of spending.

Every time we create a new entitlement, every time we create a new mandated spending program, we are taking every Member of this Congress a little more out of the process of what the Constitution guarantees as our responsibility and our jurisdiction. That process is to make appropriations decisions for the United States Government.

This bill guarantees an appropriation of $10.5 billion for the FAA for fiscal year 2001. The bill earmarks $6.2 billion of that amount for capital programs, which are desirable, especially in election years.

□ 1145

That leaves only $4.3 billion for the FAA's operating budget. The FAA requested $6.6 billion for that appropriation. So what we are talking about here is funding for the people that, frankly, run the safety operations of the FAA.

This is an expensive bill. Over the past 3 years, we have appropriated $28 billion for the FAA. Under this bill, we could be forced to provide $40 billion. That is $12 billion more.

I know that, in the budget process, all of this spending is going to go down as Federal expenditures. They will be scored. And those revenues will, therefore, not be available to reduce the Federal debt, to provide tax relief, or to address other budget initiatives.

In fact, this bill is a tax bill. This bill increases certain airport taxes. I am not sure that this Congress wants to be on record as increasing taxes.

Next year, a new President and a new Congress would have this much less money to put into new initiatives to provide for the safety of those who use airports and who fly in our airways.

Funding for airport construction grants under this bill will rise from $1.9 billion to $3.2 billion. And if that is not enough, as I said, the bill provides additional airport taxes, which would increase spending by another $700 million a year. So airport spending is going to approximately double overnight. I am not sure how wise it is to double a budget overnight.

Now, the electronics and software companies also like this bill. And I have no problem with them. I am not opposed to them. Those who pour concrete and build buildings and runways are going to like this bill. But I am concerned about the people who actually run the system, who provide the safety, who control the airplanes, who inspect the airplanes. I am concerned that their budget has been reduced dramatically because of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I have no illusions over what is going to happen here. Because when this bill was before the House before it went to conference, there was no doubt that the House strongly supported it. But I thought it was important to make the case today that this is just one more step toward more mandated spending, one more entitlement type program that takes Congress out of the mix and requires money to be spent in ways that Congress may or may not approve.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Aviation.

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this conference report.

This is indeed an historic occasion, and I believe that we are on the brink of passing legislation that does more for small- and medium-sized communities and their airports than any other aviation bill in the history of the Congress.

In addition, this bill makes major strides towards ensuring that our aviation system remains one of the safest and most efficient in the world and it does so without any earmarked pork barrel type projects. We do this by ensuring that aviation taxes paid for by passengers and airlines on tickets and fuel will be spent for aviation purposes as they were intended.

This has been a long, hard fight. We have been without a reauthorization bill for the FAA for over 2 years. We have had no long-term guaranteed funding of critical FAA programs during that time. The AIP program has been without funding since last year.

Now, through the efforts of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER) and those of the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the ranking member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Aviation, we have guaranteed $3.3 billion of spending from this trust fund for FAA programs through 2003.

This was a team effort, Mr. Speaker, but I do not believe we would be here today without the great strong and effective leadership of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER). This bill is a real tribute to him, above everyone else.

I know that some people are concerned about the spending caps. Let me say two things about that. First, this money is desperately needed by an aging aviation infrastructure to reduce delays and allow our already stretched aviation system to catch up to the record number of passengers that traveled this past year and are predicted for the future, 656 million passengers this past year, one billion before this decade ends.

Aviation is the cornerstone of our Nation's economy. Everyone, even people who never fly, benefit from a strong aviation system.

Second, with respect to the spending caps, this bill still permits annual review and oversight of aviation programs and does not alter our current budgetary or appropriations structures. It gives the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations the flexibility they have asked for. In fact, both the chairman of the Senate budget and appropriations committees voted for this very bill.

At the present, because of the willingness of everyone to work together, this bill is more fiscally conservative than the bill that passed this House several months ago by a vote of 316–110. At the present rate of growth, 10 new airports the size of Dallas/Ft. Worth, Atlanta Hartsfield, or Chicago/O'Hare would be needed to adequately absorb the increase in air passenger traffic.

According to the Air Cargo Association, in addition to this passenger growth, air cargo volume rose 50 percent last year and is increasing at a rate of 2½ times the increases in air passenger traffic. With all this growth, aviation delays are too high now and would be much higher without a bill such as the one we have before us today.

The airlines estimate that these delays will cost them over $4 billion in the next year.

I urge strong support for this bill.

The National Civil Aviation Review Commission has predicted that if we simply maintain the status quo, our aviation system will face gridlock early in this decade.

With these increases in travel, it is likely that people who wanted to fly could not fly without increased investment in aviation infrastructure. Flights would have to be limited in the very near future.

AIR 21 will ensure that proper investment is available to fund the necessary improvements to our aviation system.

By 2003, the bill raises the level of FAA operations to over $7 billion, the Airport Improvement Program to $3.4 billion, and the Facilities and Equipment account to $2.9 billion.

The increase in AIP funding will double the entitlement dollars for primary airports, double the minimum entitlement for small airports, and, for the first time, fund an entitlement for general aviation airports up to $150,000.

In addition to ensuring that our nation continues to have the safest, most secure, most efficient air service in the world, one of the most important benefits of this new funding will be the tremendous improvements in airport infrastructure at small and mid-size communities.

This bill doubles the small airport fund. This will give small and non-hub airports as well as general aviation airports more money to meet their needs.

In addition, the bill creates a new discretionary set-aside for reliever airports.

It authorizes a contract tower cost-sharing program so that small airports can get the benefits of air traffic control services, and creates an incentive program to help airlines buy regional jets if they agree to use them to serve small airports.

It also helps small communities by creating a new funding program to help small, underserved airports market and promote their air service. In addition the bill increases funding for the essential air service.

Phasing out the slot restrictions at New York and O'Hare will provide smaller communities better access to these large cities.

This provision will also act to increase competition when the slot restrictions are fully lifted in 2002 in Chicago and in 2007 in New York.

In addition, by providing substantially more money to build terminals, gates, taxiways, and other infrastructure, competition will be stimulated at other airports.

This bill also raises the cap on the Passenger Facility Charge from $3 to $4.50. Under this provision, each local airport continues to have the flexibility to determine whether it wants to charge this fee. By raising the cap, the locality also can determine how much up to the cap it wants to charge based on its individual needs. This new PFC provision can be implemented by the FAA without the need to institute a rulemaking proceeding.

AIR 21 also incorporates the National Park Overflights provisions based on a bill that I introduced. These provisions represent a strong compromise reached between all the parties involved in air tours over national parks. The provision will ensure that both air and ground visitors to our national parks will have the ability to experience and enjoy our national parks. I am personally proud of the work that went into these provisions and I thank Chairman YOUNG of the Resources Committee for his work on this issue also.

Finally, although everyone is talking about all the big things this bill does, it also does a lot of little things that merit mentioning.

We have raised the fine that can be imposed on unruly passengers, to $25,000. This will help to ensure the safety of the flight crew and other passengers on a flight.

We have also acted to improve the training of security screeners so that we can continue to assure the traveling public of its safety when it flies.

We have a provision requiring collision avoidance devices on cargo aircraft. This will ensure that cargo aircraft have similar technology that passenger aircraft have now to avoid collisions.

And we have changed the applicability of the Death on the High Seas Act so that it does not apply to airplane crashes within 12 miles of the United States. This will help to ensure that victims of tragic plane crashes over the water will have the same ability for recovery as those crashes over land.

AIR 21 has been a bipartisan project and has resulted in a bipartisan product that I truly believe is good for aviation.

In this bill, there is the promise of safety and efficiency in our nation's aviation infrastructure in the years to come.

That should be a promise we all can support.

I urge you to vote yes on the conference report for H.R. 1000.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska).

The Chair advises that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) has 7 minutes remaining, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) has 13½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) has 15½ minutes remaining.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 7 minutes. Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal of respect for the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), and I have a great deal of respect and affection for the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR). He is a good friend of mine. But I simply cannot, in good conscience, abide in any way this legislation before us today.

Five years ago, when the majority party took control of this institution, we were told that we were going to see a new day and that we were going to see a high degree of fiscal responsibility and balance. Instead, this bill for the second time throws that promise out the window.

Two years ago, this House voted to require large increases in spending for highways and they put that requirement ahead of every other priority in Government.

Now, I am a strong supporter of the trust funds and I am a strong supporter of highway construction and airport construction, but I do not believe that that ought to be a higher priority than education, than health care, than cancer research, than environmental cleanup, than support for our farmers or support for our national defense. And yet, the House voted to put highways ahead of all of those 2 years ago.

Now, today it is taking us down that path for a second time and it is saying that our highest priority before all others is the funding of concrete to build new airports.

Now, I want to see new airport construction. The problem with this bill is that it pretends that it is only directing the spending of trust fund money, but, in reality, it also directs the spending of non-trust fund money.

Here is how it does it: It appropriates about $40 billion over the next 3 years to the FAA. It guarantees that $3.3 billion of that will have to be spent on bricks and mortar, on construction items. And it leaves us in this situation: It means that, if we do not then fully fund the remainder of that $40 billion out of non-trust fund monies in the appropriations process, that then the operations portion of the budget for the flying public will be severely

crippled and shortchanged. And, obviously, we do not want to be in the position to do that.

The Committee on Appropriations is effectively denied by this legislation the ability to trade off the funding that we spend for operation versus construction by taking a bit out of the construction portion of the budget to fund operations. And the result is that that means that we are going to inevitably require reductions in many of the programs I have just mentioned.

Let me explain why. I am the one of the biggest supporters I know of for highway construction and airport construction. But this proposal requires the 64 percent increase in just 1 year for airport entitlements without examining competing needs in education, biomedical research, veterans' health care, or anywhere else.

An extra billion dollars that is taken by this bill to fund airports is a billion dollars that we cannot use to fund 3,000 NIH grants for research and cancer and diabetes. It is a billion dollars that we cannot provide for special education. It is a billion dollars that prevents us from putting a dent in the $112 billion of renovation needs of our schools. It is a billion dollars that we cannot use to fund 9,000 security officers in our schools with the worst violence and drug problems.

What is happening is that this bill is being passed without regard to what is happening to the budget in the Committee on the Budget. And what is happening there is that the majority party is planning to mark up a FY 2001 budget resolution that provides only $289 billion in appropriation room for the coming year on the domestic side of the ledger. That is some $25 billion below the amount requested by the President, and it is some 2 percent below a freeze level.

Now, if we are going to provide outlays for highway and transit that are $3 billion this year above last year and $4.8 billion, or 19 percent, above by the year 2003, that means that other cuts are going to be required on other programs. And that seems to me that we should not want to do that.

If we take a look at this bill, under this bill, aviation outlays would escalate by 3 percent in 2001 and 41 percent by 2003. And all of that is supposed to take place in the context of a budget which will provide a cut below freeze level.

If we pass this bill today, I do not want to hear anyone who votes for it saying that they were for making more room for cancer research or for making more room for education or for making more room for defense, because they will be denying the Committee on Appropriations the flexibility that we need to try to meet all of those problems.

I would point out one additional problem with this legislation. It allows the Senate and the President to determine what the internal rules of the House of Representatives are going to be because it puts into law changes in House rules. It puts into law two new points of order that are aimed at precluding any current or future Member of the House from offering any bill, conference report, motion, amendment, or resolution that would alter aviation funding guarantees for the next 3 years in any way whatsoever.

Do we really believe that this institution ought to have to go to the President of the United States to get his permission to change our internal rules? I think that is outrageous.

It has been said that the leadership of both parties are in support of this bill today. If that is the case, then all it demonstrates is that the leadership of both parties are abdicating their responsibilities to the greater prerogatives and needs of this institution. And that is a crying shame, Mr. Speaker.

□ 1200

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to my good friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA), a member of the committee.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding, and I would like to enter into a colloquy with the chairman, that section 132 of the conference report allows DOT to approve 20 innovative financing projects such as allowing AIP entitlement funds to service debt on an earlier terminal development project at a small or nonhub.

Am I correct in understanding that the fourth provision in this section concerning the use of entitlement dollars for terminal debt was added to the final conference report to assist Daytona Beach International Airport in coping with its debt terminal service?

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

Mr. MICA. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHUSTER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MICA. Then is it the chairman's belief that Daytona Beach International Airport is well positioned to be selected as an innovative financing project under this program?

Mr. SHUSTER. That is correct.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to pose a question to the chairman. In the conference report's joint explanatory statement, critical language directing the FAA administrator to ensure that all runways at civil airports have standard runway cost safety areas in accordance with the most cost-effective and efficient method appears out of sequence. This language, which ensures that future AIP runway grants include provisions of bringing runway safety areas in accordance with FAA regulations should be included in section 514 rather than 515. Is that the chairman's understanding as well?

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SHUSTER. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

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

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the conference report for H.R. 1000, the Wendell H. Ford Aviation Investment and Reform Act for the 21st Century.

This is a historical piece of legislation that will unlock the aviation trust fund ensuring for the first time that aviation taxes will be used to fund aviation infrastructure needs.

The United States has the best aviation system in the world. It also has the busiest aviation system in the world. Unfortunately, our aging air traffic control system and our aging airports are having difficulty keeping up with the increased demand.

That is why we need AIR 21, by guaranteeing that aviation taxes are spent on aviation infrastructure needs. AIR 21 significantly increases investment in our Nation's airports, runways and air traffic control system today so that our aviation system is ready for the increased demand of tomorrow.

Although AIR 21 increases funding for the Airport Improvement Program, AIP, by over 50 percent, this is still not enough to fund the many, many airport projects that are needed to prepare our national aviation system for the 21st century.

Therefore, AIR 21 also authorizes local airport authorities to raise their passenger facility charge from a maximum of $3.00 to up to a maximum of $4.50. The PFC is a critical source of funding for local airport authorities. The PFC revenues allow local airports to fund needed safety, security, capacity, competition, and noise projects that otherwise would have to wait for years for Federal AIP funds or may not be eligible for AIP funds at all.

AIR 21 also helps increase competition in the airline industry in a number of ways. Most significantly, AIR 21 phases out the high-density rule at three of the four slot-controlled airports in the Nation. Eliminating this artificial constraint in operations at Chicago O'Hare in 2002 and at New York's Kennedy and LaGuardia Airports in 2007 will provide immediate and substantial benefit for both consumers and communities.

Today, very few new entrants, low-fare carriers, are able to serve slot-controlled airports because it is extremely costly to either buy a slot or go through the political process of obtaining a slot exemption. The phaseout of the slot restrictions creates new opportunities for new entrant airlines at these airports. These will increase competition and lower fares for all consumers.

In addition, the phaseout encourages increased air service between the high-

density airports and small communities. Also, after slots are completely eliminated, carriers will have the scheduling flexibility to serve more designations from these three airports. As a result, carriers will have more opportunities to serve small and medium-sized communities because they no longer will have to worry about using their precious few slots on the most profitable routes.

Phasing out the slot restrictions at O'Hare, Kennedy, and LaGuardia is only one of many, many provisions in AIR 21 at improving air service to small communities. I am particularly proud of the fact that the EAS program has been improved, and I am particularly proud of the fact that we address the issue of the Bilateral Aviation Agreement between the United States and the United Kingdom.

Mr. Speaker, there are many, many more important provisions in AIR 21. I have highlighted only a few of them. I strongly urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the conference report for H.R. 1000. It will be a vote in favor of a strong, safe aviation system for the 21st century.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), a member of the committee.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) for yielding, and I also thank him for his good service as chairman of the committee and solving first our surface transportation problems and now our air transportation problems.

This bill, as presented to us, deserves passage. I am very pleased with the contributions it will make to solving the problems in Michigan, with the construction of the new terminal at the Wayne County Metro Airport and also at the Grand Rapids Airport with the construction that they have, particularly rebuilding a new runway.

I am especially pleased because I live in terror that we will have a major mid-air collision sometime, and this bill will provide funding for a new air traffic control system which will solve that problem. I congratulate the chairman.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Ground Transportation.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I join in commending the distinguished chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER); the ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR); subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN); and the ranking subcommittee member, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) for their tremendous efforts in bringing forward to the House today this Aviation Investment and Reform Act for the 21st Century, AIR 21.

This measure does indeed make an investment in America, a badly needed investment, and one that will not just benefit airport facilities located in major cities but rural parts of this Nation as well.

Rural parts of this Nation often neglected under this bill will have the ability to make greater contributions to local economic development activities, and the pending measure will help them achieve their true potential through Federal policy changes.

In this regard, I would like to highlight two provisions that I had a part in fashioning. The first will provide $75 million in assistance to small airports to implement measures aimed at improving the costs and availability of air service to consumers, including through marketing and promotion, better use of airport facilities and air service subsidies. The second provision makes it clear that projects facilitating the transfer of cargo and passengers between air and ground transportation modes are eligible for funding under AIP.

In other words, air to transit, air to freight railroads, air to trucking facilities located on airport property can be built using Federal aviation funds.

This provision benefits both large and smaller airports, but in particular the small community and rural area facilities can utilize it as a means of expanding economic development and creating jobs.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, the concept of intermodalism, intermodalism, which is part and parcel of our Federal surface transportation laws and policies, has now finally found its way into aviation policy. I urge adoption of this report.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY), the distinguished vice chairman of the Subcommittee on Aviation.

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

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), our distinguished chairman, for yielding me this time.

In my brief period of time, let me just say that this is a great day of hope for the region of the country that I represent, a region that has been termed by the FAA as an underserviced area. This is a day of hope because it provides the necessary and requisite Federal resources that will give the people of that area the opportunity to connect with the rest of the world so that we can compete economically. I want to salute and congratulate the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. I want to thank him for the opportunity not only to serve as vice chairman of the Subcommittee on Aviation in the Year of Aviation but also for the opportunity to have served as a conferee on this conference.

I urge my colleagues to support it.

First, I would like to thank Chairman SHUSTER for all his hard work and dedication to transportation issues—without his leadership—I don't think this body would be considering such a landmark piece of legislation.

Legislation that improves Air Safety, improves competition, preserves the environment, helps small communities, reforms the FAA, restores the trust in Aviation Trust Funds, and most importantly, helps passengers and pilots.

As the only freshman member of Congress on the Conference Committee, I was fortunate to work so close with the Chairman and the Aviation Subcommittee Chairman JOHN DUNCAN.

These two gentleman's commitment to making our skies safer and more accessible to passengers is truly remarkable and commendable.

I urge all my colleagues to support this conference report.

Help us finish the work started by AIR–21 when the House overwhelmingly passed H.R. 1000 last year.

This conference report will help every segment of the aviation industry. I'd like to focus on how it will help the great state of New York.

For example, the following small airports in my district will benefit by having a small, but dedicated, annual revenue stream that they can tap into to make the airport a better place for passengers and pilots alike.

This money will allow airports to start projects like installing runway lighting for improved safety, purchase snow removal equipment, update the airport plans for growth.

Adirondack Regional Airport in Saranac Lake, Seneca Falls, Lake Placid, Saratoga Springs, Glens Falls, Ticonderoga, Schroon Lake, and Hudson.

Larger airports in New York will also benefit from this bill.

Albany International Airport, which serves my district will receive twice as much as it did under the old funding formula.

Under this bill it will receive an additional $2 million per year.

Each year that money can go for excellent projects like navigation aides to improve safety, runway renovations, and acquiring land to expand safety areas.

This is the consummate Win-Win-Win conference report.

Passengers win by having improved safety and competition.

Airports win by having a larger dedicated funding stream so they improve their facilities—which in turn helps passengers and pilots.

Airlines win because this bill takes the first step in modernizing the air traffic control system—helping improve arrival and departures on time—which also help passengers.

In the end, this bill will ensure that America's air transportation system is one of the finest in the world.

Thank you again Chairmen SHUSTER and DUNCAN for all of your hard work in bringing this bill to the floor.

I urge all my colleagues to support this conference report.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO), the ranking Democrat on the Subcommittee on Transportation.

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

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, my congratulations to my friend from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), again, on their ability to apparently pass a bill that gives their committee jurisdiction of funding priority over everything else. My only wish would be that their committee had jurisdiction over housing so we could deal with what is a true need in this country.

This, in my judgment, is one of the worst bills I have seen go through the Congress. It is wrong because of what it does within FAA. It says the top priorities are concrete; the lowest priorities are people.

It is plain and simple. The lowest programs for funding are air traffic controllers, personnel who deal with safety. They compete with other people for funding, but the people who pour the concrete do not. The people who buy facilities and equipment do not, and we have had a history in this agency of having a terrible time bringing any contract in on time or in an appropriate fashion. It does the wrong thing for FAA.

Then at the very day that the House Committee on the Budget is meeting to deal with the budget resolution for this session, where we hear we are going to have very tight restrictions on discretionary spending, we are going to say the first priority above everything else is building more runways, more runways, more important than anything else on the agenda. That is what we are doing with this bill. More important than other transportation priorities within our subcommittee, that small unprotected operation is going to have to compete with Amtrak and the Coast Guard. So if there are concerns about Amtrak or the Coast Guard, better take another look within the transportation area. If there are other concerns of what we are going to fund this year, if there are priorities beyond concrete for runways, take another look before casting what my colleagues might think is their easy vote.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report on AIR21 for several reasons. This is a bad bill that strikes a blow at fiscal responsibility. It continues to unfairly subsidize aviation from the general fund. And it will not adequately address the safety and security needs of our air traffic system.

This bill creates an unwarranted $33 billion entitlement for certain FAA capital and facilities programs before any other national needs are addressed. Before we consider any needs for housing, educating our children, helping our farmers, or providing for our veterans, this bill says fund airports first and guarantees a massive increase—46% in just one year and 59% over 3 years—for concrete and construction. That is wrong. It makes no sense.

In recent weeks, we have heard a lot about the need for reform of the budget process and especially in support of biennial budgeting. I ask, why have any budget process at all when we put highway and transit programs on automatic pilot for six years, and we put aviation infrastructure funding on automatic pilot for three years. What is the purpose of having a budget process where we carefully consider competing priorities, if one special interest after another simply declares that spending constraints do not apply to them?

Mr. Speaker, this is a bad bill because it perpetuates the myth that somehow we have shortchanged aviation needs over the years. Supporters of AIR21 argue that we need to ''unlock'' the Aviation Trust Fund. But, there is no evidence that aviation has been shortchanged and deserves special treatment outside of the regular budget process.

In fact, those who travel by air have gotten far more from the federal government than they are paying in aviation taxes, due to large subsidies paid by taxpayers out of the general fund. Since 1991, we have spent over $21 billion in general fund revenues for FAA operations. In eight out of the last ten years, we have spent more on the FAA than incoming receipts into the trust fund. The ''historical'' 30% general fund share of FAA expenses that the authorizers point to exists only because authorizing statutes have arbitrarily restricted the use of trust fund revenues to fund the FAA.

Mr. Speaker, this conference report is also a failed opportunity to fully address the FAA's needs and to bring our air traffic control system into the 21st century. As we speak, the FAA is struggling to address the needs of an air traffic control system that operates 24 hours a day, seven days a week. The FAA must provide adequate training for air traffic controllers and inspectors, and ensure that we have the necessary security personnel to address the growing threats across the globe.

The FAA has 170 aviation inspector positions which have remained vacant and has cancelled most training activities. Additional funding is required for spare parts for air traffic control equipment and to install new state of the art equipment that sits in warehouses because the agency lacks the necessary funding to bring them on line.

Our air traffic control will have to cope with a 66% increase in passenger traffic by the year 2010. That means more people and planes in the sky. Yet, AIR21 caps the amount of trust fund revenue that can be used for FAA operations, which will require discretionary general funds to make up the shortfall. Ironically, this bill constrains the most essential functions of the FAA under budget caps, while completely exempting the other 80% of the FAA's budget from any budget scrutiny at all.

This bill does not provide a balanced approach to addressing those needs, nor does it consider the impact of guaranteed funding for FAA capital programs on other transportation priorities—like the Coast Guard and Amtrak.

AIR21 would require a $1.8 billion or 46% increase next year for FAA capital accounts, and puts at risk needed funding for Coast Guard's operations and assets, and Amtrak capital investments.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot support a bill that puts aviation infrastructure ahead of all other national priorities, and then fails to fully address the air traffic control modernization needs within the FAA.

I urge the defeat of the conference report.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE), a member of the committee.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that generous allotment of time.

Mr. Speaker, I know this is wrapping up. I just want to credit the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) for his tireless efforts to make this bill become a reality that restores honesty and integrity to the aviation trust fund and goes a long ways towards seeing that the aviation taxes that are paid by passengers and airlines and general aviation users on tickets and fuel and cargo are actually being used to improve airport capacity and safety.

This has been a long time coming and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) has worked very, very hard to ensure that we have unlocked this trust fund and this is going to be a wonderful thing for many of the airports across this country; and certainly in my State of South Dakota a lot of the rural areas are going to be very well served by this legislation. I encourage its passage.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN).

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the conferees were able to finish their work so we now have the opportunity to vote on this conference report. I know that this negotiation was complex and frustrating. I want to commend my colleagues for working so hard on behalf of the American people.

My State of Florida is keenly aware of the importance of getting AIR 21 passed and signed by the President.

□ 1215

This comes at a critical time for our Nation's travelers as aviation forecasts continue to show a rise in the number of passengers taking advantage of air travel.

In particular, I would like to take this opportunity to express my thanks for the inclusion of the Military Airport Program provisions in this bill. This program benefits communities like Jacksonville that suffered during BRAC. Florida's Cecil Field is a Naval Air Station closed during BRAC and selected for the MAP program last month. MAP helps turn former military airports over for civilian use. This is critical for my State.

Florida has an incredible aviation demands, and Cecil Field will be used to handle some of this growth. Jacksonville is the second fastest growing airport in the country and Orlando International Airport handles more than 30 million passengers a year.

Overall, I think this is a good bill, and I urge my colleagues to please vote for it.

I rise in support of this conference report. I am very pleased the conferees were able to finish their work so we now have an opportunity to vote on this conference report. I know that the negotiations were complex and frustrating, and I want to commend my colleagues for working so hard on behalf of the American people. My state of Florida is keenly aware of the importance of getting AIR 21 passed and signed by the President. This comes at a critical time for our nation's travelers, as aviation

forecasts continue to show a rising number of passengers taking advantage of air travel.

In particular, I would like to take this opportunity to express my thanks for the inclusion of the Military Airport Program provision in this bill. This program benefits communities like Jacksonville that suffered during BRAC. Florida's Cecil Field is a Naval Air Station that was closed during BRAC and selected for the MAP program last month. MAP helps turn former military airports over to civilian use, and this is critical for my state.

Florida has incredible aviation demands, and Cecil Field will be used to handle some of this growth. Jacksonville is the 2nd fastest growing airport in the country and Orlando International Airport handles more than 30 million passengers a year. Overall, AIR 21 provides the vital transportation infrastructure investment that is needed to shore up safety and security, as well as providing the economic engine that will aid development not only in Florida, but across the nation as well. I urge my colleagues to support the conference report.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD).

(Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in firm support of a very fair compromise bill that will help California's aviation system.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Conference Report on H.R. 1000, the Aviation Investment and Reform Act for the 21st Century. This Conference Report represents a fair and balanced compromise. AIR 21 will make our skies safer, reduce flight delays and increase competition by modernizing our air traffic control systems and improving our airports. With today's vote we have an opportunity to give America the aviation system it deserves, one firmly based on both safety and reliability.

Whether on television or in the newspapers we are reminded on an almost daily basis of the shortcomings in our Nation's aviation system. I, like so many of my colleagues have heard from many constituents who have suffered from airline delays and are deeply concerned about air safety. We have simply pushed our aviation infrastructure to the limits.

The aviation infrastructure in the United States has deteriorated because of increased usage. We can no longer afford to fail in meeting the current and future needs of the aviation system. Last year, more than 600 million people used air transportation as their mode of travel and in just 10 years, that number will skyrocket to a billion. The Conference Report on H.R. 1000 places the key to the Airport and Airway Trust Fund back in the hands of the people who use the system, that is to say passengers and consumers who both benefit from a more efficient and safer aviation system.

By unlocking the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, the Conference Report provides about $40 billion over the next three years for aviation investment programs. Funding for airport improvements will increase by more than 50 percent. This will allow allocations for commercial passenger airports and cargo airports to double. For the first time, general aviation airports will receive their own individual allocations. This money can be used to improve safety and increase capacity, leading to more air service and lower fares.

This bill will unlock the aviation trust fund and ensure that all trust fund receipts and interest will be invested in the Airport Improvement Program—the primary program for airport construction—and the Facilities and Equipment Program—the chief program for air traffic control equipment. This means that as more people use our aviation system, more money will be invested in it.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my Colleagues to vote Yes on the Conference Report on H.R. 1000. Let us give the American people the aviation system that they both want and deserve.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let me first commend the chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and our ranking member and all of our leadership, but most especially our chairman, who helped us to negotiate, through lots of tenacity and commitment, this agreed upon conference report. It was not easy coming, but we are very grateful for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, today is where aviation is growing the fastest of any other method of transportation, and it really is an economic engine for practically every community where it exists, and most especially mine. This is the only way that we have goods and services moving at all times, and it has enabled us to enjoy the most prosperous time in our history. We have to attribute much of that to aviation.

Numerous jobs have been created because of our ability to move people very rapidly around the world, and all of us know what happens when jobs disappear. That is when we will need many more services spent in other ways, where most of us really do desire to be independent. This is a mode of transportation that really does it.

I understand clearly about distribution of funds. But when funds are collected from a particular industry with a commitment that those funds go back to that industry, then I think it is only fair and it only shows integrity when that is what happens to the funds.

With the passage of the facility fee, this is not distributed to everyone, only those passengers that use the service, and we need the improvements. That is one clear and fair way to get them.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY MILLER), a distinguished Member of our subcommittee.

(Mr. GARY MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GARY MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 1000. Like many Members of this House, each Friday I board an airplane and travel to my district. My expectations for this weekly commute are similar to my constituents who regularly travel for business. I want to take off in a timely manner and be assured that all safety features are working accordingly.

This bill will help to create this peace of mind for all travelers. First of all, safety equipment such as windshear detection apparatus, runway incursion prevention devices and enhanced vision technologies will be eligible for airport improvement funding.

This type of comprehensive approach to airline safety is crucial for both improved safety and better spending practices.

Last year, $15 million was appropriated to purchase new approach lighting systems for airports whose systems were 20 years old and older. However, no money was appropriated for the installation of these lighting systems. As a result, we have airports which need these runway lights, but will be forced to continue to wait for them until funds can be appropriated.

In addition to serving on the Aviation Subcommittee of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, I also am a member of the House Science Committee. On behalf of Science Committee Chairman SENSENBRENNER and Technology Subcommittee Chairwoman MORELLA, I wish to thank Chairman SHUSTER, Ranking Member OBERSTAR, Aviation Subcommittee Chairman DUNCAN and Ranking Member LIPINSKI, for their cooperation to incorporate many of the provisions of H.R. 1551, the Civil Aviation Research and Development Authorization Act of 1999 into Title IX of the Conference Report that we are considering today.

Overall, Title IX authorizes $237 million in Fiscal Year 2001 and $249 million in FY 2002 for the projects and activities of the FAA's Research, Engineering and Development account. This represents an increase of roughly 35% over the FY2000 enacted level. Investing in aviation research and technology today is important to ensure that our aviation system meets the growing demands of the future, while enhancing safety.

I also wish to point out that during the Science Committee's consideration of H.R. 1551 last spring, I successfully offered an amendment to direct the FAA to place a greater priority on the non-structural components of its current aging aircraft research and development portfolio. The non-structural components of aging aircraft include electrical wiring, hydraulic lines and certain other electro-mechanical systems. Of the funding for projects and activities that comprise FAA's aging aircraft research and development portfolio, less than ten percent is targeted to address non-structural issues. I am very pleased that today's Conference Report includes my amendment to H.R. 1551 and I wish to thank the House and Senate Conferees for their support of my efforts in this area.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute and 20 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. MORAN.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I know this bill is going to pass, and I understand that politics is the art of compromise, but this should not be the body of broken promises. Back in 1986, Congress made an iron-clad commitment that it would never increase the number of slots at Washington National Airport and it would never break

the perimeter rule of 1,250 miles beyond Washington National Airport. Yet today we break that promise.

The Washington region, D.C., Maryland, and Virginia fulfilled its part of the bargain. It said we will fund the airports and be responsible for their administration and redevelopment. We fulfilled our part of the bargain, and now Congress breaks its part of the bargain.

It is wrong. I know what happened, I know the guy that is responsible. But it is irresponsible for us to do this. We ought not set a tradition of breaking promises. Our word ought to be good. We had an iron-clad agreement. This breaks that agreement by adding 24 more slots, 12 of them beyond the perimeter rule. Those slots should be at Dulles Airport, not at National Airport, and that is why I have to vote against this bill.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON), who serves on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure with distinction.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the chairman and the ranking member for their diligent work in making sure that this bill came to pass, this conference report. I rise in its support. It is critical to Idaho, not only the general aviation airports, but also to the commercial airports in Idaho.

Unlike the previous speaker, I am very pleased that we have decided to extend the perimeter rule at Washington National Airport to those of us in the Western United States. It is critical. I hope that some of those slots that will be made available will be made available to the inter-mountain region's most important airport in Salt Lake City.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his work on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member OBERSTAR on the success of their determined efforts to enhance our nation's commitment to a safe and effective air transportation system.

Not only does this Conference Report provide landmark funding levels for augmenting and modernizing airport facilities, its multi-year reauthorization of the Airport Improvement Program breaks the cycle of short-term reauthorizations that has made safety- and capacity-enhancing projects at airports such as the Boise Air Terminal in my district needlessly difficult and costly.

Particularly important to the citizens of rural districts such as my own are the provisions which guarantee AIP funding for general aviation airports for the first time. These small facilities represent the backbone of Idaho aviation, and this legislation secures them the flexibility of funding they need to continue to play a vital role in agriculture, firefighting, and wilderness access in my district.

Another aspect of the conference report which I and many fellow Western members strongly support is the provision which allows exemptions for underserved communities to the current Perimeter Rule at Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport. I commend the conferees on creating a process which I believe fairly balances the interests of states inside the Perimeter and those of us from Western states without convenient access to Reagan National.

With 12 new slots at Reagan National, this report represents a slight loosening of the restrictive conditions that prevail at one of our nation's most important airports. These limited exemptions to the perimeter rule from hubs like Salt Lake City will improve service to the nation's capital for dozens of Western cities beyond the Perimeter—while at the same time ensuring that cities inside the Perimeter are not adversely impacted by new service. This is a fair balance which is consistent with the overall intent of the bill to improve air service to small and medium-sized cities.

Throughout consideration of this bill, our goal has been to ensure truth in budgeting for the Aviation Trust Fund and to improve air service for communities which have not experienced the benefits of deregulation to the same extent as larger markets. By refusing to accept a short-term reauthorization of FAA programs that would have interrupted the momentum for these much-needed reforms, Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member OBERSTAR have achieved a remarkable success.

Airports are key components to our regional economies and critical links to the world outside our communities. I support the Aviation Investment and Reform Act because it protects the investments we have made in these important facilities, and helps underserved communities take full advantage of the benefits of our nation's air transportation system. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. BOSWELL), an aviator and strong advocate for aviation.

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

Mr. BOSWELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN), and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. LIPINSKI) for their leadership. I have a lot of confidence in them. The times we have talked and traveled together, we talked about this thing; I know they are in the game and are concerned about this fact that we have got tremendous demands for increased traffic, both in people, personnel and freight. And we have got to deal with it, and we appreciate that.

Airport improvements, ATC equipment, longer runways, terminals, whatever, the infrastructure has got to be there to accommodate these things. But I am concerned about the people. I know these gentlemen are too. I do not even have to ask, I know they are. I think that was one of the things we fell a little short in.

I am going to support this, but I am going to expect me to be diligent and continue to watch this side of it, and I know that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman SHUSTER) will, as will the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), that we watch this to be sure that this does not get pushed back somewhat. So I trust we can do that.

The question of slots is worrisome. Ms. Garvey, the Secretary of Transportation, says this is not a safety problem. They can work with this. Folks from our part of the country, we need some help and relief. I also have confidence that we will continue to work on that.

Advanced out to 2007, I hear people already working on trying to advance it out even further, so we have to be watching for this very much. I trust that we will.

So let us support this. Let us grow aviation. It is very important to our country's economy. Let us get on with it. I look forward to continuing dialogue on these things that I am a little bit worried about.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, the appropriators come to the floor fulminating that we have made aviation the highest priority. ''Before all others,'' they said.

Well, not before all other issues that have a trust fund. Housing does not have a trust fund. If it did, we would be advocating the same thing. My good colleague from Minnesota said he would like to put other issues in the care of our committee. Give them to us. We will deal with them. But it does not have a trust fund, housing.

This does have a trust fund, and what we are simply doing is keeping faith with the traveling public, who agreed to be taxed for a specific purpose. All increases come from spending the taxes and interest out of the trust fund.

What the Committee on Appropriations would argue here is that they should be allowed to hoard those dollars in the budget, hold the trust fund hostage, in order, as one conferee from the other body said in the course of our debate in the conference, so we could fund Amtrak. They want to fund Amtrak out of the surplus they want to keep in the Aviation Trust Fund.

That does not keep faith with the traveling public. We have taken care of Amtrak, goodness knows, in this committee and in the Committee on Ways and Means, giving them $2.3 billion in previously-earned tax benefits from their predecessor railroads.

What this legislation does in fact with respect to the general fund is cut in half the general fund historic contribution to aviation, from 36 percent to 18 percent. All the rest is funded out of the trust fund.

If you want to say we would like to hold that trust fund, we would like to build up a surplus so that with that surplus we can fund other things, then be honest with the public and say that. But do not come and cry crocodile tears about priorities that are supposed to be set by the Committee on Budget and by the Committee on Appropriations itself.

My dear friend from across the water, with whom I differ on maybe one or two issues, called this a ''turkey of a bill.'' Well, I want to say to my good friend that domesticated turkeys today do not fly, and his constituents will not either if we do not pass this legislation.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, there are over 100 trust funds and other special funds in the Federal budget. Should we put all of them ahead of cancer research, ahead of education, ahead of defense, ahead of other national priorities? I think not.

I am all for the trust funds. I am all for the trust funds, but I am not for placing this particular trust fund ahead of every other need of government. That is unfair. It is not right to have a 41 percent increase in 3 years for this program, while cutting all other domestic appropriations by $25 billion, as the Committee on Budget intends to do.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to my good friend, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR).

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to say to my good friend that the issue is not trust funds. The issue is whether we should have trust funds at all. That is a different debate. If you do not want trust funds, abolish them all and make everything subject to general revenues. But we do have a trust fund, and we are keeping faith.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, the issue is not whether we favor trust funds. We do favor trust funds. The issue is whether we ought to abuse trust funds and in the process leverage other spending outside of the trust fund. That is the issue.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 3 minutes.

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

Mr. Speaker, before I speak in opposition to this bill, let me congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) for their effective work.

This bill creates a new entitlement, and what the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) has said and others about trust funds are true. But what the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. SABO) said with regard to cancer research and others is also true. It also hurts the FAA operations fund. So when you are flying into that airport, it will suffer. It helps concrete. This is a pro-concrete bill.

□ 1230

It also hurts the Coast Guard. I think if my colleagues like the Coast Guard, the Coast Guard will suffer more; and frankly, I think the Coast Guard and Admiral Loy ought to get out of the Department of Transportation and get into some other department, like the Department of Defense. They will suffer no matter what anyone says.

It undermines the budget process. It undermines the budget process.

Lastly, why do we not get a committee to come and say, we want to increase funding for cancer? Well, let us find a cure for cancer or reduce cancer deaths by 50 percent by the year 2010. Let us put the money into reducing or finding a prevention for Alzheimer's. Let us put the money in for diabetes research.

This is a bad bill. It undermines the budget process; it distorts the priority of where this Congress ought to be. To the poor and the hungry and those like that, it says forget it, you do not have the lobbyists and you are not here.

Lastly, as the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) said, it creates what I call the aluminum policy for National Airport. Do not say it is not a safety issue to add slots there at National Airport. Do not forget the airplane crash that took place there when people died when it hit the 14th Street Bridge. My colleagues are breaking their promise. Many of you who were here who voted for that policy are now breaking your promise. They want to stuff in as many airplanes as they possibly can from wherever they can. This is just the beginning.

So I would say to my colleagues who are listening, unless you are already committed, vote no on this bill. It hurts the poor, it hurts the Coast Guard, it goes for concrete. Let us put into cancer research, let us put it in diabetes research, let us put it in Alzheimer's research. By doing this we will undermine the budget process, and it will make it harder for us to do what the American people want us to do. Vote no on the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, history tells us that in good budgetary times it is very difficult for the budget process to keep a tight rein over federal spending. We see happening now a repeat of what happened during the late 1800's. During that time, various legislative committees convinced the Congress that the stingy ways of the Appropriations Committee had to be changed, that we needed to spend a lot more to make the country grow.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we did spend a lot more when we let the authorizing committees make those decisions, and we're doing it all over again. This bill spends an extra $12 billion over the next three years, compared to the past three. And some programs will get astronomical raises.

For example, the airport grants program will get $3.2 billion next year—a 64 percent increase in one year. Air traffic control modernization will get almost 30 percent more next year. Now, I agree there are needs out there, and that air traffic continues to rise. But the increases in this bill are uncalled for. FAA doesn't even know how to spend all of this money, if you look at their existing long-range plan. So we're really throwing money at them in this bill.

The bill also puts a priority on airport construction and equipment renovation, to the detriment of FAA's day-to-day operations, which I think is a dangerous shift in Congressional priorities. In some past years, the Appropriations Committees have reduced FAA's capital programs in order to fully fund their day-to-day operations, and that has made some contractors and businesses unhappy. That is because we put a priority on the smooth, safe functioning of the agency.

By contrast, this bill raises and locks in funding for the capital programs, and leaves FAA's operations out in the cold, begging for whatever remaining funds we can find. Members should not be surprised if we come up short, because we first have to fund the significantly increased guaranteed programs. We can't protect the operating budget anymore, because this bill takes that flexibility out of the appropriations process. In fact, this bill even takes that flexibility out of the hands of the Congressional leadership, by amending the Rules of the House to tie their hands as well.

The creation of new ''guaranteed'' programs continues a troubling trend. A few years ago we created new mandatory programs in the agriculture appropriations bill. Then in 1998 we walled off highway and transit spending. And now we're adding to that list most of our aviation programs. Of course, in each case we increase the funding, because that's the reason for doing it in the first place. Each time we do this we make a small constituency happy, but we make our job here infinitely more difficult, because we make the real discretionary budget smaller and smaller.

Then, when we want to begin new initiatives, like putting more police on the street, increasing education grants, or fighting a more intense war on drugs, we have to dip into the surplus to do it because we have effectively shrunk or walled off so much of the discretionary budget that we have no choice.

And this agreement is especially bad for the Washington metropolitan area. It breaks a commitment made to the area many years ago when we transferred the operation of Dulles and Reagan National airports from the federal government to a local authority. I worked with then Transportation Secretary Dole and others to come up with a finely tuned package that put decision-making for these two airports in the local community and provided the authority with bond financing to make airport improvements.

That package also established the perimeter rule and a limit on slots, or the number of daily takeoff and landing operations, at Reagan National. That rule essentially allowed the orderly development of Dulles and Reagan National airports, by limiting the length of flights which could be taken from Reagan National. That led to the enormously successful development of Dulles International Airport in my district—a development which might not have occurred without the perimeter rule in place.

By adding 24 daily slots at Reagan National and allowing some of those to fly beyond the perimeter, this conference report is starting down a slippery slope which could undermine the delicate balance between these two airports and choke off the economic expansion at Dulles and the surrounding community. This is a very bad decision, and much like our

changes to the Wright amendment at Dallas Love Field a couple of years ago, sends the message to local communities that they shouldn't depend on the federal government keeping its word.

The commitment to the local community in providing a local authority to operate these airports and in setting slot and perimeter rules was also made because of safety and noise concerns to prevent Reagan National from having a so-called ''aluminum skies'' policy with unlimited flight operations. This conference report breaks faith with the local community and I cannot support it.

This is a very bad bill, for the Congress as an institution, for FAA employees—who are now relegated to the margins of the budget process—and for other federal programs which must pay for the additional programs in the bill. It is a good bill for the pork barrel, and a bad bill for sound federal policy.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize that there can be different opinions, but facts are difficult things to change. There are certain facts that need to be said. First of all, it is a fact that we are talking about aviation trust fund money paid for by the users that we say should be spent, and if we should not spend it, we ought to reduce the tax.

Secondly, as a result of unlocking the aviation trust fund, and get this, because this is a fact, not an opinion, the amount of general fund money required will be reduced rather than increased. In fact, it will be about cut in half, because of the portion of the money that comes from the trust fund. So by reducing the historic amount of general fund of money required, we are actually freeing up more general fund money for the Coast Guard and any other general fund expenditure; and indeed, those are expenditures that many of us vigorously support.

Thirdly, there is no tax increase here. What there is here, and certainly my conservative colleagues should embrace this, we are returning to the local authorities, to the locally elected officials the decision as to whether or not they should increase passenger facility charges. We do not increase them by one penny here; we give that authority to the local elected officials.

With regard to this building concrete, less than half of the money going into this bill will be for concrete. I in no way denigrate the importance of concrete, because we need more runways, we need more terminals. However, more than half of this money will indeed go to F&E, will go to operations, will go to improved air traffic control to make it safer so that we can have safer landings not only in good weather, but in bad weather as well.

This bill, when it came through the House, passed overwhelmingly, 316 to 110, with the Speaker of the House, the minority leader, the majority leader all supporting it. We went and negotiated with the Senate, and what we bring back to the House is less than that which overwhelmingly passed this House with strong majorities on both sides of the aisle. That compromise, which we admit is less than the bill that passed this House overwhelmingly, that compromise passed the Senate 82 to 17. It passed the Senate with the strong support of the chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, who originally had been opposed to the House bill; with the strong support of the chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget, who originally opposed the House bill; with the strong support of the chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation of the Committee on Appropriations, who originally opposed the bill. We negotiated a compromise, and we are so thankful and appreciative that those people looking out for those other interests in the Senate were able to meet us halfway. We like to think we gave more than halfway; but that I guess is debatable, the point being we did compromise.

Mr. Speaker, we bring a bill the American people need. We bring a bill that must be passed or our aviation system will be hurtling toward gridlock and potential catastrophes in the sky. Let us pass this and send it down to the President, who, I understand, has said will sign this legislation enthusiastically.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Conference agreement on H.R. 1000, the ''Aviation Investment and Reform Act for the 21st Century.'' I am especially pleased that the Conference agreement included 12 new perimeter rule exemptions at Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport.

As a representative from the State of Washington, my constituents will directly benefit from this common sense provision to ensure fairness for all Americans. It is essential that the Department of Transportation ensures that this new service is evenly distributed among carriers and cities to make certain that the maximum number of communities benefit from these new flights.

Mr. Speaker, it is especially important that small and midsize communities gain improved access through hubs such as Salt Lake City. We must guarantee that these important slot exemptions are not simply accessed by a few large cities for non-stop point-to-point service, so that citizens living throughout the West will benefit from these much needed slots via connections at Western hubs such as Salt Lake City. Currently, many passengers from small and medium-sized communities in the West are subject to double and often triple connections in order to reach Reagan National Airport. Adding new service from hubs like Salt Lake City will improve service to the nation's capital for dozens of cities throughout the west. This supports the overall objective of the legislation, which is to improve air service to small and medium-sized cities nationwide.

Once again, I thank you for this opportunity to underscore the need for a broad distribution of the perimeter rule exemptions. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and encourage the Department of Transportation to ensure the equitable distribution of the new service beyond the perimeter rule.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the conference report on the Federal Aviation Administration Authorization, or AIR–21, bill. Within this bill, the high-density rule (HDR) at LaGuardia and J.F.K. Airports in New York City will remain intact until 2007. As you know, the HDR limits the number of take-offs and landings at these airports.

Continuation of the HDR, particularly at the already congested LaGuardia Airport, was vital to my constituents, who are afflicted with constant noise. Additionally, there are safety concerns due to the already crowded airspace and the redirection of flights to accommodate more enplanements.

In June of this year, the Queens Congressional Delegation led the fight in the House of Representatives to preserve the HDR at LaGuardia and JFK Airports in AIR–21. Together, with the other Members of Congress representing the New York City metro and tri-state areas, we successfully fought to save the slot restrictions from immediate elimination, and, in fact, extended the HDR to the year 2007. This was a major victory for the neighbors of our airports and those of us who represent them in Congress and who have fought to keep the HDR in place. The result will be safer and quieter skies for the New York City Metropolitan area and beyond.

Mr. Speaker, I personally live beneath the flight path of airplanes taking off and landing at LaGuardia Airport. This makes me understand the frustration and angst of my constituents over the duration and volume of the noise when planes take-off and land. Noise from incoming planes can drown out the TV, a phone conversation, and even shake your windows.

I have been advocating on behalf of the community surrounding LaGuardia Airport for the past 13 years, first as a State Assemblyman and now, as a Member of Congress. I was honored to work with Chairman SHUSTER on this bill, particularly because he appreciates the concerns of myself, the Queens delegation, and our constituents. Working together with Congressman OBERSTAR, Chairman DUNCAN and Congressman LIPINSKI, we forged the language found in today's bill regarding the continuance of the HDR at LaGuardia Airport.

On behalf of all the New York City residents affected by aircraft noise, I strongly support this conference report and urge my colleagues to support passage of AIR–21.

Mr. LARSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1000—the Wendell H. Ford Aviation Investment and Reform Act for the Twenty-first Century. Although I am in strong support of the overall bill and the benefits it will provide to American aviation, I would like to draw my colleagues' attention to a particular aspect of the bill.

On September 2, 1998, two hundred thirty-one (231) people lost their lives in the tragic crash of Swiss Air Flight 111 off the coast of Nova Scotia. This tragedy struck my district when the Rizza family of Newington, Connecticut learned of Victor Rizza's untimely death and began to cope with the loss of a beloved member of their family. Since the date of the crash, the Rizza family, along with many of the other families affected by this disaster, have been stymied in their efforts to recover fair and just compensation for the losses that they have sustained due to the onerous and outdated provisions of an ancient shipping statute known as the Death on the High Seas Act.

This act denies families the ability to recover non-economic damages in a lawsuit. This

means that a family member could not be compensated for the loss of their sons and daughters; sons and daughters could not be compensated for the loss of their elderly parents.

Section 404 of this legislation addresses this gross unfairness by amending the Death on the High Seas Act to allow for the recovery of non-economic damages. Although this legislation is not flawless, it is a step forward in bridging an existing gap in our system of compensation for those who have lost loved ones in aviation disasters.

While the existing statute recognizes the rights of those persons who are economically dependent upon family members lost in aviation accident, this new legislation recognizes the rights of parents, children, siblings and other family members who are dependent upon those lost in aviation disasters for care, comfort and companionship.

Specifically, this legislation allows these individuals to recover just compensation in aviation accidents for the loss of a loved one's care, comfort and companionship.

Athough this legislation cannot fully restore the lives of those affected by the loss of a loved one in an aviation disaster, it is an improvement upon their lives by compensating them for the void resulting from the unbearable loss of a family member.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this important piece of legislation.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I voted today for H.R. 1000, the Aviation and Investment Reform Act for the 21st Century, because airport expansion is important to our national economy and the local economies surrounding each airport. In my district, Cleveland Hopkins International Airport is a tremendous asset to the people of Cleveland and Northeast Ohio. However, the value of Hopkins to business and recreational travelers, as well as the resource economy of the Greater Cleveland area, must be balanced to protect residents living near the airport, or who are otherwise affected by Hopkins operation and expansion.

Many issues have arisen at Hopkins, including the failure to look at other alternatives, the significant noise impacts from increased air traffic, and finally environmental concerns that include water quality, air quality, hazardous waste, and wetlands.

The current approach to Hopkins expansion assumes that Cleveland Hopkins International Airport will continue to be the sole airport serving all the needs of passengers and air cargo traffic for the next twenty years. Any expansion plans must include regional planning that considers use of already existing resources, including greater use of Burke Lakefront Airport, the Akron/Canton Regional Airport, and other local airports, as contributors to Northeast Ohio's air transportation mix. The Greater Cleveland business community criticized the Hopkins expansion proposal for its failure to include simultaneous operations under poor weather conditions. Greater use of other airports will allow for simultaneous runway operations under conditions of poor visibility.

Communities near Hopkins are already over-burdened with airport and train noise. The current Hopkins expansion proposal fails to consider the cumulative effects of the noise burden to neighboring communities. The Hopkins expansion proposal needs to consider greater use of other area airports to alleviate additional noise in the direct flight path, affecting Olmsted Falls, Olmsted Township, and Cleveland Wards 21, 20, and 19.

If the FAA approves the expansion as proposed, a displaced threshold must go into effect to protect communities in the flight path as a superior alternative than the fan-out procedure recommended in the DEIS. The displaced threshold would protect surrounding communities such as Bay Village, Berea, Brook Park, Fairview Park, Lakewood, North Olmsted, Parma, Parma Heights, Rocky River, Strongsville, and Westlake, by preventing the need for the fan-out. The FAA must also focus on beefing up its noise prevention procedures, such as noise monitoring and Noise Abatement Departure Procedures.

Greater attention must be focused on cleanup of hazardous materials buried at Hopkins and the NASA Glenn Research Center, the proposed site of a new 5L/23R runway. Costs must also be considered: the public needs to know how much such a cleanup is going to cost.

Wetlands have important features that help protect the environment by filtering out runoff and contributing to biological diversity. The federal policy on wetland protection is to first avoid impacting wetlands, then minimize the effects, and finally, if no alternative is available, to mitigate by restoring other wetland areas. Current expansion plans make no attempt to avoid or minimize the loss of 87.75 acres of wetland and 7900 linear feet of Abram Creek. Alternatives that avoid wetland loss, such as greater use of other airports, must be considered. If mitigation is the only alternative, a full accounting of how, and at what cost, these resources will be mitigated. Expansion proposals must account for how culverting Abram Creek will affect the water quality of the Rocky River and Lake Erie, explain how it will remediate these effects, and how much it will cost the taxpayers.

Alternatives must be considered that will minimize the contributions to the poor air quality that already exists and that will increase with an expanded Hopkins.

Once these issues are resolved, further expansion at Hopkins will be achievable, and the landmark legislation passed today will ensure funding can be made available.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, have you noticed that you tend to get sick every time you fly? Many of us who are frequent flyers, know that the air on commercial flights is stale and poorly ventilated, and in some cases, it really does seem to make you ill. Though hundreds of flight crewmembers have reported hundreds of separate incidents of unexplained headaches, blurred vision and other health problems, no one has closely looked into this problem.

Health risks associated with poor air quality in airplanes include exposure to toxins, airborne viruses, and ozone. These risks are worsened by the fact that passengers do not breathe fresh air on flights, but instead inhale re-circulated ''bleed air'' that passes through the engine.

Passengers should be able to feel confident that they are not endangering their health when they fly to visit friends and relatives or as they arrive and depart from business trips. Airline industry workers should not feel their health is threatened as they earn a living. We must learn the nature and extent of the health risks that are associated with poor cabin air quality so that the problem can be corrected.

After learning of the potentially dangerous health risks for frequent flyers and flight crewmembers, I urged the AIR–21 conferees during negotiations to include a study of the air quality on commercial flights in this bill. I am pleased that the conference report calls for a comprehensive, 12-month study into the air quality of commercial airplane flight cabins. The independent study, to be undertaken by the National Academy of Sciences, will look into the contaminants to which flight crew and passengers are exposed, as well as the consequences of using engine and auxiliary ''bleed air'' as air sources. This study is long overdue.

The AIR–21 conference report also provides for a one-year study into the effects of helicopter noise on individuals in densely populated areas. As a representative of Manhattan and parts of Brooklyn, I have heard the pleas from many of my constituents who have been plagued by the daily disruption of helicopter noise. It is time for the FAA to investigate the harm this noise inflicts upon residents and develop procedures to reduce helicopter noise as much as possible.

The conference report addresses important safety concerns, as well as the growing capacity and infrastructure demands of the aviation industry. That is why I urge my fellow colleagues to support it.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of a number of provisions included in the Conference Report to H.R. 1000, the Wendell H. Ford Aviation Investment & Reform Act for the 21st Century (AIR–21), including Emergency Locator Transmitters (ELTs) and a study on helicopter noise. Unfortunately, I am voting against the legislation because it provides federal aviation programs budgetary protection not afforded to other equally vital federal programs.

I strongly support the ELT section included in this conference report and thank the House and Senate conference committees for including this life-saving provision.

On December 24, 1996 a Learjet with Pilot Johan Schwartz, 31, of Westport, Connecticut and Patrick Hayes, 30, of Clinton, Connecticut lost contact with the control tower at the Lebanon, New Hampshire Airport. Despite efforts by the federal government, New Hampshire state and local authorities, and Connecticut authorities, a number of extremely well organized ground searches failed to locate the two gentlemen or the airplane until November 1999—almost three years later.

The disappearance of the Learjet on Christmas Eve was a true tragedy. In my judgment, what is particularly frustrating about this situation is that had the plane been equipped with a moderately-priced location device, the plane may have been found quickly. While current law requires most planes to be equipped with an ELT, there are several exceptions.

For this reason, together with the rest of the Connecticut Congressional delegation and Congressman NEAL of Massachusetts, I introduced H.R. 267, to require ELTs on fixed wing aircraft, with a few exemptions, including planes used by manufacturers in development exercises, agricultural crop planes, acrobatic show planes and large commercial planes which already have on-board technology to be quickly located.

In a tragedy—where time can play the difference between life and death—it is critical aircraft are equipped with locating devices

necessary to find the plane and its passengers.

I am extremely grateful for ELT provisions—which will save lives and funds spent on expensive search efforts—are included in the conference report today.

I also strongly support helicopter noise study provisions included in the conference report. I understand frustration with aircraft noise. It is loud and disruptive. The noise level can be overwhelming, and diminishes quality of life. I have been working for many years with officials at the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and local residents, to control aircraft noise in Fairfield County.

During consideration of the House-passed version, a provision I supported on helicopter noise was included in the manager's amendment to H.R. 1000. I am glad to see the conference report retains this provision to require the Secretary of Transportation to conduct a one-year study on the effects of nonmilitary helicopter noise on individuals and develop recommendations for noise reduction. In order to combat noise pollution from helicopters it is imperative we understand how it is affecting individuals and how to best reduce it.

On budgetary reasons, I cannot, however, support this conference report. AIR–21 authorizes approximately $40 billion over three years through fiscal year 2003 (FY 03) for airport improvements, air traffic control and Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) operations. Of this amount, $33 billion is allocated from the aviation trust fund and $7 billion will be ''available for appropriation'' from the general fund.

While I am pleased the conference report does not take the aviation trust fund off-budget, I do not support establishing a series of parliamentary points of order designed to guarantee authorized funding levels for aviation.

As someone who uses flies on a weekly basis, I understand the importance of a safe, efficient aviation system. But, I oppose affording aviation special protections not given to other important programs. In my judgment aviation programs should have to compete for funds in the overall budget, just as education, healthcare, elderly services and veterans programs are required to do.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise in strong support of H.R. 1000, the Aviation Investment and Reform Act for the 21st Century. I also want to commend Chairman Shuster and the Transportation Committee staff for their tireless efforts to improve the safety and efficiency of the nation's aviation system. As the number of Americans using our national airway system continues to increase, it is essential that we provide the necessary tools and resources to make air travel as safe and efficient as possible. Today, the House is considering legislation that will do just that. H.R. 1000, the Aviation Investment and Reform Act for the 21st Century, makes great strides toward improving passenger safety and reducing delays in our nation's aviation system.

America's skies are becoming increasingly crowded and, with aging radar and computer systems, passenger safety would have ultimately been at risk. AIR–21 takes the necessary steps to keep our skies safe by providing a $40 billion investment in America's aviation infrastructure designed to increase passenger safety and reduce flight delays.

In addition, AIR–21 will produce a greater return on Oklahoma's investment to the Aviation Trust Fund. Oklahoma's three primary airports—Will Rogers World Airport in Oklahoma City, Tulsa International Airport, and Lawton-Ft. Sill Regional—as well as 75 general aviation airports throughout Oklahoma, will see a significant increase in their funding. This increased funding will be used to improve the infrastructure and safety of Oklahoma's aviation system by upgrading equipment, modernizing computer systems, and improving landing strips across the State. These much needed improvements will attract future aviation industry to Oklahoma which will, in turn, bring more jobs to the citizens of our State.

Mr. Speaker, today we have the opportunity to enable significant improvements to the aviation system in the United States and ensure the safety of America's skies. I am honored to have the opportunity to play a role in making these significant improvements possible by casting my vote in favor of H.R. 1000. I strongly urge my colleagues in the House to join me in support of this very important legislation.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong support for the conference report on AIR–21. This conference agreement is a product of hard fought negotiations by the conferees and it deserves our support.

The needs of our aviation system are great and last summer's delays were an obvious reminder of how bad things will get as the number of people traveling by air increases. AIR–21 addresses these needs by authorizing record levels of funding and by returning the aviation tax dollars to the aviation system. Through these investments air travel will be safer, competition between airlines will be improved and the level of confidence in the management of the FAA will be raised.

As a conferee, I supported the provisions which allow exemptions to the current perimeter rule at Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport. However, I want to make it clear that these limited exemptions must benefit citizens throughout the West. It should be clear that this very limited number of exemptions must not be awarded solely or disproportionately to one carrier or one airport. I expect that the DOT will ensure that the maximum number of cities benefit from these 12 slots.

Closer to home in Alaska, AIR–21 will provide great benefits. With over eleven hundred airports, seaplane bases and aircraft landing areas, Alaska has the largest number of general aviation airports in the U.S.

Because Alaska does not have a comprehensive road system, Alaskans must use air travel for tasks we take for granted, such as grocery shopping and medical care. The passage of AIR–21 will make flying in Alaska safer. For the first time general aviation airports will have a dedicated funding source that complements the airport improvement program to improve runways, install much needed lighting and enhance communications.

I appreciate the opportunity to speak today and commend Chairman SHUSTER for his leadership and dedication to improving air travel. AIR–21 is a good bill and one that I encourage all members to support.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to take a moment to recognize Mr. Jack King and his son, Chip King, a Navy fighter pilot. Jack is a public relations manager with United Space Alliance in my district, and is well known in the space program as the ''Voice of Apollo.'' It was Jack's voice that millions of Americans heard chronicling our early adventures in space.

And, appropriately, his son, Chip, is also in the aerospace business. He's flying F–14s, and he recently flew a Sports Illustrated correspondent to give the public a taste of flying jet fighters. That flight was reported in the September 1999 edition of the magazine, and I will submit the full text of that article for the RECORD.

This is a great story about a father and son working in one of the industries in which our nation leads the world—aerospace. We need to work together in Washington to ensure fathers like Jack continue to work in our space industry, and that sons like Chip continue to faithfully serve in defense of our nation.

[From Sports Illustrated Magazine, Sept. 20, 1999]

ON A WING AND A PRAYER

(By Rick Reilly)

Now this message for America's most famous athletes: Someday you may be invited to fly in the backseat of one of your country's most powerful fighter jets. Many of you already have—John Elway, John Stockton, Tiger Woods to name a few. If you get this opportunity, let me urge you, with the greatest sincerity. . . .

Move to Guam. Change your name. Fake your own death. Whatever you do, do not go. I know. The U.S. Navy invited me to try it. I was thrilled, I was pumped. I was toast!

I should've known when they told me my pilot would be Chip (Biff) King of Fighter Squadron 213 at Naval Air Station Oceana in Virginia Beach. Whatever you're thinking a Top Gun named Chip (Biff) King looks like, triple it. He's about six-foot, tan, ice-blue eyes, wavy surfer hair, finger-crippling handshake—the kind of man who wrestles dyspeptic alligators in his leisure time. If you see this man, run the other way. Fast.

Biff King was born to fly. His father, Jack King, was for years the voice of NASA missions. (''T-minus 15 seconds and counting. . . .'' Remember?) Chip would charge neighborhood kids a quarter each to hear his dad. Jack would wake up from naps surrounded by nine-year-olds waiting for him to say, ''We have a liftoff.''

Biff was to fly me in an F–14D Tomcat, a ridiculously powerful $60 million weapon with nearly as much thrust as weight, not unlike Colin Montgomerie. I was worried about getting airsick, so the night before the flight I asked Biff if there was something I should eat the next morning.

''Bananas,'' he said.

''For the potassium?'' I asked.

''No,'' Biff said, ''because they taste about the same coming up as they do going down.''

The next morning, out on the tarmac, I had on my flight suit with my name sewn over the left breast. (No call sign—like Crash or Sticky or Leadfoot—but, still, very cool.) I carried my helmet in the crook of my arm, as Biff had instructed.

A fighter pilot named Psycho gave me a safety briefing and then fastened me into my ejection seat, which, when employed, would ''egress'' me out of the plane at such a velocity that I would be immediately knocked unconscious.

Just as I was thinking about aborting the flight, the canopy closed over me, and Biff gave the ground crew a thumbs-up. In minutes we were firing nose up at 600 mph. We leveled out and then canopy-rolled over another F–14. Those 20 minutes were the rush of my life. Unfortunately, the ride lasted 80.

It was like being on the roller coaster at Six Flags Over Hell. Only without rails. We

did barrel rolls, sap rolls, loops, yanks and banks. We dived, rose and dived again, sometimes with a vertical velocity of 10,000 feet per minute. We chased another F–14, and it chased us. We broke the speed of sound. Sea was sky and sky was sea. Flying at 200 feet we did 90-degree turns at 550 mph, creating a G force of 6.5, which is to say I felt as if 6.5 times my body weight was smashing against me, thereby approximating life as Mrs. Colin Montgomerie.

And I egressed the bananas. I egressed the pizza from the night before. And the lunch before that. I egressed a box of Milk Duds from the sixth grade, I made Linda Blair look polite. Because of the G's, I was egressing stuff that did not even want to be egressed. I went through not one airsick bag, but two. Biff said I passed out. Twice.

I was coated in sweat. At one point, as we were coming in upside down in a banked curve on a mock bombing target and the G's were flattening me like a tortilla and I was in and out of consciousness, I realized I was the first person in history to throw down.

I used to know cool. Cool was Elway throwing a touchdown pass, or Norman making a five-iron bite. But now I really know cool. Cool is guys like Biff, men with cast-iron stomachs and Freon nerves. I wouldn't go up there again for Derek Jeter's black book, but I'm glad Biff does every day, and for less a year than a rookie reliever makes in a home stand.

A week later, when the spins finally stopped, Biff called. He said he and the fighters had the perfect call sign for me. Said he'd send it on a patch for my flight suit.

What is it? I asked.

''Two Bags.''

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to cast my vote in support of H.R. 1000, the Wendell H. Ford Aviation Investment & Reform Act for the 21st Century conference report. This crucial piece of legislation will not only allow the aviation system of the United States to provide needed improvements and remedy problems facing the industry today, but will also move our Nation's aviation system well into the next century.

The U.S. aviation system is in more dire need than most realize. Within the last five years air travel has increased 27%, and is expected to increase over 50%, to one billion passengers over the next ten years. This incredible increase is forcing the aviation system into a gridlock, which will result in a deterioration of safety, harm the efficiency and growth of our domestic economy, damage our position in the global marketplace and threaten the lives of our Nation's families.

Already, recent aviation accidents have highlighted the overwhelming importance of this legislation. Today's air traffic control system is the equivalent of a bridge about to collapse as more and more air traffic strains the system. Regrettably, I personally experienced the severity of this situation. As my Hudson Valley colleagues and I fought to acquire modern air traffic control equipment for Stewart International Airport in our region, it horrified us to learn that vital pieces of equipment, including a radar screen, were not available and that our air traffic controllers had been forced to use binoculars to guide in passenger aircraft.

New safety and security recommendations must be implemented and modernization efforts, already many years behind schedule, must be completed. The capital investments and operational funds needed to meet these priorities and to support the overall advancement of our air traffic control system are indeed daunting and must be met.

Today, the House of Representatives has the opportunity to make our airports and skies safer by passing this conference report. To my constituents in New York's 20th Congressional District, who live in the flight paths of Stewart and other regional airports, the passage of this bill will have a tremendous effect. This conference Report ensures that the FAA will have the funding to hire and retain air traffic controllers, maintenance technicians, and safety inspectors necessary to keep our airways safe. It will enhance safety at our airports by providing funding to modernize air traffic control facilities, improve runways and install collision avoidance systems. H.R. 1000 will increase the amount of money available for noise abatement projects, creates a new environmental streamlining program and encourages airports to use low emission vehicles.

In conclusion, this measure will be the most important piece of legislation for our Nation's aviation system to date. It will make our airways and airports safer, more competitive and more friendly to the communities around them and our Nation as a whole.

Accordingly, I urge our colleagues to fully support this important aviation measure.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1000, The Wendell H. Ford Aviation Investment and Reform Act for the 21st Century.

Mr. Speaker, this bill does not address the critical aviation needs of the South Suburbs of Chicago. Chicago desperately needs a South Suburban airport to be able not only to maintain its current level of aviation traffic but to continue to receive new flights into the community. Chicago is currently the aviation center of the United States. However, under this legislation, Chicago is certain to lose its preeminence as the nation's aviation leader.

Specifically, H.R. 1000 lifts slot restrictions at O'Hare airport after July 1, 2002. In the interim, the Department of Transportation must provide exemption to any airline flying to O'Hare if it uses aircraft with 70 seats or less under similar conditions outlined above. In addition, beginning on July 1, 2001, slot restrictions will apply only between the hours of 2:45 p.m. and 8:14 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, this is not an effective answer to the problems surrounding O'Hare airport. Just this past year, we have seen significantly higher delays at O'Hare airport. Attempting to push more flights into an already overcrowded airport will not solve the capacity problems of Chicago O'Hare nor will it reduce delays and congestion. In fact, this will only exacerbate a problem that will get progressively worse.

Aviation demand is expected to more than double by the year 2015. In order to meet this demand, it is necessary to expand and grow capacity, not to simply put more flights into an already overcrowded air system. Not only will this strategy force more delays, but it will also potentially increase the safety risks of the traveling public.

Both O'Hare and Midway will have reached operational capacity in the very near future. Unfortunately, neither of these airports can physically expand as they are both constrained by urban growth around them. Chicago is the nation's aviation leader, and, in order to protect that status, we must look beyond O'Hare and Midway airports and begin serious work on the South Suburban Airport—an airport that can grow and expand to meet the demands of this new century.

Additionally, the South Suburban Airport would create 236,000 permanent jobs and $5.1 billion in annual wages. 2.4 million people live within 45 minutes of the proposed South Suburban Airport—these people need and deserve to have the third airport built. Mr. Speaker, the time has come for the South Suburban Airport. Clearly, we need an airport which can grown and expand as necessary while relieving the congestion and delays at our other Chicago airports.

Finally, the bill contains no funds for the third airport. While the bill does contain what is effectively a tax increase on the flying public, not one dime is spent towards the creation of a South Suburban Airport. The measure authorizes the FAA to permit an airport to levy a Passenger Facility Charge of up to $4.50. This represents a 50 percent increase over the current Passenger Facility Charge. Mr. Speaker, I cannot support raising the prices that the flying public must pay to reach their destination when no funds are provided for the creation of a South Suburban Airport.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am very supportive of the Conference agreement provisions which allow exemptions to the current perimeter rule at Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport. I commend you on creating a process which I believe fairly balances the interests of Senators from states inside the perimeter and those of us from Western states without convenient access to Reagan National.

As you know, I have been involved and supportive of this effort since the legislation was first introduced. I want to reiterate that these limited exemptions must benefit citizens throughout the west. I want to make it clear that this very limited number of exemptions must not be awarded solely or disproportionately to one carrier or one airport. I expect that the DOT will ensure that the maximum number of cities benefit from these 12 slots.

While I would have preferred to eliminate the perimeter rule altogether or have more slots available for improved access to the West, the final agreement includes 12 slots and now the DOT must ensure that all parts of the West benefit. I am particularly concerned that small and midsized communities in the West, especially in the Northern tier have improved access through hubs like Salt Lake City.

These limited exemptions to the perimeter rule from hubs like Salt Lake City will improve service to the nation's capital for dozens of Western cities beyond the perimeter—while at the same time ensuring that cities inside the perimeter are not adversely impacted by new service. This is a fair balance which is consistent with the overall intent of the bill to improve air service to small and medium-sized cities.

Throughout this bill, our goal has been to improve air service for communities which have not experienced the benefits of deregulation to the extent of larger markets. The provision related to improved access to Reagan National is no different. Today, passengers from small and medium-sized communities in the West are forced to double or even triple connect to fly to Reagan National. My goal is to ensure that not just large city point-to-point service will benefit, but that passengers from all points west of the perimeter will have better

options to reach Washington and Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport via connections at Western hubs like Salt Lake City. This provision is about using this restricted exemption process to spread improved access throughout the West—not to limit the benefits to a few large cities which already have a variety of options.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my support for H.R. 1000, the Aviation Investment and Reform Act for the 21st Century. First, I would like to congratulate Chairman DUNCAN and Ranking Member LIPINSKI for their tireless efforts on behalf of this bill.

I also want to thank Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member OBERSTAR for their leadership on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. The bipartisan way in which these two gentlemen conduct the committee is an example for all. Under their direction, this Congress has made the maintenance of and investment in our nation's infrastructure a top priority.

AIR–21 is good news for the American people and the country. This legislation maintains the integrity of the trust funds and reinforces the idea that the money we collect from air passengers should be spent on aviation to reduce the backlog of infrastructure needs at our nation's airports.

I am pleased that the impasse over this vital piece of legislation has ended and that the FAA will finally receive the funding they so desperately need. Additionally, AIR–21 is extremely important to Philadelphia, as well as to all airports because it provides the funding necessary to make improvements, enhance capacity, and to increase safety.

AIR–21 will increase spending on airport improvements, air traffic control, and other aviation needs. This ''record level of investment,'' as Secretary Slater called the $40 billion that will go to the FAA, will make air travel safer and more efficient for everyone.

Mr. Speaker, we have all heard about how crowded our skies are. Domestic air travel had 655 million passengers over the past five years. This number is expected to reach over one billion in the next ten years. Air travel is the mode of choice for travelers today. The demand is unbelievable and is evidenced at Philadelphia International Airport, which is one of the busiest airports in the eastern region. The passage of this legislation will go a long way towards making Philadelphia International a better airport. Under this Conference Agreement Philadelphia Airport, a major hub, will receive almost $7 million. This money will be used for new projects that will improve the efficiency of Philadelphia's airport, since it is congested throughout the day and not just at peak times. Last year, the airport had over 23 million passengers and the funds that Philadelphia International Airport will receive will allow the airport to provide increased capacity for these travelers and to promote safety as well.

I would also like to note that the increase in the Passenger Facility Charge that the conferees reached agreement on is also important to Philadelphia's airport. This modest raise in the cap on the PFC will also allow individual airports, like Philadelphia, the flexibility to proceed with improvement projects not eligible for funding through the Airport Improvement Program.

The passage of this bill is essential because it increases funding for air traffic control modernization by almost 50 percent and funding for airport improvements will increase by more than 50 percent. This level of investment is vital to all airports not just Philadelphia's.

Mr. Speaker, I offer my support for AIR–21 and I urge my colleagues to vote for this important legislation. H.R. 1000 is good for transportation and good for the nation.

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Title IX of the Conference Report and will limit my remarks to Title IX of the Agreement, which provides a three-year authorization for the research and development activities of the Federal Aviation Administration.

I am particularly pleased with the authorization levels that are provided for aviation research and development, both in Title IX and in the Airway Facilities portion of the bill. The budget growth provided by Title IX is focused on more long-term research and will help reverse recent declines in this essential component of the agency's R&D investment.

Sufficient funds must be provided to enable FAA's research and development programs to develop the new technologies that will help increase the capacity and efficiency of operation of the airspace system, while ensuring its safety and security.

I would like to highlight a provision in Title IX that requires FAA to provide Congress with a complete description of its R&D programs. Some confusion exists about the full scope of FAA's R&D activities, since they appear in different parts of the agency's annual budget submission.

The Inspector General (IG) of the Department of Transportation, in recent testimony before the Science Committee, recommended that FAA identify in its budget basic research, applied research, and development activities, including prototype development. The IG pointed out that such reporting will give the agency a better idea of how it spends development funds and will provide Congress with a more comprehensive picture of FAA's civil aviation R&D investments.

The reporting provision included in Title IX requires FAA to provide Congress with a comprehensive description of its R&D programs by identifying the individual projects that appear in each category of the agency's budget. This information must be provided annually by FAA in the National Aviation Research Plan.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to thank our Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member OBERSTAR on the Transportation Committee for working with us on Title IX. And as always it has been a pleasure working with Chairwoman MORELLA on FAA's research and development provisions. This Conference Agreement will ensure that FAA has the R&D resources needed to meet its challenging goals for the modernization of the national airspace system and for improving the safety of air travel.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the AIR–21 Conference Report which reauthorizes funding for the Federal Aviation Administration. As a conferee on this bill, I am pleased that we were able to come together in a bipartisan fashion to provide the funding the FAA needs to provide America with a first class aviation infrastructure for the 21st century.

First, I want to thank Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member OBERSTAR for their leadership and persistence in making certain that all aviation tax revenue and interest be spent each year on aviation programs.

The Conference Agreement authorizes $40 billion in funding for the next three fiscal years—a 26 percent increase in FY01 alone. This funding provides increases for all aspects of the FAA, to modernize its systems and deal more effectively with our expanding air transportation industry.

This legislation serves to increase competition and aid small communities. The provisions to lift all slot restrictions at O'Hare, La Guardia and Kennedy, and increase the number of slots at National Airport can only help new airlines provide service and underserved communities receive service. I worked hard to ensure that rural communities in the Midwest stood to benefit from these new provisions. By improving capacity at large and small airports, the bill ensures more equitable competition in an industry where individual air carriers have market dominance over many communities. And by promoting access, the bill increases service which currently have little or no markets at all.

The bill also provides funding for small and general aviation airports through an annual entitlement. This provision will guarantee that small and general aviation airports will receive an annual federal investment to continue to implement safety improvements and projects to increase efficiency.

Finally, AIR–21 should provide money to allow the FAA to make administrative changes without harming ongoing effective programs like the Air Traffic Control Contract Program. I recently urged the FAA Administrator to reject proposals by some bureaucrats to cut this program which is so vital to many small communities, and I hope now with passage of AIR–21, she will do so.

Mr. Speaker, again I want to thank Chairman SHUSTER, Mr. OBERSTAR, Chairman DUNCAN, and Mr. LIPINSKI for their leadership in bringing this bill to the floor today. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation in order to bring our aviation system into the 21st century.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member rises in strong support of the conference report for H.R. 1000, the AIR–21 legislation. This legislation is clearly needed to unlock the Aviation Trust Fund and to provide adequate funding for our nation's airports.

This Member would like to begin by commending the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, (Mr. SHUSTER), the Chairman of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee; the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the ranking member of the Transportation Committee; the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN), the Chairman of the Aviation Subcommittee; and the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI), the ranking member of the Subcommittee and the other members of the conference committee for their extraordinary work in developing this conference report and bringing it to the Floor. This Member appreciates their diligence, persistence, and hard work.

This is an important bill for this Member's district, for the State of Nebraska, and for the Nation. It addresses the country's growing aviation needs in a fiscally responsible manner. Quite simply, the bill recognizes the need to spend aviation taxes on the aviation system. During the 105th Congress we restored the trust with American drivers by ensuring that gas taxes actually will be spent as available primarily on highway construction and

maintenance. It is now time to ensure that this trust is restored with the flying public.

This conference report will lead to significantly increased funding for our nation's airports. As a result, it will result in reduced flight delays, improved air safety, and greater competition. The American people deserve to see this legislation enacted. They deserve it because they've already paid in taxes what it will now authorize.

This Member is concerned about growing needs at our nation's airports. While more people are flying, airport improvements are simply not keeping pace. That's because the money that passengers are paying each time they fly and fuel taxes are accumulating in the trust fund rather than being put to use to improve our airports and provide safer flying.

Unless we act now, the problems will only get worse. It is now anticipated that air travel will increase by more than 40 percent over the next ten years. This surge will place increased demands on an already over-burdened aviation system. According to the General Accounting Office, we are underfunding airport infrastructure by at least $3 billion each year. Currently, the needs of smaller airports are twice as great as their funding sources. Fortunately, we have the ability to act now. We can improve the system without raising taxes or threatening the funding for other government programs or services. We must unlock the money in the Aviation Trust Fund and spend it for what it was intended.

Airports across the country and the passengers who use them will all benefit from passage of this legislation. Large airports as well as small airports will be able to modernize and expand once the Trust Fund money is released.

The increases in funding will be substantial and passengers will notice the results if we make these investments now. As an example, the Lincoln Municipal Airport in Nebraska currently receives an entitlement of about $1 million per year. Under the conference report, this will increase to more than $2 million annually. Such an increase would greatly assist the airport with its planned $5 million runway project, which would replace the surface, comply with new safety requirements, and provide new lighting. General aviation airports in Nebraska, in communities such as Beatrice, Falls City, Blair, Fremont, Norfolk, York, Plattsmouth, and Nebraska City will also receive annual entitlements which will assist them with necessary projects.

Mr. Speaker, this Member urges his colleagues to support the conference report for H.R. 1000. It will provide the American people with the aviation system that they have paid for and deserve.

GENERAL AVIATION—CONFERENCE GA ENTITLEMENT

NEBRASKA

ANW—Ainsworth Municipal, Ainsworth, $150,000.
BVN—Albion Municipal, Albion, 150,000.
AIA—Alliance Municipal, Alliance, $117,533.
BIE—Beatrice Municipal, Beatrice, $39,800.
FNB—Brenner Field, Falls City, $60,000.
CDR—Chadron Municipal, Chadron, $111,600.
CNP—Chappell Municipal, Chappell, $1,000.
OLU—Columbus Municipal, Columbus, $43,200.
K46—Eagle Field, Blair, $150,000.
FBY—Fairbury Municipal, Fairbury, $118,800.
FET—Fremont Municipal, Fremont, $80,000.
OKS—Garden County, Oshkosh, $150,000.
HSI—Hastings Municipal, Hastings, $69,000.
IML—Imperial Municipal, Imperial, $119,200.
OFK—Karl Stefan Memorial, Norfolk, $150,000.
EAR—Kearney Municipal, Kearney, $80,475.
LXN—Lexington (Jim Kel), Lexington, $130,000.
MCK—Mc Cook Municipal, Mc Cook, $84,000.
VTN—Miller Field, Valentine, $150,000.
9V5—Modisett, Rushville, $99,253.
4D9—Municipal, Alma, $36,800.
JYR—Municipal, York, $100,000.
AFK—Nebraska City Municipal, Nebraska City, $150,000.
0V3—Pioneer Village Field, Minden, $77,200.
PMV—Plattsmouth Municipal, Plattsmouth, $150,000.
OGA—Searle Field, Ogallala, $93,400.
Summary for 'State' = NE (26 detail records)—Sum $2,661,261.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1000.

Although I support the reauthorization of the FAA and the Airport Improvement Program, I find the manipulation of the current budgeting process in this bill detrimental to a fiscally sound government, for which the Republicans have been fighting, and have achieved, as the majority party.

Why do we want to take a step backwards, back to when this House was governed by a tax and spend policy, in a misguided attempt to drastically inflate a federal agency's budget?

Where is the Republican agenda—the agenda to make the federal government smaller, leaner, more efficient?

This bill could increase taxes by an estimated $700 million if all the airports levy the additional charge that this bill authorizes—and I have no reason to believe that they wouldn't.

Is this what Congress wants to do today, raise taxes by $700 million when we have a surplus and are trying to cut taxes?

I cannot support this approach. With the rise in fuel costs, which has equated to a rise in airline prices, we don't need to pile on to this and put another increase onto an air traveler's expenses.

In addition, it is disappointing to see this bill come before the House today under the slogan of ''unlocking the Aviation Trust Fund.''

Federal trust funds are not your run-of-the-mill trust fund that can be compared to a family or business trust fund. These federal trust funds are authorizations for appropriations, and this has always been the intent since their creation.

But, don't take my word for it. Let me quote a CRS report:

> Whatever their intended purposes, federal trust funds are basically record-keeping devices that account for the spending authority available for certain programs. Although frequently thought of as holding financial assets, they do not.

I repeat: trust funds do not hold financial assets; there is no money in them.

The report goes on to say:

> Simply stated, as long as a trust fund has a balance, the Treasury Department has authority to keep issuing checks for the program, but balances do not provide the treasury with the cash to cover these checks.

So if it's the right policy to take trust funds off-budget, where is the cash going to come from to cover the checks written on the trust fund balance? Are we going to cut funding for our schools, for law enforcement, for environmental programs, for our Veterans?

We need to take a step back and understand where this road leads us.

I understand the supporters of this measure see guaranteed money every year.

Wouldn't this be nice if everyone had a guaranteed stream of cash flowing into their coffers every October First? But, that is not the way to run a fiscally responsible government.

We simply cannot govern a nation by compartmentalizing our budget through dedicated funding streams. Revenue streams must be spent on the nation's priorities as a whole. You can't run a business by restricting cash flows to expenses directly attributable to their related sales. Can GM effectively compete in the world market if the money they received from selling shock absorbers couldn't be used for maintenance of brake manufacturing equipment? No. GM can't, and neither can the federal government.

Republicans have governed our nation's tax dollars with restraint and have given the taxpayer some of their money back with tax cuts.

Let's not sabotage 5 and a half years of work. We should be looking at ways of streamlining federal agencies, not bloating their budgets by creating a mandatory account and increasing the taxes for this account.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman SHUSTER and Ranking Member OBERSTAR for the much needed Aviation Investment and Reform Act.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this Conference Report on H.R. 1000. Just last Friday, at the Philadelphia International Airport in my district, the air traffic control technology went down for 30 minutes. Thank God there were no incidents.

The FAA is—even as I speak—still trying to figure out what went wrong. This much needed legislation will speed up the process of updating that technology for the safety of the thousands of people who use our airport.

Mr. Speaker, my son, daughter-in-law and two precious granddaughters are flying out of Philadelphia Airport on Thursday. I want to make sure that they and everyone's children and grandchildren who are traveling are as safe as can be. This legislation will help Philadelphia International acquire state-of-the-art technology to keep the public safe. There is no price that can be put on human lives. So we should pass this report and spend what is needed to protect our constituents.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I speak out today in strong opposition to the conference report on the Aviation Investment and Reform Act, better known as AIR21. While there is much to be said for certain portions of that measure, the negative aspects of it are far more pervasive. For many people living in the northwest suburbs of Chicago, those aspects are nothing short of disastrous.

To be sure, this AIR21 conference report will make more money available to our nation's airports, not just for construction work but for service enhancements and security improvements as well. In addition, it will allow more people to fly to and from the busiest of those airports. For some people, those two features may be good news. But, for many others, they are anything but.

Not only will the 50% increase in the Passenger Facility Charge (PFC) have a negative

affect on the airlines and those who patronize them, but the phaseout of the High Density Rule at O'Hare, LaGuardia and JFK Airports and the easing of that Rule at Reagan National Airport in Washington D.C. will be a living nightmare for thousands of people living near those facilities. In addition to being awakened at all hours of the day or night, but they will have a hard time getting much sleep in the first place.

Hardest hit will be those people who live near Chicago's O'Hare Airport. For them, the High Density Rule, or slot rule as it is often called, will be phased out by July 1, 2002, not January 1, 2007 as is the case for La Guardia and JFK Airports in New York. Or to put it another way, in just over two years, there will no longer be any set limit on the number of flights that can arrive at, or depart from, O'Hare even though efforts to reduce existing noise levels there have met with little success. When that happens, not only is the total number of flights to and from O'Hare likely to increase dramatically—but so too will airport noise levels and the risk of planes colliding either on the runway or in nearby airspace. That two airliners nearly flew into one another over Lake Michigan not long ago should alert us to the fact that additions to O'Hare's very busy flight schedule could have safety as well as noise implications.

That said, Mr. Speaker and colleagues, please know that I fully understand and appreciate why you may want to make it easier for your constituents to visit Chicago, either to vacation or to conduct business. With all that the city has to offer—the Magnificent Mile, Navy Pier, the Museum of Science and Industry, Grant Park, the Field Museum, Shedd Aquarium and many other attractions too numerous to mention—it is no wonder that people from all over the country want more flights, and better flights schedules, to the City of Broad Shoulders. Make no mistake about it, Chicago is a wonderful place to visit and those of us fortunate enough to live in or near the city want to make it as easy as possible for anyone to do so. However, that can be readily accomplished without making it almost impossible for those living near O'Hare to get a good night's sleep, to carry on a quiet conversation, to have a peaceful cookout in their own back yard, or to relax in the knowledge that aircraft safety is not being put to an additional test.

As things now stand, there are no less than four other regional airports within 100 miles of Chicago. One of these—the Greater Rockford Airport—already has a 10,000 foot runway, the second longest in Illinois, plus an 8,200 foot runway and a 65,000 square foot passenger terminal that is currently underutilized. Another—Midway Airport on the west side of Chicago—is in the midst of a terminal expansion program that will enable it to serve even more air passengers than it does already. Since the passenger terminal at Greater Rockford could be expanded also, there is no compelling reason why any additional flights to Chicago could not be diverted to those two airports without inconveniencing air passengers to any great extent. Both lie within 60 miles of O'Hare, for those passengers wishing to catch a connecting flight and neither all that far, or out of reach, from downtown Chicago.

Given the existence of such an attractive and relatively-easy-to implement alternative to the adverse consequences of increasing flights to and from O'Hare, I would urge my colleagues to vote against this conference report. Not only would its defeat today enable us to make changes that would accommodate the demands for additional air service to Chicago by directing any extra flights to either Midway Airport or Greater Rockford Airport, but it would give us an opportunity to make several other improvements as well.

For instance, we could—and should—eliminate the 50% increase in the PFC that is making the airlines, their passengers and residents around O'Hare Airport understandably nervous. Also, we could—and should—take a look and see whether air traffic safety and aircraft noise abatement programs are being sufficiently funded and, if not, whether funds should be transferred from other projects so that people living near major airports can have some peace and quiet as well as peace of mind. They deserve every bit as much consideration as those who wish to see additional air service become a reality.

With that, Mr. Speaker, let me close by once again urging my colleagues to vote down this conference report. We can, and should, make it responsive not just to the needs of air travelers but to the very legitimate concerns of those living near our Nation's airports as well.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report for the Aviation Investment and Reform Act for the 21st Century.

As a conferee on the Research and Development section of AIR–21, I applaud the strong bipartisan support for the significant increase in funding levels for the FAA's research, engineering, and development program. It is remarkable that the FY 2001 authorization will be 51% more than the current funding levels for these valuable activities.

However, some sections of the Aviation Investment and Reform Act are misguided in their purpose and detrimental to many of our constituents.

If the conference report for AIR–21 passes the House today, twenty-four new slots will be added to Reagan National Airport. Half of these additional slots will be used for flights outside of the existing perimeter rule of 1,250 miles.

Drafters of this legislation claim that additional slots will increase airline competition. What they do not realize is that the Washington Metropolitan Area retains an enviably high level of competitive service. Most major cities are served by a single airport with a dominant carrier. Washington, on the other hand, is fortunate to be served by three airports. With no dominant carrier, changing the slot and perimeter rule will only damage the environmental and economic balance that exists between National, Dulles, and BWI Airports. An increase in flights at National could mean fewer flights in and out of Dulles and BWI—which, in turn, would cause further flight delays.

The slot rule was originally part of a ''good faith'' agreement between federal, local, and airport officials when control of National and Dulles was transferred from the FAA to a local authority—the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority (MWAA). This ''good faith'' provision has the effect of abating airport and air traffic noise. Any tampering with the current slot rule will open the doors to further changes that would impact the airports' neighbors in Maryland and Virginia.

The daily lives of these citizens are interrupted enough by airplane noise. They do not need additional flights disturbing their children at school or their family dinners at home. More and more, scientific studies reveal that noise at the decibel levels found in communities neighboring airports may cause hearing loss, impaired health, and antisocial behavior. On the floor of the House, I have often stressed that unlike oil spills or landfills, noise is an invisible pollutant, but the hazards are just as real.

The Federal Government should not be in the business of operating airports. The citizens living in the Washington Metropolitan area must have a voice in the ultimate determination of decisions that affect airport and air traffic noise. They are the ones that have to live each day with our decision.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank the conferees for including a provision in this bill that will help airports, like the Sarasota-Brandenton International Airport in my District, use certain terminal costs to be eligible for Passenger Facility Charge funding. As the author of the language, I also wish to clarify that the intent of the last three lines of Section 152 (2)(c) that reads ''between calendar year 1989 and calendar year 1997,'' specifically refers to calendar years 1990 through 1996 and does not include calendar years 1989 and 1997.

Mr. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. SHUSTER, once again for developing legislation that returns budgetary honesty to our trust funds, ensuring that the necessary funding for our nation's transportation infrastructure is provided. Similar to the success of TEA–21 enacted last Congress, this bill, Wendell H. Ford Aviation Investment and Reform Act for the 21st Century (AIR–21), will make certain that the receipts and interest of the Aviation and Airways Trust Fund are used to improve our aviation infrastructure first and the administrations of operations second.

America's transportation system is the envy of the world. The United States, however, has pushed our air transportation system to the limit. Aviation delays are increasing as we exceed airport and runway capacity. The United States is home to 19 of the world's 20 busiest airports, yet we do not have the world's most advanced air traffic control systems. AIR–21 will provide the necessary funding for airports to keep pace with the dramatic increase in air travelers.

Nationwide, passenger travel has increased at a rate of five percent a year, and we expect more than a billion people will board planes by 2010. Manchester Airport, in my home state of New Hampshire, is the fastest growing airport in the country. In 1998, 1.94 million people flew out of Manchester, which represents a 70% increase over 1997.

This legislation will make it possible to increase airport capacity, which will not only reduce delays, but will also inject a healthy shot of competition into the airline industry. By creating more gates, more airlines will have the opportunity to fly popular routes, and the increased competition will help drive down ticket prices.

Upgrading antiquated FAA traffic control systems is another priority. Just last year, the FAA experienced more than 100 significant system outages where air traffic controllers lost some or all of the primary systems that

help them track aircraft. We lead the world in technology yet we entrust the safety of our skies to computers made almost 30 years ago.

Additionally, among the many excellent provisions in this bill, I would like to call attention to a provision that requires the FAA to conduct a study of the use of recycled materials in the construction of airport runways, taxiways, and aprons. As used here, recycled materials includes recycled pavements, waste materials, and byproducts. This is an important environmental provision. It addresses an urgent need to do a better job of promoting the use of recycled materials. Furthermore, it does so in a way that will make recycling successful. This is critical to maximizing the volume of waste materials that actually gets recycled.

Last year, we included in TEA–21 a provision to create the Recycled Materials Resource Center. That center, funded by and working in close collaboration with the Federal Highway Administration, provides assistance to highway programs nationwide. It helps develop standards for the appropriate use of recycled materials, along with suitable tests to ensure compliance with those standards. In addition, it conducts research into specific applications to determine the conditions under which recycled materials can be used. This is needed for two reasons. First, to ensure the physical performance of the road or highway throughout its planned useful life. Equally important, it ensures that there will be no adverse environmental problems resulting from the use of a recycled material in place of virgin materials.

In short, this center was created to provide independent third party analysis of proposed uses, so that decision makers could approve the use of recycled materials in appropriate circumstances based on objective evidence, and with appropriate standards and tests. In other words, rather than just pushing for recycling and hoping the road or highway stands up under long-term use, this center is dedicated to promoting successful recycling. And doing so in a way that responds to legitimate concerns by public officials. Against this background, I proposed that we leverage this ongoing Federal investment in using recycled materials in transportation infrastructure by extending its benefits to our national effort to upgrade airports. After all, airport construction involves large amounts of pavement in runways, taxiways, and aprons; not to mention related parking lots and approach roads.

As with roads and highways, public officials want to do the right thing. They understand the value of recycling, providing it does not increase costs, and providing that they can be sure the runway, taxiway, or apron will be built to the required high performance standard. They do not need mandates, they need technical assistance and information based on independent analysis of the issues.

As with roads and highways, the FAA study needs to focus both on physical performance—will the pavement work as expected over its full useful life—and also on environmental performance over that same useful life. Public officials need assurance that there will be no unexpected environmental side effects in the future. They cannot be expected to risk possible contamination problems because of incomplete analysis. Therefore, this assurance of future environmental integrity must be based on sound science, validated by an independent third party. Therefore, as with earlier efforts with roads and highways, the logical place to start seems to be with a comprehensive study focusing on issues of long term physical performance, safety implications, and environmental benefits of using recycled materials in aviation pavement. Recognizing that much work has been done in this field, this provision provides that the FAA should carry it out by entering a contract with a university of higher education with expertise necessary to carry out the study.

A logical candidate to do such a study would be the Recycled Materials Research Center at the University of New Hampshire. It has directly relevant experience working with transportation pavements. Since the US Department of Transportation already is funding and utilizing this center, it seems especially appropriate that we should leverage that Federal investment by applying that expertise to related issues in airport construction.

Furthermore, I am pleased to see the section regarding Airplane Emergency Locator Transmitters (ELTs) included in AIR–21. The absence of ELTs has increased the costs of public and private search and rescue operations following certain aircraft crashes. One such crash occurred on December 24, 1996, when a plane piloted by Johan Schwartz and Patrick Hayes disappeared near Lebanon, New Hampshire. The States of New Hampshire, Connecticut, Vermont, New York, and Massachusetts conducted an extensive search, in cooperation with the Federal Government, in an unsuccessful effort to locate the plane and any survivors. It is believed that the existence of an ELT on this plane would have substantially increased the likelihood of finding the crash.

In conclusion, I believed that AIR–21 would help instill honesty in the budget process and allow us to invest in our airports to expand airport capacity and make our skies and airports safer. For too long, we've neglected our transportation needs and allowed the surpluses in the transportation trust funds to accrue in order to mask the size of the budget deficit. AIR–21 will ensure that the airline ticket taxes we pay each time that we fly will be used to improve our airports and aviation infrastructure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). All time has expired. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 319, nays 101, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 48]

YEAS—319

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Carson
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooksey
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dingell
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Engel
English
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hefley
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Isakson
Istook
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kelly
Kildee
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Olver
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Reynolds
Rivers
Rogan
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Shaw
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Strickland
Stupak
Sweeney
Talent
Tauscher

Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thune
Thurman
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Vitter
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)

NAYS—101

Aderholt
Archer
Baldwin
Barrett (NE)
Boehner
Bonilla
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chenoweth-Hage
Coburn
Collins
Cox
Crane
Davis (IL)
DeLay
Dicks
Dixon
Doggett
Emerson
Eshoo
Farr
Foley
Frelinghuysen
Goode
Goss
Graham
Hall (TX)
Hayworth
Herger
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoyer
Hyde
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kilpatrick
Kingston
Kolbe
Largent
Latham
Lewis (CA)
Lofgren
Lowey
McDermott
McInnis
McIntosh
Miller (FL)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Nethercutt
Obey
Packard
Pastor
Paul
Pelosi
Pitts
Porter
Portman
Ramstad
Regula
Riley
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Sabo
Salmon
Sanford
Scarborough
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Skeen
Stark
Stenholm
Stump
Sununu
Tancredo
Taylor (NC)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Weller
Wicker
Wolf
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—14

Boucher
Cook
Gonzalez
Gutierrez
Hinojosa
Klink
McCollum
Myrick
Ortiz
Reyes
Rodriguez
Rush
Tanner
Walden

□ 1258

Mr. LEWIS of California, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CRANE, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. COLLINS, Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE, and Messrs. FARR of California, HAYWORTH and STUMP changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. LAZIO changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I was absent this morning due to important business in my Congressional district yesterday and missed rollcall vote 48 on the Wendell H. Ford Aviation Investment and Reform Act for the 21st Century.

Had I been present I would have voted ''yea.''

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 48, on agreeing to the Conference Report to accompany H.R. 1000, I was away on official business. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, because of official business in my District (27th Congressional District of Texas) I was absent for rollcall votes 46–48. If I had been present for these votes, I would have voted as indicated below: Rollcall vote 46—''yea''; rollcall vote 47—''yea''; rollcall vote 48—''yea.''

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN THE ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 1000, WENDELL H. FORD AVIATION INVESTMENT AND REFORM ACT FOR THE 21ST CENTURY

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the enrolling clerk be authorized to make technical and conforming changes in the engrossment of H.R. 1000, the bill just considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1000.

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

There was no objection.

SMALL BUSINESS REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2000

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 439 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 439

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3843) to reauthorize programs to assist small business concerns, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Small Business. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Each section of the bill shall be considered as read. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. House Resolution 432 is laid on the table.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 439 would grant H.R. 3843, the Small Business Reauthorization Act of 2000, an open rule waiving all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides one hour of general debate to be equally divided between the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Small Business.

The rule provides that the bill shall be open to amendment by section and authorizes the Chair to accord priority in recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The rule also allows the chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone votes during consideration of the bill and to reduce voting time to 5 minutes on a postponed question if the vote follows a 15-minute vote.

Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions and lays H. Res. 432, providing for consideration of the conference report to accompany S. 376, on the table.

H.R. 3843 reauthorizes a number of worthwhile Federal programs established to assist small businesses all across the country. In addition to SBA's various loan programs, the agency's management training and entrepreneurial counseling have proven very helpful to owners and operators of the smaller firms that are responsible for creating the majority of new jobs in our expanding economy.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the bill makes a number of technical corrections to the 1958 Small Business Investment Act in order to increase the flexibility of the Small Business Investment Company program, and improve small business access to this program.

Mr. Speaker, as a long-time small business owner myself, I know firsthand what an important contribution small businesses make to the economy and the quality of life in every community. Helping small businesses get started and continue to grow is important to all of us.

The availability of capital and access to expert advice are among the greatest challenges facing our new business owners, and meeting those challenges is the heart of the Small Business Administration's mission.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support the open rule reported by the Committee on Rules, and the underlying bill, H.R. 3845.

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) for yielding me the time.

This is an open rule. As the gentleman from Washington has described, this rule provides for 1 hour of general debate to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Small Business.

This rule permits amendments under the 5-minute rule, which is the normal amending process in the House. All Members on both sides of the aisle will have the opportunity to offer germane amendments.

Mr. Speaker, small business is the backbone of the American economy. The Small Business Administration is the key source of assistance to nurture and grow American small businesses.

The Small Business Administration offers loans, technical assistance, and disaster assistance to small businesses. Under this bill, these programs will be authorized through the year 2003.

To give my colleagues an example of how these programs work, I cite the Small Business Development Center operated by the Dayton Area Chamber of Commerce in my district. Last year, the center received a $145,000 grant from the Small Business Administration, which was matched by non-Federal funds.

With those funds, the center counseled small business owners who did not have access to expensive, professional advising services.

According to the Dayton Area Chamber of Commerce, the counselors in the Dayton center worked with more than 1,200 businesses last year. A total of 429 jobs were created or retained as a result of the center's services. This is a terrific investment of Federal dollars.

I do regret that this bill does not authorize or reauthorize the Defense Economic Transition Initiative which targets assistance to communities hurt economically by declining defense spending. The authorization for this program expired in 1998.

Still, this is a good bill. It funds important programs to benefit small businesses. This is an open rule. I urge its adoption.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I advise the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. HALL) that I have no requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELAZQUEZ), who is the ranking minority member.

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

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to voice my strong support for the rule and the underlying legislation, H.R. 3845, the Small Business Reauthorization Act of 2000. This bipartisan legislation will provide critical funding for such vital programs as SBIC, 7(a), Microloan, and SBDC, allowing increased lending and technical assistance to our Nation's small businesses. These programs have played a large role in helping our Nation's most small businesses create and maintain this unprecedented economic growth.

This rule is fair and will allow Members to offer any germane amendments to the legislation. This clean numbers-only reauthorization bill is the first in recent memories. H.R. 3845 contains no new programs or policy changes and is due in large part to the hard work of the chairman and members of the Committee on Small Business that has passed 13 pieces of legislation, eight of which have been signed by the President.

This type of regular order is not often found in Congress these days, and I would like to commend the chairman and the members of our committee for their hard work.

With the passage of this reauthorization, we will assist in making the kind of economic decisions that not only will help close the widening economic gap in this country, but will hopefully keep us on the right track for continued prosperity in the future.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to come to the floor today to support the reauthorization of the Small Business Administration. It is a pleasure for me to serve on this committee where I had the opportunity to work with small businesses and leaders from throughout our Nation to develop programs which are so valuable in promoting economic development in our communities.

This bill has been hashed out and agreed to in a bipartisan manner. I commend the gentleman from Missouri (Chairman TALENT), my good friend, for making this process so amicable. I commend the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELAZQUEZ) for adding to that amicability.

The SBA has done a great job nationwide and more specifically in the State of New Jersey. In my State, 98.5 percent of the businesses in New Jersey are small businesses. We need the SBA to make sure these businesses continue to succeed and employ our workers.

A vote for this reauthorization is a vote to support funding for the 7(a) loan program, which will be able to make $1.3 billion in loans this upcoming year.

A vote for this reauthorization is also a vote for the 504 loan program, which provides small businesses with long-term fixed rate financing for the purchase of land, buildings, and equipment; 504 is fully funded by revenue from program fees to guarantee $3.75 billion in loans. In 1999, the 504 loan program led to the creation of 199 jobs in my district alone. It led to the retention of 37 jobs that were in danger of disappearing from the district.

In the two counties which comprise my district, Essex and Passaic County, these loans, both 7(a) and 504, were granted in 1999, 199 of them. Forty-five of those 199 were given to women-owned businesses in the amount of $6.1 million. Ninety-one loans were given to the minority-owned businesses in the amount of $17 million. This program works. It is results oriented, not process oriented.

I am pleased to support the reauthorization, Mr. Speaker, which provides funding to the New Jersey Small Business Development Centers, including three in my own district, which must be funded so that they might continue their great work.

In 1999, those Small Business Development Centers provided free one-on-one counseling to over 5,000 New Jersey businesses and small business owners.

As we enter the 21st century, the SBA is a leader in the field of technological support in the use of the Internet. Small businesses can help setting up their business on the Web through programs such as the one developed in New Jersey at Rutgers University. E-commerce is an important way for a business to compete and gain access to more markets.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, in closing, that the bipartisan work that is done on the Committee on Small Business should be reflected and duplicated throughout all of the other departments, all of the other committees that work in this Congress of the United States. I am honored to serve, and I commend both the leader and the ranking member.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON).

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, small businesses are important to Missouri's 4th Congressional District. They represent the backbone of our thriving economy back home and throughout our Nation. It is the responsibility of the government to provide assistance when needed in order for new entrepreneurs to succeed.

That is why this legislation, H.R. 3843, should overwhelmingly be passed by this House.

□ 1315

It authorizes significant expenditures for programs that impact the would-be and current small businesses in Missouri every day.

Under this legislation, the small business development centers, like the one in Warrensburg, Missouri, are authorized at an appropriate level of $125 million each year over the next 3 years. These SBDCs provide invaluable technical assistance to up-and-coming small businesses throughout our country. I might add that the Missouri SBDC, led by statewide director Max Summers, is one of the premier SBDC programs in America.

H.R. 3843 authorizes steadily increased funding for the 7(a) 504 Microloan and SBIC programs. In addition, this measure provides for funding the administration's New Market Initiatives, the National Women's Business Council, the HUB Zone program, the Drug-Free Workplace program, and the SBA's authority to continue the small disadvantaged business certification program. It also authorizes significant funding for the disaster loans, surety bond guarantees, and the regular salaries and expenses for the SBA.

Missouri's 4th Congressional District thrives as a result of a growing economy, a strong work ethic, and a commitment to success due in part to the small business owners and their families. Let us pass this rule and let us pass the bill, H.R. 3843.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Pursuant to House Resolution 439, House Resolution 432 is laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). Pursuant to House Resolution 439 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3843.

□ 1317

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3843) to reauthorize programs to assist small business concerns, and for other purposes, with Mr. LAHOOD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Under the rule, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. TALENT) and the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELAZQUEZ) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. TALENT).

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

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us is H.R. 3843, the Small Business Authorization Act of 2000. This is a simple, straightforward, bipartisan bill. I hope the House will be able to deal with it in an expeditious fashion.

H.R. 3843 is the 3-year reauthorization for the Small Business Administration and its programs by the Committee on Small Business. This year we return to a format the committee has not used since the 1970s. The bill is a straight numbers-only reauthorization bill. There are no modifications to programs, no new programs, just the authorization levels for the next 3 years and extensions of existing programs. The committee has, instead, passed focused bills in particular areas of the SBA's work where we felt there was statutory changes that were needed. The House has passed many of those, some of which have already become law.

Mr. Chairman, let me briefly explain H.R. 3843. The bill contains the major authorizations for the SBA and its programs, programs which provide a variety of services for small businesses, financial assistance, technical and managerial assistance and disaster assistance.

Every year, the SBA provides over $11 billion in financing to small businesses. This financing is made available through a variety of programs and at a cost of less than $200 million appropriated dollars, a large return for the investment. Programs include the 7(a) program, the 504 program, the Microloan program, and the SBIC program.

Mr. Chairman, under H.R. 3843, authorizations for those programs will all rise steadily and modestly over the next 3 years. Our numbers reflect the administration's estimates and testimony we have heard from witnesses at the budget hearings for the regular salaries and expenses for the SBA. I believe the estimates are fair and reasonable authorization levels designed to provide for growth in the programs and take into account possible increases in demand.

H.R. 3843 will also reauthorize the SBA's programs for providing technical and managerial assistance to small businesses. The two most significant technical assistance programs are the Small Business Development Centers, or SBDCs, and the Service Corps of Retired Executives, known as SCORE.

In addition to its business assistance, the SBA also provides disaster loan assistance to homeowners and small businesses nationwide. The program is a key component of the overall Federal recovery effort for communities struck by natural disasters. The assistance is authorized by section 7(b) of the Small Business Act, which provides authority for reduced-interest rate loans. Currently, the interest rates fluctuate according to the statutory formula. The lower rate, not to exceed 4 percent, is offered to applicants with no credit available elsewhere, while a rate of a maximum of 8 percent is available for other borrowers.

Mr. Chairman, I want to speak from personal experience about the importance of this program. A few years ago, in 1993, large parts of my district were literally underwater. The help the SBA provided to my constituents and neighbors at the time was excellent and was vital to the rebuilding of our communities. Many other Members have experienced the same things in their districts.

Because of the unpredictable nature of disasters, the committee provides no specific authorization level for this program, a course of action that enables us to respond more quickly when additional assistance is needed.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3843. It is a good bill, it is a clean bill, and it is a bipartisan bill. It will continue to provide assistance to small business in a cost-effective and sound manner and deserves our approval.

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

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

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

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3843, the Small Business Reauthorization Act of 2000. The passage of this bipartisan legislation will provide our Nation's small businesses with the critical assistance they need to succeed.

As many in this Chamber are aware, we are currently experiencing one of the greatest economic booms in this Nation's history. It has been said that small business, which makes up 51 percent of the gross domestic product and contributes 47 percent of all sales in this country, are the engine that has driven this economic growth. And if small business has been this engine, then the Small Business Administration, with its loan and technical assistance programs, has been fuel for that engine.

SBA fills a critical gap in our small business community, helping those entrepreneurs who often have great ideas, energy, and drive, but lack that last element they need to succeed. SBA helps put those pieces in place, whether through mentoring, assistance with a business plan, or helping with a loan.

The legislation before us today provides record funding for such critical programs as SBIC, 7(a), Microloan, and SBIC. These programs have played a major role in helping our Nation's small businesses create and maintain our unprecedented economic growth. However, to continue assisting our Nation's small businesses, access to capital must be available. To assist with this critical issue, SBA has several loan programs aimed at helping entrepreneurs launch their businesses.

The flagship of these loan programs is the 7(a) program. Since its inception,

this program has made loans to more than 600,000 businesses, totaling approximately $80 billion. With the passage of today's legislation, we will be making $1.3 billion more in loans available to small business. That will give companies like Woodman's Precision Machine in Massachusetts, that used 7(a) to go into a low-income area and expand its business, increasing its employment by 20 percent, the chance to revitalize our urban communities and create new jobs.

The 504 program helps entrepreneurs purchase their place of business or new equipment. Oftentimes during a debate the question is asked, are we giving taxpayers a good value for their dollar? I would say to my colleagues that the 504 program, which is totally run on fees, with no cost to the taxpayer, is a perfect example where the taxpayer clearly gets his money's worth.

With today's reauthorization, the program's fees will make sure that people like Fox Racing USA, a northern California family-owned business that designs, manufactures and sells motor cross and mountain bikes apparel, will succeed. Fox Racing USA, through a 504 loan, was able to purchase a new building, which expanded its business and tripled employment to 137 full-time jobs. Now, that is economic growth.

SBA programs have also played a critical role in moving individuals off of welfare. Moving from welfare to work is difficult in itself, but moving from welfare to owning your own business is pure inspiration, and SBA has made this happen through its Microloan program.

It helps people like a welfare mother in rural Appalachian Valley, Ohio, obtain a Microloan to start a home health care business that first helped move her family off welfare. Eventually, she was able to hire 52 additional employees, 50 of which were welfare recipients.

Today, with the passage of H.R. 3843, we ensure that these programs will continue to stand as a foundation as we look ahead to take on the new frontiers of technology, expansion, e-commerce, and continue to help bring economic development into low-income, rural and urban communities. These are the new challenges facing our Nation's small businesses. And by acting today and passing this legislation, we are taking that first step on the critical path toward choosing a new course for tomorrow.

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

Mr. TALENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY).

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I rise today in support of H.R. 3843, the Small Business Reauthorization Act of 2000. This important legislation will reauthorize lending programs of the SBA, allowing our Nation's small businesses continued access to capital.

This legislation also reauthorizes other programs, such as the Small Business Development Centers and the Service Corps of Retired Executives, the SCORE program, two programs which provide vital support to a dynamic community of entrepreneurs.

In addition, H.R. 3843 reauthorizes the National Women's Business Council, a bipartisan organization that advises both the President and the Congress on issues impacting women-owned businesses.

We are all aware of the role that small business plays in maintaining the economic strength of the United States. They create the vast majority of new jobs, provide countless new technological innovations, and drive economic growth. Technology, particularly the expansion of e-commerce, has opened doors for men and women who may have only dreamed 50 years ago of one day owning their own business.

While mom and pop stores continue to be a way of life in this country, ''dot coms'' are attractive enterprises that often allow business owners to work from home. As the mother of four, I understand the desire to telecommute or to establish a home-based business. Yet no matter how fast our small business sector grows, unfortunately there is often insufficient capital available for entrepreneurs to use to start up new businesses or for current small business owners to expand existing ones. This is the void that Small Business Administration's loan guarantee programs often fill.

Moreover, technical assistance must be readily available to our mom and pop establishments as they seek new and innovative ways to attract customers and preserve Main Street. By the same token, even the most technically skilled young entrepreneurs need information concerning business plans and the advice of mentors before they launch their businesses. Millions of our Nation's small business owners find exactly this kind of assistance at Small Business Development Centers across the country, and they receive valuable advice from SCORE volunteers every year.

Without passage of this important legislation, all of these valuable services would be threatened. Our Nation's small businesses and, indeed our economy, would suffer as a result.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. TALENT) and the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELAZQUEZ) have worked very closely to put together a bipartisan bill that deserves the backing of every Member of this House. I urge my colleagues to support the small business community and support H.R. 3843.

□ 1330

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN MCCARTHY), the ranking Democratic member of the Subcommittee on Tax, Finance, and Exports.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of legislation reauthorizing the Small Business Administration and its increasingly relied upon programs.

I want to thank the gentleman from Missouri (Chairman TALENT) for all the great work that he has done. It has been a pleasure working with him over these last few years. And certainly, I have nothing but good things to say about the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELAZQUEZ), the minority ranking leader, my colleague.

Small businesses are the driving force of our economy, and access to capital is the number one concern. The SBA has filled this void by providing various loans and other technical assistance programs needed to survive in today's competitive market.

This legislation also takes into account the changing face of the business community and provides record funding levels over the next 3 years for core SBA programs.

For example, the 7(a) loan guarantee program, which is SBA's primary business loan program, is increased to provide $1.3 billion more in loans.

On Long Island, New York, this is extremely beneficial. Last year, SBA provided over $13 million in loans and other technical assistance to 86 small businesses in my district alone. The assistance provided to these businesses not only benefit them but the surrounding communities, as well.

As small businesses prosper, so do the neighborhoods in which they operate. Studies show that small businesses are the leading source of innovative ideas. That is why it is important to foster their growth and provide them with the tools and skills they need to succeed in today's business world.

Of particular importance to small businesses in my district is the need to take advantage of technology's role in the business sector. That is why I support funding increases for such incentives as small business development companies that help small businesses understand the role of e-commerce to compete in a technology driven economy.

In addition, I also support the Women's Business Center Program.

Mr. TALENT. Mr. Chairman, how much time do both sides have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri (Mr. TALENT) has 23½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELAZQUEZ) has 23 minutes remaining.

Mr. TALENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH).

Mr. ENGLISH. Mr. Chairman, I particularly want to thank the chair and the ranking member for having produced, on a bipartisan basis, this very important piece of legislation.

Mr. Chairman, every small business begins with a dream. It is the dream of a saleswoman who longs to hang out a shingle on Main Street or the dream of

an entrepreneur who envisions moving his inventions from his basement to department store shelves. Unfortunately, not everyone with a dream has the business experience or the capital to put their ideas in motion and compete successfully in an increasingly competitive marketplace.

Data from the Bureau of the Census indicates that over 99.9 percent of new employer firms and business closures are small firms. But with the help of the U.S. Small Business Administration, more and more small businesses are swimming upstream and are able to make it, making these dreams a reality.

Established in 1953, the SBA provides financial, technical, and management assistance to help Americans launch, manage, and expand their businesses. The SBA is the Nation's largest single financial backer of small businesses. They fund dreams; and, on the way, they have created millions of jobs and helped us build the economy of the future.

With their $45 billion portfolio of business loans, loan guarantees and disaster loans, the SBA provides the money that allows the corner hardware store to expand its line of power tools.

America's 23 million small businesses employ more than 50 percent of the private workforce. They generate more than half of the Nation's gross domestic product and they are the principal source of new jobs in the U.S. economy.

Last year, the SBA offered management and technical assistance to more than one million small business owners. Training classes allow the barber shop on Fifth Street to learn how to better manage their time and resources, while a mentoring program provides an inexperienced restaurant owner with an experienced one who can counsel and advise the new business owner.

The SBA has a proven track record of success, which is evident not only through the success of its members but through the jobs that it has created and the economic growth that it has fostered.

I urge all the Members in the House to take a look at this institution to recognize its value in the economy. It is the largest and most important programmatic commitment that the Federal Government has made to growing the Federal economy.

I urge my fellow Members to join in my enthusiasm and to vote in favor of reauthorizing this worthwhile program. I believe that this institution, which has helped so many small businesses lay the groundwork for the economy of the future, deserves to be reauthorized.

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) the ranking Democratic member on the Subcommittee on Government Programs and Oversight.

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3843, the Small Business Reauthorization Act.

First of all, I want to commend the gentleman from Missouri (Chairman TALENT) and the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELAZQUEZ), the ranking member, and all members of the committee, as well as staff, for working so well together to provide improved services to small businesses.

Today there are more than 25 million small businesses, the most ever in the United States. This bill provides America's 25 million small businesses with billions of dollars in technical assistance and access to capital programs.

It provides $45.5 billion for the SBA's 7(a) program, a program to provide loans to small businesses unable to secure financing on reasonable terms through normal channels; $13 billion for the 504 loan program to assist community development corporations who provide long-term fixed rate financing to small businesses in underserved areas; $10 billion for small business investment companies; $450 million in direct microlending loans and technical assistance; $750 million for small business development centers; 3 million for the women-owned businesses; $30 million for HUB zones.

This bill is a testament to the idea that when minds work together with a common interest, it does not matter which party, which area, which city, which State that they come from, that they all can come together for the common purpose of providing access to capital and direct services to those businesses in great need.

Mr. Chairman, I participated in the opening of a small day-care center this past Saturday, a $75,000 loan to a young couple. It is the pride of their life. It is the joy of their being. It is the testament to their tenacity.

I want to thank this committee for having the insight and foresight to provide that kind of impetus to growth and development in our country.

Mr. TALENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say that I always appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. BONO).

Mrs. BONO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3843, a bill to reauthorize the Small Business Administration.

Small business owners across the country recognize the importance of the Small Business Administration in making sure that our country's entrepreneurs are provided with the tools they need to grow and prosper.

As we look to the exciting trade and technology opportunities of the 21st century, it is important that we examine closely the role that the Small Business Administration is going to play as an advocate for small business owners and a provider of information and resources.

Over the last several years, there have been proposals to disassemble the Small Business Administration. While I am a proponent of a leaner and more streamlined Federal Government, I believe that the SBA provides a unique service to entrepreneurs. Not only is the SBA a clearinghouse of information, but it is the main capital source for many small business owners.

In particular, I believe the work that has been done through the SBA regarding minority- and women-owned businesses has been particularly noteworthy. These constituencies have not been traditionally encouraged to pursue business ventures and, therefore, have not had the resources at their disposal to provide the know-how and funding to make their aspirations a reality.

This legislation recognizes the contributions made in these areas and strengthens the Federal commitment to the Microloan program, the HUBZone program, and the Women's Business Enterprise Development programs.

In the 44th District of California, we have seen several successful SBA efforts. There have been numerous 504 loans granted through the Certified Development Company program. Not only do these loans provide jobs, but they also improve the economy of the area as a whole and serve as an example to others that the SBA system does indeed work.

As well, we have a very successful branch of the Services Corps of Retired Executives, SCORE. These individuals have served as a valuable resource to the less experienced entrepreneurs in the area. In one noteworthy case, a retired accountant from our SCORE chapter was able to assist a local entrepreneur in putting together a successful business plan to qualify for an SBA loan. This has led to the business becoming one of the largest printers in the Coachella Valley.

While we must continue to find ways to improve the system, I encourage my colleagues to support H.R. 3843, the Small Business Reauthorization Act, and the Small Business Administration in their commitment to provide valuable resources for small business owners, the backbone of our economy.

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO).

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 3843, a bill that commits the U.S. Government to support and fund the Small Business Administration.

As my colleagues have heard, this is a truly bipartisan bill. I commend both sides, as well as Ms. Alvarez, the administrator, and staff because this is something truly, truly remarkable.

SBA programs, including its loan and microloan programs, technical assistance services, and small business development centers, have helped our Nation's small businesses grow and prosper. To communities like mine, that

are so dependent on small businesses, this assistance is a true lifeline and must be preserved and strengthened.

I strongly believe assisting small business makes good business sense. There is a false perception that most people work for large corporations and for big business, but that is just not so. A&G Auto Sounds from east L.A. is a family-opened business that is being assisted in a purchase of a building by the SBA.

Let me give my colleagues some clear and convincing reasons why we must support our small businesses. Small businesses have created more than 10 million new jobs in the last 4 years and are a critical component in the implementation of the Welfare to Work initiative.

From 1992 to 1996, small businesses, those that are with less than 500 employees, created all of the net new jobs. Nearly 8 million women-owned firms now provide jobs for 18.5 million people, more than are employed in all of the Fortune 500 industrial firms combined. That is quite an achievement.

Minority-owned businesses have dramatically increased from 8.8 percent to 12.5 percent of all firms. And Hispanic-owned businesses are now the second fastest growing sector, behind women-owned business.

Let us not forget that small business is the vehicle by which millions of our constituents access the American dream. Small businesses create many opportunities for women, for minorities, and for immigrants.

Our small business owners work harder and longer. Fifty percent of small business owners work an average of 51 hours a week, as opposed to 34.6 in private industry. And another 26 percent work more than 60 hours a week. These are people with drive, with strong ambition, with new creativity, and with a desire to succeed.

□ 1345

They thrive on challenge, and they help make our country the great country it is. We must pay attention to the needs of our small businesses, or we risk losing or at least hampering an important and necessary job creator that has led the way in the last decade to our current economic recovery. We cannot and must not turn our backs on them now.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote for all small businesses by voting for H.R. 3843 and renew our commitment to the Small Business Administration.

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

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

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. TALENT) for yielding me this time, and I congratulate him and the ranking member for their fine work on this reauthorization bill.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to recognize an institution and engine for economic development in the great State of New York, the New York State Small Business Development Center. The center is the largest and most effective organization working directly with the State's small business community to ensure it survives and flourishes.

Companies grow from entrepreneurs with dreams. The growth of tomorrow's companies will be as dramatic or beneficial as the past generation of start-ups if we do not ignore their needs and, where possible, we reduce the burdens placed upon them. That is because today's business environment is simply too complex and cumbersome to give the current entrepreneurs the same chance of success.

Without an affirmative offer of help and assistance, we are stifling the very backbone that built this great Nation.

Mr. Chairman, for the past 16 years, the New York State Small Business Development Center has done just that. It has bridged the gap between government and the entrepreneurial sector to accomplish results. Since its founding in 1984, the program staff has worked with over 142,000 New York entrepreneurs and small business owners one on one, helping them acquire and invest over $1.42 billion and funding their business dreams and, importantly, creating jobs for others.

In fact, these entrepreneurs have reported that their investments created or saved 65,000 jobs in New York State alone.

The SBDC does this by delivering critical outside expertise in the form of business counseling and training centers through 22 regional offices located on campuses of the State University of New York City and the State University of New York and private universities throughout New York. The SBDC staff works one on one with entrepreneurs to find sources of funding new markets, new technologies, or simply better ways to deal with the changes in our new economy.

As a result, the SBDC serves all New Yorkers. In particular, the SBDC, by prioritizing its interests and its needs, provides help to members of our community that have not always been well represented in our business sector, such as women, minorities, veterans, and the disabled. It also emphasizes the economic development priorities of New York State, including international trade and the encouragement of technology-based industries.

As the former State labor commissioner in New York, it was my job to work aggressively on job creation. I speak today of the SBDC's commitment with that full knowledge and understanding that they are a critical component, and I ask all my colleagues in this House to join with me today in showing our resolve by contributing to the further growth and success of this program, our most cherished resource, our entrepreneurial citizens.

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES).

(Mrs. JONES of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, today I rise to emphasize the importance of small business funding. Small businesses are the economic engine which drive our prosperity.

I would like to thank our chairman, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. TALENT), and I would like to particularly thank our ranking member, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELAZQUEZ) and her staff. I have been serving on this committee for the past 15 months and there has not been a committee meeting where I have not been prepared not only by my staff but by her staff for all the meetings we have had. I want to thank her particularly for all the hard work that she and her staff does, too.

Small businesses are increasingly diverse and loans to African Americans and Hispanics have doubled. However, even considering this trend, much can still be done to help small businesses succeed. It is important, as we think about small businesses and we have rid our country of what we used to call welfare, that there are many people who used to be on welfare who are capable now of creating businesses through the Microloan business opportunities.

I would encourage my colleagues to vote in support of that.

One example, a small business in the 11th Congressional District reports a typical scenario that illustrates the importance of funding technical assistance for small business development. A woman wanted to begin a van transportation business for the purpose of taking people without access to transportation to church, shopping, and to visit incarcerated families.

She had a good credit rating and an innovative idea but no idea how to implement it. She took out a second mortgage on her house, bought vans and hired drivers. Her lack of experience with budgeting her cash flow, invoicing and collection almost sent her into bankruptcy before she sought help from the Small Business Development Corporation, which was able to help her devise a business plan.

Another woman started a cleaning business. She landed a contract from a housing organization to provide cleaning for 50 houses. Unfortunately, she did not know how to competitively price her services or plan her cash flow. Subsequently, she lost the contract. She was able, through the assistance of the Small Business Development Center, to get back on track and keep her business going.

Clearly, access to technical expertise and lending programs is vitally important. In the 11th Congressional District, during 1999, Small Business Development Corporation's counseling resulted in an economic impact of $2.5 million in increased sales; $1.9 million in export contracts; $2.9 million in government contracts and $5.7 million in business loans from all sources.

For all of Ohio, SBDCs have been at their funding cap since 1995. Small business development corporations have been at their funding cap since 1995. Clearly, this $3.1 million has had a significant effect on small business growth. This is not charity. It is sound economic policy.

It is time we stepped up our support to provide greater opportunities for small business development and that is why I stand in support of this piece of legislation.

Mr. TALENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATKINS).

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

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Chairman, I stand in strong support of H.R. 3843. I would like to ask my colleagues to envision with me a rural area of real economic distress since the Great Depression. One of the major characteristics of such an area is high unemployment, low income, and also the lack of financing. In fact, most of the small banks only make some cattle loans and maybe some crop loans and pickup truck loans to meet existing needs. We could not get Oklahoma City or Tulsa banks to come down to this rural area. We could not get Fort Worth and Dallas banks to come north of Red River. It was a no-man's land for finance. An area in economic distress; yes, but an economically distressed area that was waiting to be revitalized.

My years of public service have been devoted to building economic opportunities and job opportunities for our people. I have worked with a lot of industries, and I have found without question the number one thing they need to have is financing to help expand businesses and industries.

The SBA has provided a vital link to be able to provide those services through Section 7 and also the 504 loan programs. I established Rural Enterprise, Inc., in my district in order to try to provide some kind of professional expertise and needed assistance working with and packaging SBA loans. I am very proud to report to this Congress that through their efforts we have been able to finance over $150 million worth of new industry in those areas.

SBA has offered, along with working with EDA, and I know the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) knows I have worked with him on EDA and we worked on all kinds of financing packages, SBA has been able to offer an important and essential financing for many people. The entrepreneurs, and free enterprise individuals, have worked to start and make their dreams come true and offer jobs for their citizens. That is truly the American way.

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD).

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the chairman and the ranking member for their outstanding work on this piece of legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3843, the Small Business Reauthorization Act of 2000, which will allow us to reauthorize the Small Business Administration programs for the next 3 years.

As a member of this committee, I am pleased to note that with the passage of this authorization bill, we continue the committee's work, to date having passed 13 bills and the President signing eight of them.

Furthermore, this is the first reauthorization that is a straight numbers-only bill since the 1970s. This was only made possible by the hard work that the chairman and ranking member and the committee did to deal with such issues as the women's business councils and centers, SBIC, SBIR, and improving loan programs.

This authorization, Mr. Chairman, takes into account the changing face of small business, which is much more global and are now at 96 percent of all exporters. In the global arena, we have new emerging markets and these new markets are prime opportunities for all the small businesses to become a part of this global marketplace.

The latest statistics reveal that small businesses do 30 percent of the total exporting of goods from this country. Moreover, the funding to provide programs like the export working capital will continue to assist small businesses in competing globally.

The 21st century has revealed the increasing diverse nature of small businesses. Minority-owned firms are growing at a rate of 62 percent. Women-owned firms are growing at a rate of 43 percent. Through passage of SBA's loan programs, we have and will continue a trend where loans to African Americans and Hispanics will double.

While SBA needs to look at small business failure rates, Mr. Chairman, we have to provide the necessary business infrastructure and technical assistance to assure the viability of new small businesses. This reauthorization provides record funding over the next 3 years for core SBA loan programs.

SBA's flagship program, 7 (A), will make $1.3 billion more in loans and the Microloan technical assistance program, which will more than double. Additionally, SBIC equity investment program will make $3.3 million more in loans and, combined with the technical corrections that were passed out yet in another bill, this program is ready to finance more businesses in the future.

Small businesses have taken off, Mr. Chairman, and we will be wise to join the forces to ensure its growth and prosperity.

Mr. Chairman, I would be remiss if I did not mention technology and its importance to small businesses. Studies show that small businesses are the leading force of innovation and that small firms produce twice as many innovations per employee as large firms. This innovation has been made possible by technology.

The technology provides funding for such incentives as SBDC, which we will offer to small businesses; and they will have the opportunity to make the jump to e-commerce and compete in the increasingly technology-driven economy. The passage of this authorization, Mr. Chairman, will assist small businesses in obtaining access to capital that is essential and important for the growth and technical support needed to remain competitive.

Moreover, the committee will have an aggressive agenda to work toward passing the President's new market initiative, which is aimed at helping low- and moderate-income communities.

Last year's New Market tour highlighted portions of my district of Watts, and I am here to say that it is of great importance to me that we continue our efforts to help low- and moderate-income communities. That is why I am urging my colleagues to support H.R. 3843 and continue to ensure that the Small Business Administration prepare itself and prepare new small businesses for the growth and the opportunities that are needed.

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, with the passage of this legislation, we will be giving those with vision and drive a chance to succeed. As discussed earlier, these programs have helped countless individuals. From New York and Massachusetts, across this country to California, urban to rural, family-owned businesses, to welfare recipients, SBA programs have helped all of them succeed. This has been made possible through access to over $11 billion in loans annually and their flexible approach to counseling.

I would like to commend the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. TALENT) for his fairness and hard work on this legislation. We have a unique opportunity to prepare our Nation's entrepreneurs for a new economy that is more global, more diverse, and increasingly driven by technology.

With the passage of this reauthorization, we will assist in making the kind of economic decisions that not only will help close the widening economic gap in this country but will hopefully keep us on the right track for continued prosperity in the future.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1400

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to close by thanking my colleague, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELAZQUEZ). It has been a pleasure working with her on this and other bills. I appreciate her assistance. I also want to thank her staffers, Michael Day and Eric Edwards, and my own staff, Harry Katrichis, Tee Rowe, Paul

Denham, and Meredith Matty, for their good work.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I want to urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3843. It has become a truism up here that small business is the backbone of the economy, and it is. It is also the backbone of our communities. If you look and see who is running the school bond issue campaign or the Christmas charity, it is usually the small businesses in the community.

Increasingly, Mr. Chairman, small business has become the backbone of opportunity for people in our society as well. Not everybody has the inclination or resources to get an advanced degree at a college or university, but everybody has the opportunity to dream of running a small business. There are a whole lot of people that other Members have mentioned who come off of welfare or back into the labor force after a while or work their way up in a company and learn to do something well. They want to open their own small businesses and make it succeed for themselves and their families. It happens all the time. It happens more often because of these programs.

I have become convinced in my time as chairman and on the committee that these programs reach out and help people who are good risks for America, and maybe that the market would not help absent these programs. So I am pleased and proud to sponsor this bill, along with my friend, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELAZQUEZ), and I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

Mr. PHELPS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today as a cosponsor and strong supporter of H.R. 3843, The Small Business Administration Reauthorization Act of 2000. This valuable piece of legislation will authorize funding for most SBA programs at record levels.

This legislation increases programs for the SBA primary lending programs, the 7a, 504 and microloan programs. These programs have played a large role in creating and maintaining this country's unprecedented economic growth. Increasing access to capital is essential to the creation and growth of small business.

This legislation reaffirms the SBA's commitment to women business owners by increasing funding for the Women's Business Centers. These Women's Business Centers provide assistance in training in finance, management, marketing, counseling and access to SBA programs and services.

I would like to compliment the Chairman and Ranking Member for their hard work and the bipartisan manner in which this committee has completed its work. This legislation is a straight, numbers-only bill because of the work the Small Business Committee has done to make important changes to many small business programs.

Small businesses are vital to my District in Southern Illinois. The passage of this legislation will allow people the benefit and drive to succeed. Access to much needed capital in rural areas will assist the economy and the community. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important legislation, and look forward to the continued success of the SBA.

Mr. TALENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TALENT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 3843.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

The bill shall be considered by section as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, and, pursuant to the rule, each section is considered read.

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

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

The Clerk will designate section 1.

The text of section 1 is as follows:

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Small Business Reauthorization Act of 2000''.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 1?

If not, the Clerk will designate section 2.

The text of section 2 is as follows:

SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION OF SMALL BUSINESS PROGRAMS.

Section 20 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 631 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(g) FISCAL YEAR 2001.—

''(1) PROGRAM LEVELS.—The following program levels are authorized for fiscal year 2001:

''(A) For the programs authorized by this Act, the Administration is authorized to make—

''(i) $50,000,000 in technical assistance grants as provided in section 7(m); and

''(ii) $60,000,000 in direct loans, as provided in 7(m).

''(B) For the programs authorized by this Act, the Administration is authorized to make $19,200,000,000 in deferred participation loans and other financings. Of such sum, the Administration is authorized to make—

''(i) $14,500,000,000 in general business loans as provided in section 7(a);

''(ii) $4,000,000,000 in financings as provided in section 7(a)(13) of this Act and section 504 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958;

''(iii) $500,000,000 in loans as provided in section 7(a)(21); and

''(iv) $200,000,000 in loans as provided in section 7(m).

''(C) For the programs authorized by title III of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, the Administration is authorized to make—

''(i) $2,500,000,000 in purchases of participating securities; and

''(ii) $1,500,000,000 in guarantees of debentures.

''(D) For the programs authorized by part B of title IV of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, the Administration is authorized to enter into guarantees not to exceed $4,000,000,000 of which not more than $650,000,000 may be in bonds approved pursuant to section 411(a)(3) of that Act.

''(E) The Administration is authorized to make grants or enter cooperative agreements for a total amount of $5,000,000 for the Service Corps of Retired Executives program authorized by section 8(b)(1).

''(2) ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATIONS.—

''(A) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Administration for fiscal year 2001—

''(i) $14,000,000 for the direct administration of the loan programs established under sections 7(a) and 7(m) of this Act and under title V of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958; and

''(ii) $10,000,000 for the salaries and expenses of the Investment Division established in title II of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958.

''(B) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Administration for fiscal year 2001 such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act not elsewhere provided for, including administrative expenses and necessary loan capital for disaster loans pursuant to section 7(b), and to carry out title IV of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, including salaries and expenses of the Administration.

''(C) Notwithstanding any other provision of this paragraph, for fiscal year 2001—

''(i) no funds are authorized to be used as loan capital for the loan program authorized by section 7(a)(21) except by transfer from another Federal department or agency to the Administration, unless the program level authorized for general business loans under paragraph (1)(B)(i) is fully funded; and

''(ii) the Administration may not approve loans on its own behalf or on behalf of any other Federal department or agency, by contract or otherwise, under terms and conditions other than those specifically authorized under this Act or the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, except that it may approve loans under section 7(a)(21) of this Act in gross amounts of not more than $1,250,000.

''(h) FISCAL YEAR 2002.—

''(1) PROGRAM LEVELS.—The following program levels are authorized for fiscal year 2002:

''(A) For the programs authorized by this Act, the Administration is authorized to make—

''(i) $70,000,000 in technical assistance grants as provided in section 7(m); and

''(ii) $80,000,000 in direct loans, as provided in 7(m).

''(B) For the programs authorized by this Act, the Administration is authorized to make $20,250,000,000 in deferred participation loans and other financings. Of such sum, the Administration is authorized to make—

''(i) $15,000,000,000 in general business loans as provided in section 7(a);

''(ii) $4,500,000,000 in financings as provided in section 7(a)(13) of this Act and section 504 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958;

''(iii) $500,000,000 in loans as provided in section 7(a)(21); and

''(iv) $250,000,000 in loans as provided in section 7(m).

''(C) For the programs authorized by title III of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, the Administration is authorized to make—

''(i) $3,500,000,000 in purchases of participating securities; and

''(ii) $2,500,000,000 in guarantees of debentures.

''(D) For the programs authorized by part B of title IV of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, the Administration is authorized to enter into guarantees not to exceed $5,000,000,000 of which not more than $650,000,000 may be in bonds approved pursuant to section 411(a)(3) of that Act.

''(E) The Administration is authorized to make grants or enter cooperative agreements for a total amount of $6,000,000 for the Service Corps of Retired Executives program authorized by section 8(b)(1).

''(2) ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATIONS.—

''(A) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Administration for fiscal year 2002—

''(i) $16,000,000 for the direct administration of the loan programs established under sections 7(a) and 7(m) of this Act and under title V of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958; and

''(ii) $11,000,000 for the salaries and expenses of the Investment Division established in title II of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958.

''(B) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Administration for fiscal year 2002 such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act not elsewhere provided for, including administrative expenses and necessary loan capital for disaster loans pursuant to section 7(b), and to carry out title IV of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, including salaries and expenses of the Administration.

''(C) Notwithstanding any other provision of this paragraph, for fiscal year 2002—

''(i) no funds are authorized to be used as loan capital for the loan program authorized by section 7(a)(21) except by transfer from another Federal department or agency to the Administration, unless the program level authorized for general business loans under paragraph (1)(B)(i) is fully funded; and

''(ii) the Administration may not approve loans on its own behalf or on behalf of any other Federal department or agency, by contract or otherwise, under terms and conditions other than those specifically authorized under this Act or the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, except that it may approve loans under section 7(a)(21) of this Act in gross amounts of not more than $1,250,000.

''(i) FISCAL YEAR 2003.—

''(1) PROGRAM LEVELS.—The following program levels are authorized for fiscal year 2003:

''(A) For the programs authorized by this Act, the Administration is authorized to make—

''(i) $90,000,000 in technical assistance grants as provided in section 7(m); and

''(ii) $100,000,000 in direct loans, as provided in 7(m).

''(B) For the programs authorized by this Act, the Administration is authorized to make $21,800,000,000 in deferred participation loans and other financings. Of such sum, the Administration is authorized to make—

''(i) $16,000,000,000 in general business loans as provided in section 7(a);

''(ii) $5,000,000,000 in financings as provided in section 7(a)(13) of this Act and section 504 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958;

''(iii) $500,000,000 in loans as provided in section 7(a)(21); and

''(iv) $300,000,000 in loans as provided in section 7(m).

''(C) For the programs authorized by title III of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, the Administration is authorized to make—

''(i) $4,000,000,000 in purchases of participating securities; and

''(ii) $3,000,000,000 in guarantees of debentures.

''(D) For the programs authorized by part B of title IV of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, the Administration is authorized to enter into guarantees not to exceed $6,000,000,000 of which not more than $650,000,000 may be in bonds approved pursuant to section 411(a)(3) of that Act.

''(E) The Administration is authorized to make grants or enter into cooperative agreements for a total amount of $7,000,000 for the Service Corps of Retired Executives program authorized by section 8(b)(1).

''(2) ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATIONS.—

''(A) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Administration for fiscal year 2003—

''(i) $17,000,000 for the direct administration of the loan programs established under sections 7(a) and 7(m) of this Act and under title V of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958; and

''(ii) $12,000,000 for the salaries and expenses of the Investment Division established in title II of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958.

''(B) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Administration for fiscal year 2003 such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act not elsewhere provided for, including administrative expenses and necessary loan capital for disaster loans pursuant to section 7(b), and to carry out title IV of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, including salaries and expenses of the Administration.

''(C) Notwithstanding any other provision of this paragraph, for fiscal year 2003—

''(i) no funds are authorized to be used as loan capital for the loan program authorized by section 7(a)(21) except by transfer from another Federal department or agency to the Administration, unless the program level authorized for general business loans under paragraph (1)(B)(i) is fully funded; and

''(ii) the Administration may not approve loans on its own behalf or on behalf of any other Federal department or agency, by contract or otherwise, under terms and conditions other than those specifically authorized under this Act or the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, except that it may approve loans under section 7(a)(21) of this Act in gross amounts of not more than $1,250,000.''.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 2?

If not, the Clerk will designate section 3.

The text of section 3 is as follows:

SEC. 3. ADDITIONAL REAUTHORIZATIONS.

(a) SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTERS PROGRAM.—Section 21(a)(4)(C)(iii)(III) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648(a)(4)(C)(iii)(III)) is amended by striking ''$95,000,000'' and inserting ''$125,000,000''.

(b) DRUG-FREE WORKPLACE PROGRAM.—Section 27(g)(1) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 654(g)(1)) is amended by striking ''$10,000,000 for fiscal years 1999 and 2000'' and inserting ''$5,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2003''.

(c) HUBZONE PROGRAM.—Section 31 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 657a) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out the program established by this section $10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2003.''.

(d) WOMEN'S BUSINESS ENTERPRISE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS.—Section 411 of the Women's Business Ownership Act (Public Law 105–135; 15 U.S.C. 631 note) is amended by striking ''$600,000, for each of fiscal years 1998 through 2000,'' and inserting ''$1,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2003,''.

(e) VERY SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS PROGRAM.—Section 304(i) of the Small Business Administration Reauthorization and Amendments Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–403; 15 U.S.C. 644 note) is amended by striking ''September 30, 2000'' and inserting ''September 30, 2003''.

(f) SOCIALLY AND ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED BUSINESSES PROGRAM.—Section 7102(c) of the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–355; 15 U.S.C. 644 note) is amended by striking ''September 30, 2000'' and inserting ''September 30, 2003''.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to section 3?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TRAFICANT:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 4. LOAN APPLICATION PROCESSING.

(a) STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall conduct a study to determine the average time that the Administration requires to process an application for each type of loan or loan guarantee made under the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 631 et seq.).

(2) TRANSMITTAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Administrator shall transmit to Congress the results of the study conducted under paragraph (1).

Mr. TRAFICANT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TALENT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from Missouri (Chairman TALENT) and the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELAZQUEZ), the ranking member, for working together. I modified my amendment because, Mr. Chairman, they have stayed steadfast to numbers.

I want to thank SBA for coming to my district and helping my troubled district to help create jobs. I want to thank the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELAZQUEZ) and the gentleman from Missouri (Chairman TALENT) for creating an environment where communities like mine can be helped.

My amendment does something though that deals with numbers. My business people are concerned about the number of days it takes to bureaucratically process a loan or loan guarantee.

The Traficant amendment, Mr. Chairman, is strictly a study that says study the process of an application for each type that they administer and then report back within 1 year how

long it takes to complete one of these transactions. That is all it does. Once we get the information, quite frankly, we will know how long it takes, we can answer the business community, and hopefully accelerate that bureaucratic process by, if necessary, substantive legislative action.

Mr. TALENT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. TALENT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, pursuant to my reservation, let me just ask the gentleman, he originally packed with the amendment a requirement that the agency produce regulations pursuant to the study. I understand the gentleman withdrew that.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, Amendment No. 2 takes that out. I would like to say to the chairman in lobbying him on the floor and the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELAZQUEZ) at this time, I would like, when further substantive legislation comes up and when that language would be germane, to include an amendment that says if it has taken 60 days, let us try and do it in 30 days. It is not in this amendment. I have stricken it.

Mr. TALENT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, under the circumstances, and since I think that the amendment as the gentleman has changed it is at least borderline in terms of germaneness, and in view of the gentleman's good faith, I am going to withdraw my reservation.

I do agree with the amendment. I think we can take and work with it in conference.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say I join with the chairman in supporting this amendment. Anything we can do to speed the processing of loans is beneficial, not only for SBA, but also for the gentleman's constituents and small businesses.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments?

If not, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) having assumed the chair, Mr. LAHOOD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3843) to reauthorize programs to assist small business concerns, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 439, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the bill.

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

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 410, nays 11, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 49]

YEAS—410

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

NAYS—11

Barr
Canady
Chenoweth-Hage
Coburn
Doolittle
Hostettler
Paul
Rohrabacher
Royce
Sanford
Shadegg

NOT VOTING—13

Boyd
Brown (FL)
Collins
Cook
Hinojosa
John
Klink
Myrick
Nethercutt
Reyes
Rush
Tanner
Walden

□ 1430

Mr. BARR of Georgia changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 1501, JUVENILE JUSTICE REFORM ACT OF 1999

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. LOFGREN moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 1501, be instructed to insist that the committee of conference should have its first substantive meeting to offer amendments and motions within the next 2 weeks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

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

Mr. Speaker, for 8 months the conference committee on the juvenile justice bill has done nothing, has not met. In fact, the last and the only meeting of the conference committee that has the opportunity to deal with the issue of gun safety was in August, and was not substantive.

Since then, we have seen shootings in day care centers and schools, we have seen 6-year-olds shoot 6-year-olds, we have seen firefighters shot as they try to do their jobs, and the congressional response has been simply nothing.

When the President calls congressional leaders to the Oval Office to get the conference started and no meeting is scheduled, something is wrong. A few days ago, the President called the chairman and the ranking members of the House and Senate Judiciary Committees to meetings at the White House to simply ask them to meet in an open and public conference meeting, and still no such meeting has been called.

We need to stop hiding behind closed-door negotiations. We cannot have a bill without a conference meeting, so we need to meet. Not having a meeting is the same as killing the bill. Time is running out, and the families of this Nation are waiting to see what we will do.

I am hopeful that we can come together on a bipartisan basis to support this motion to instruct, which simply says, get the job done. Sit down. Talk to each other. Have a meeting. I hope that such a meeting will produce a bill, will produce a law that we will all be able to support.

Recently I had the chance to read the statement of Robin Anderson, who bought the guns for Eric Harris and Dylan Klebold, the young men who killed those kids at Columbine High School.

What she says in her statement was that if there had been an instant check, if there had been a background check from the private gun dealers at the gun show where she bought the weapons that those boys used to kill all those kids, that she would not have purchased those guns. In fact, she says, ''I wish a law requiring background checks had been in effect at the time. I don't know if Eric and Dylan would have been able to get guns from another source, but I would not have helped them. It was too easy. I wish it had been more difficult. I wouldn't have helped them buy the guns if I had faced a background check.''

There has been a lot of unfortunate rhetoric in the last few days about the issue of gun safety and people questioning motives and the like. But I like the statement made by one of the Republican Members of this body at the White House earlier this morning. He said, what we want is we want to bury this as an issue. We do not want to bury any more kids. So please, let us support this motion to instruct.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to respond to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) on this motion to instruct conferees.

First, I want to say that this is an important issue. No one treats this issue lightly, because we are dealing with the lives of individuals as well as dealing with constitutional liberties. So it is a very, very important subject that arouses the passions of people, as it should. It is something that we have to deal with and should deal with.

I believe that we do have a consensus that we want to make progress on this. But as the gentlewoman knows, when we make progress in this body, there are many ways to do that, particularly whenever we not only have to work with ourselves but we have to work with our colleagues at the other end of this Capitol in the United States Senate. So there are a lot of ways to make progress.

I will oppose the motion to instruct conferees because I generally oppose motions to instruct because these artificial time lines, these artificial constraints, are really not helpful in the negotiating process, in the coming together of the different points of view. I believe that can be done as the conference committee has already met, and the gentlewoman, and she well knows, they have met. She argues that that is not a substantive meeting, but they discussed, they articulated their different views on this particular bill. To me that is a very substantive meeting.

The way the legislative process works, then we go back and we start working. We put out ideas. The chairman, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), who is on the conference committee, has an idea that he has presented that is being examined. There is a lot of work that is going on on this very, very important issue.

Whenever there is some indication that there is a meeting of the minds, that there is some room on both sides to come together, I am confident that this conference will meet and that they will pass substantive legislation.

I would also point out that not only is this an artificial time line, but it directs our conferees. As the gentlewoman knows, the chairman of the conference, who has the right to call the conference together, is the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary on the Senate side, Chairman HATCH. So it is he that must make the decision to call the conferees together.

When I talk about areas of agreement, as I talk to my constituents and as I hear from different people, I believe that we have an agreement that we ought to protect children. I believe that we ought to provide parents with tools with which they can protect firearms, and they do not expose those children. Parents need all the tools that they can have.

I believe this is an area that we can reach agreement on. I believe we can reach agreement that we ought to keep guns out of the hands of criminals.

Whenever we want to expand the background checks to gun shows, there is basically a debate between a 24-hour waiting period and a 72-hour waiting period. I believe that people of good faith can resolve these differences, but there are clear differences. There are substantive constitutional rights at stake, so people, being passionate about this, want to be able to work these things out, fighting for their principles. I hope that we can come together on this.

But a lot of work is being done between the Members, dialogues are going on, ideas are being discussed. I believe this is the way to get this job done, rather than having these artificial time lines and constraints that are imposed.

So I thank the gentlewoman for her comments and her suggestions and engaging in this debate. We have had discussions, and I would be happy to sit down with her at any time. But for the conferees, I think the motion to instruct is inappropriate, is not conducive to working this thing out and reaching common ground.

For that reason, I would ask my colleagues to oppose the motion to instruct.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would note that the speeches we gave to each other on August 5 have not been followed by action. The check has been in the mail for quite a long time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the motion offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN). I am horrified that we have to stand here on the floor of this House of Representatives, the people's House, and battle to keep the debate on gun safety alive.

I cannot believe that some of my colleagues, who work so hard every day to represent the best interests of the American people, think that it is in this country's best interest for Congress to drag its feet in passing comprehensive, commonsense gun safety legislation.

Frankly, in a country that was founded on the ideals of democracy and freedom of speech, it seems downright undemocratic to me that we cannot even get this conference committee to meet. As I understand it, it has been promised since August 5.

Here we are with the anniversary of Columbine looming, with more of our Nation's children dying each day from gun violence, two high school students massacre their classmates, and we will not discuss closing the gun show loophole; a 6-year-old shoots his classmate dead, and we will not discuss mandatory gun child safety locks.

This is about saving lives. This is about keeping our streets, communities, schools, places of worship, safe. Gun violence does not discriminate between the inner city and the suburbs. It does not discriminate between young and old, rich and poor, black and white. The tragedy of gun death touches us all, and shame on us if we stop this debate before it can begin in earnest.

The American people have asked Congress to be leaders in reducing gun violence, and have shown that they are willing to back up our leadership. As long as we refuse to meet, refuse to negotiate and discuss, we are ignoring our responsibility as lawmakers.

I urge my colleagues, let this conference meet. I urge my colleagues to support this motion.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, what we are witnessing here today is the continued politicization by the Democrats and by this administration of issues that really ought to be removed from the political arena and looked at objectively in the best interests of the American people, with the laws and our Constitution in mind.

Unfortunately, though, Mr. Speaker, every time there is a tragedy in our community, folks on the other side, including those clamoring for this resolution today, do not look to those in the community who are responsible for enforcing our gun laws, nor, of course, would they even dare to think of looking to the administration to enforce existing gun laws, which this administration has shamefully refused to enforce in a number of areas, including those, Mr. Speaker, relating to the very crimes that give rise to these cries today for precipitous action on the part of the Committee on the Judiciary conferees.

Rather, though, Mr. Speaker, than look to continually politicizing an issue regarding the safety of our children and efforts to construct a framework within which we can protect our children, within the bounds of our Constitution and our laws, the other side simply clamors for politicization.

□ 1445

The motivation of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) who purports to speak so purely of the interests of the children is suspect by a letter that she and her Democrat colleagues sent on, I think it was, March 2 signed by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), minority leader, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR) and other members of their leadership and those who favor gun control.

What they say really provides a window into their thinking, not the language of the resolution today. They are demanding that the House accede to the requirements in the Senate bill on youth violence and gun control, even though the House of Representatives on two, count them, Mr. Speaker, two occasions last summer clearly, clearly voted down those provisions in the Senate bill.

The gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) both proposed amendments to the House bill that essentially mirror those in the Senate. Now the folks on the other side purporting to speak so purely and innocently and to blast us on this side for trying to reflect the will of the House rather than their political agenda are trying to force us to accede to something that the House reflecting the will of the people by majority vote has twice refused to adopt.

Instead of clamoring to politicize this issue, I would urge, although I do not think that this offer will be taken up, I would urge those on the other side to simply try and work with us, remove their very stilted and very blindered focus on gun control and look as we did, Mr. Speaker, at the substance of the bills that passed the House earlier last year and which were the subject of considerable debate by dozens upon dozens of experts in the youth violence legislation working group, with an equal number of Republicans and Democrats appointed by the Speaker and the Minority Leader on which I and many on the other side were honored to have served.

That body heard from experts all across the geographic agenda, the professional agenda and the political agenda, looking at very real, very concrete ways that we can help within the bounds of federalism to solve the problems of youth violence in our communities. Many of those ideas are reflected, Mr. Speaker, in the bill that we did pass in the House.

Now, I do not think any of us on this side, and certainly speaking for myself, Mr. Speaker, shy away from the debate on gun control. The other side wants to bring up gun control. I say bring it up, let us debate it, and let us vote it down. We do it all the time when they try and infringe on the Second Amendment.

But I would implore the other side to stop holding important youth violence legislation hostage because they want it to be a political Christmas tree for gun control. Let us at least bring it to the floor without artificial mandates mandating the House already do something that it has twice rejected, and they know it would happen again. They are simply trying to make the issue political.

Let us, instead, Mr. Speaker, pool our efforts, focus on real solutions to real problems, bring those pieces of legislation to the floor on which we can agree and on which school administrators and parents are imploring us to do, not listen to the plaintive cries of those that are now convicted of crime facing criminal activity, instead of bringing the quotes in here of those who now, after the fact, after they have contributed to tragedy say, oh, please, if only there had been a law to have stopped me from violating the law, I certainly would not have violated the law. That is absolute nonsense.

Let us look at the real laws that are on the books, those that are not being enforced by the Clinton administration, and let us come up with some real solutions.

Work with us on the other side instead of against the efforts to come forward and come back to the floor with a conference report that they know will not be rejected as the current one would be that they are demanding that we take up on the floor.

There is an historic opportunity here, Mr. Speaker, to come up with some real solutions to real problems with youth violence in our communities that fit within the bounds of the Constitution, not outside of those bounds; and, yet, the other side refuses to work with us, simply demanding, they are demanding in this letter, Mr. Speaker, that we adopt a position that already has been voted down twice by the House.

I urge rejection of the Lofgren motion to instruct.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would just note that the motion before the body is only that

the conference committee should meet, and I hope that we can do that; and if we would meet, that we would be able to find common ground that would be of value to the safety of America's children.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, for nearly a year, we have seen the Republican leadership scheme with their special interest friends to kill meaningful gun safety reform. Behind closed doors, yes, they have threatened Members of this House, they have twisted arms, and they have used every back-room tactic in the book to make sure that common sense, moderate gun safety reform would never see the light of day. They would, in fact, thwart the will of the American people.

Just when one thought that tactics could not get any worse, the leader in the NRA said this week that the President is, and I quote him, ''willing to accept a certain level of killing to further his political agenda.'' Mr. Speaker, these are not the words and the comments of someone who is willing to work constructively to keep guns out of the hands of children and criminals. These are the views of a group that will do anything, say anything to make sure that even the most modest gun safety reforms are left for dead.

I call on the Republican leadership to help Democrats pass a bill that requires background checks at gun shows, child safety locks for all firearms, and a ban on high capacity ammunition clips. We have Democrats and Republicans in this body who are willing to do that. Let us vote for this motion to instruct.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) has 23½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) has 19 minutes remaining.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY), a leader in this country for gun safety measures.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I stand in strong support on letting this motion go forward. We all know that things here in the House go extremely slow. But I happen to think that 8 months waiting so we can meet together and hash this out is too long. We have seen too many killings. We have seen too many killings in our schools, our churches. We have seen our firemen being shot.

I have to believe that the American people want us to do this. What upsets me is we know the American people want us to respond. Yet, we see the NRA coming out against us constantly, even to the point where they will put a flier out asking our Members to vote this down.

We had a meeting this morning in the White House, Republicans and Democrats. And I have to tell my colleagues one of the most interesting things that came out, in California, they have what we want to do as far as closing the gun show loophole. Do my colleagues know what, the gun shows are doing very, very well in California. No one has been denied their rights on buying guns. We have to remember the majority of people that go buy their guns get cleared extremely fast.

Let us sit together, let the American people hear our debates. This is not like we are rushing through it. Eight months is 8 months.

I have to tell my colleagues, Mother's Day of this year, the Million Mom March is going to be marching across this country because we want safety. We can handle all the other issues that work to reduce gun violence in this country, but there are more things we can do; and the bottom line is it is the easy access to guns that are killing our citizens. We can do something. The people of America are looking forward to us doing something.

It is bipartisan. Republicans and Democrats should be joining together on this. This is something good for the American people. After this morning and seeing my Republican colleagues working with us, and across this country, we do not ask registration of all those that are going to be in the Million Mom March. They are Republicans. They are Democrats. They are Independents. They are going to be sticking with us.

We are going to make a change in this country. We cannot wait any longer. Because each day, people are dying: our police officers, our firemen, our children, our loved ones. That is wrong. We have to make a difference. We have the moral obligation.

I ask all of my colleagues on the Republican and Democratic side to vote to let us sit down and talk. That is all we are doing. This has nothing to do with the Second Amendment. This has nothing to do with the Constitution. We are not even touching those laws. All we are trying to do is say we care about everyone in this country.

I as a victim and now I as a Congressperson have to say enough is enough. I cannot face any more victims that keep coming to my office and asking why we are not doing anything.

This should not be politics. We should not bring politics into this whatsoever. This is doing the right thing. If it was any other subject, it would have been passed more than 8 months ago.

One more month before Mother's Day, then my colleagues are going to see moms across this country making a difference.

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

Mr. Speaker, I just want to thank the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) who just spoke and for the tone by which she presented the issue and the way she conducts herself on this issue of great importance. I know that she has personally been touched by this.

She indicated that this should not be a partisan issue. I agree with her completely. I think that whenever we can diminish the tone from a partisan standpoint, because there are people on both sides that take different positions on this issue, I would say that I still think it is a difficult issue. That is one of the reasons we are having a hard time getting together.

But the tone that the gentlewoman from New York represented is just what is needed to bring the sides together. I wanted to take this moment to thank her for what she had to say and the manner in which she had to say it.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the minority leader.

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the motion that is before us today. The juvenile justice conference was supposed to hammer out a compromise bill. Instead, the conference seems to be in hibernation.

It is bad enough that the conference has not met since last August. What is even worse is that now Republican leaders have abandoned any effort to work out a bipartisan solution.

Republican leaders are now rapidly backtracking from efforts to move a bill out of conference that addresses the core issues behind the epidemic of violence that threatens our young people. Yesterday, the Majority Leader stated that he would support dismantling the juvenile justice bill to eliminate the Senate-passed gun safety provisions.

I think we have a simple choice to make. Do we back down and eviscerate the bipartisan compromise in the Senate, or do we move forward to protect the children of America? The choice should be clear to anyone who is fed up with violence in our schools and in our neighborhoods.

We must stand up for parents and the safety of their children by sitting down and reaching a bipartisan agreement to close the gun show loophole.

I had a policeman in Chicago who had been shot 13 times by a gang tell me that, when he goes to the high schools in Chicago and asks the students how many have a gun at home, everybody raises their hand. How many know where the gun is? Everybody raises their hand. How many have shot the gun? Everybody raises their hand.

He said that the gun show loophole is causing thousands of guns to flood into a city like Chicago. He said, look, gun safety measures will never stop crime, but it will help because, he said, the truth is our cities and our villages of this country are awash in guns. We do

not need that many. We should not have that many.

A juvenile justice bill that ignores the issue of gun safety is a hollow bill that is an insult to the victims of these horrible acts of violence. Today we must stand our ground and send a strong message to the conferees that they must return with a bill that represents bipartisan sentiment and contains real protections for our children.

□ 1500

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I want to respond to the minority leader and the remarks that he made.

I think the best way to respond is to go through some of the facts. He indicated that we on this side have abandoned an effort to seek a bipartisan solution, and that is quite the contrary. The only way anything is going to happen is through a bipartisan solution. I know that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), on the House side, is submitting some proposals out there in seeking a bipartisan solution to this. So we very much desire that because that is the only way it is going to work.

Secondly, the minority leader, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), indicated that we should accept the Senate-passed gun provisions. Well, I might remind the gentleman from Missouri that those same provisions were defeated in this body. So what he is asking is that our conferees reject the will of this House. And I think that the will of this House has to carry some weight in the conference committee.

If we go back as to what has happened, some very important things happened during the debate. First of all, in the House, and we debated this issue, at a vote of 395 to 27 we passed a juvenile Brady law, which prohibited juveniles convicted of an act of violent juvenile delinquency from possessing a firearm, a common sense gun restriction that is appropriate that people in this body supported in a bipartisan way, and it was passed. And then again we passed a ban on the juvenile possession of semiautomatic assault weapons. It passed by an overwhelming bipartisan vote. Child safety locks, which I supported, passed by a vote of 311 to 115. It passed on an amendment. The ban of importation of large capacity ammo clips passed the House by a voice vote.

So all of this we did when we engaged in the debate. As my colleagues on the other side of the aisle well know, when these amendments were attached to the substantive bill, it was defeated on a bipartisan basis because there was a perception that it went too far and that it was not acceptable. So the other side had some, as a matter of fact many, Democrats voting against it because they felt like it did not go far enough, and others that voted against it because it went too far. So it was defeated on bipartisan basis by this House.

This paints the difficulty in which we find ourselves. The best way to achieve a result is not to ignore the will of the House, but to factor it in, and to try to arrive at a consensus. The motion to instruct conferees is not the right way to get it done. We are putting out these proposals, we are continuing the dialogue, and we need the other side's help in reaching a consensus. We think we can achieve this in a bipartisan way.

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

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman from Arkansas tell me at what point in all of that deliberation did the House express the notion that we should not even meet in conference; that we should not even discuss these items? There seemed to have been, I would agree with the gentleman, broad consensus.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, what I was reciting was the debate that occurred in this House, which showed how much we did accomplish together and how much was defeated that was good that was defeated together. That is the difficulty the conferees find themselves in.

This is not a simple issue that we can politicize. We have to debate policy. We have to debate policy. And that is what we are doing in a very substantive way and that is what we are going to continue to do. We ask the help of the other side.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), a member of the Committee on the Judiciary and a member of the conference committee.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time and for her leadership on this particular legislation.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the American people can understand and decipher between rhetoric and sincerity. On one side we have children dying every day; on the other side we have a special interest group that intimidates, lobbies, and obstructs. On one side we have those in a bipartisan way who are committed to meeting; on the other side we have a conference committee that, at best, is limited in its sincerity and intent to do right.

I think it is certainly a crime to suggest that those of us who want real gun safety legislation would be those who are undermining laws that would prevent gun violence, or that we are undermining laws that would want to have us enforce gun laws against those who would be criminal. I think our records mutually, both Democrats and Republicans, are strong on enforcing criminal laws.

In fact, the Brady law has seen 500,000 criminals not get guns. I ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle if they think the Brady law is wrong. I have legislation that holds adults responsible for guns in the hands of children that supports trigger locks that I will be filing. Do they want us to go piece by piece, or can we come and be a committee of one that will listen to the American people, that will listen to the mothers who are going to march?

I ask my good friend from Georgia, and I lower my tone and I ask it out of great interest and sincerity, would he get the National Rifle Association to repudiate its ugly comments that suggest that the President of the United States and the Vice President of the United States, holding the two highest offices and the respect of the American people, that suggest that they are, in fact, fueling the fires of violence for their own political interest.

I am outraged and saddened that we would have an organization that has such a dominant hand on the Members of this Congress that they cannot even wiggle themselves out to stand up for dying children who are dying every day.

I simply ask, NRA, will you admit to your error and will you draw back on those ugly words? Will you pull them down so that we can have a conference, Mr. Speaker, that lowers the tone and works in a bipartisan way so that we can save the lives of children, so we can pass gun safety legislation and be committed not to special interest, not Democrats, not Republicans, not independents but the will of the American people? I ask my colleagues on the other side and I ask the representatives of the National Rifle Association in this Congress, will they repudiate such ugly, ugly words?

I want real gun safety legislation, Mr. Speaker, and I want to do it in a bipartisan and forceful manner on behalf of our children.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The Chair would advise all Members to address their comments to the Chair.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I again thank the gentleman from Arkansas for yielding me this time.

The previous speaker purports to, with all sincerity, indicate her willingness to work together in a bipartisan fashion. Yet more than any other speaker on this issue, she inflames the passions of politicization.

This is a matter that ought very much to be decided by all of us in this body, not by circulating letters drafted by the White House, not by taking intransigent positions as reflected in those letters, but by listening to our constituents. That is what we do. I presume that that is what she does. Until somebody tells me otherwise, I presume and will conclude that that is what the gentlewoman from Texas does.

One would simply wish that the gentlewoman would grant to us that same

courtesy, to believe that we also represent our constituents. And our constituents, many of us on this side, including mine in Georgia, tell us that they believe in strong enforcement of our gun laws, that they believe in responsibility in schools and parents, and that is where our focus ought to be. And I would urge the gentlewoman to join us in keeping the focus there, not on artificial gun control or on outside groups.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WEINER), a new member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal of respect for my colleagues on the other side. The gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) argued persuasively that there are some very difficult issues to resolve here. And I think the forum to resolve these issues is in a conference committee where I believe, and many of my colleagues believe, that these issues will be resolved favorably to our interest.

But I think that we have to be careful not to keep repeating things that are simply incorrect as an argument for not having the conference. The gentleman from Georgia repeats again and again this notion that is perpetrated by the NRA that enforcement is down. Simply not true. Unsubstantiated by the facts. Twenty-five percent increase in the Federal enforcement in the last year; a 7 percent reduction in violent crime in the last year alone.

And the final proof in the pudding, if my colleagues do not want to compare it just year to year, there are 22 percent more people in prison for gun offenses today than there were in 1992. That is the fact of the matter.

The National Rifle Association would like to repeat and repeat and repeat the big lie that these laws are not being enforced. They are being enforced more now than at any time in the last decade. So my colleagues can have many reasons to oppose the conference committee, but that ought not be one of them.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the ranking member of the House Committee on the Judiciary, and someone who has spent an enormous amount of time trying to forge an answer with the chairman of the committee.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) for the great work she is doing in bringing this motion to instruct, because this is the simplest level we can arrive at. I have never heard of a motion to instruct that had no substantive purpose whatsoever except to ask the conferees to meet. This must be a record of some sort.

And this is an absurd and morbid game that the National Rifle Association is playing, to accuse the President of being dishonest about gun safety legislation. Nobody wants it more than the President. We have met with him time and time again. We know that that is true.

The tired old tactics of delaying and distracting cannot hide one essential truth: we want an open and public debate of these issues. The President says have a conference. Matter of fact, there are more conservatives on the committee than there are liberals. So we will take whatever happens. But do not tell the American people that for 8 months we are not going to do anything whatsoever.

The NRA fears the debate. And that fact alone speaks volumes. When an organization is scared to take this debate out into the open, who is really lying? The NRA claimed at one point that they pioneered criminal background checks. Do not make me laugh. I was here. They fought the Brady bill tooth and nail. So who is really lying? They say they support gun show and background checks, but they offer bills that would exclude events where hundreds of guns are sold from any background checks.

And by the way, the biggest gun shows in America are in California, where they check very carefully the purchases that are done there. So we beg our colleagues to support the motion to instruct.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire on the balance of time?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) has 14 minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) has 12 remaining.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I voted for Brady, I voted to ban semiautomatics, and I am done voting.

I think it is time to start enforcing the laws. And I think it is time to start looking at political issues around here. I think we are playing a lot of football with guns.

On that juvenile crime bill I passed a little amendment that said, look, a teenager or kid that is involved with a gun that gets caught loses their driving privileges until they are 21. Where are we enforcing this law? Not this one, I hope, that becomes law.

Where is the aggressive record of this administration and even the past administration going after people that violate laws with the use of guns? I think we are throwing an awful lot on the NRA that need not be on the NRA. My God, when kids are building a bomb in the basement of a home, where is mom and dad? It is not the NRA's fault.

I do not want anybody's guns taken away. And I am telling the Democrats this: with the language that the Democrats have for these gun shows, there will be more illegal sales at gun shows than there will be legal sales if it was just left alone.

I do not want to argue the case, I say to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman from Ohio that, as the one who made that amendment, I would like him to know that we have a modification of Lautenberg which allows 24-hour, 1-day, clearance for gun checks. And then for the 5 percent who cannot check in the 1-day, we have a 2-day period. Now does that take away anybody's rights?

□ 1515

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, what if it was a 2-day sale, I say to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), and it is a Saturday at 4 o'clock and that gun dealer wants to make a buck and just sells the gun anyway to Joe Blow.

Mr. Speaker, there are two sides of this issue, be careful, but the Clinton administration could be much more aggressive on crime and guns and that is the fact of it.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), a distinguished member of the committee.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I know I am not alone in asking how long we have to wait and what is it going to take?

It is hard to believe that it is almost 1 year since the Columbine tragedy, and yet it appears that we have not learned a thing. Since Columbine, we have endured tragedies in Conyers, Georgia; my community of Rogers Park in Chicago, Illinois; Bloomington, Indiana; Atlanta, Georgia; Pelham, Alabama; Granada Hills, California; Ft. Worth, Texas; Honolulu, Hawaii; Seattle, Washington; Wilkinsburg, Pennsylvania; Memphis, Tennessee; Kayla Rollard in Mt. Morris Township in Michigan. Thirteen children, a Columbine's worth of children, every day are killed in the United States.

Communities are waiting. Parents are waiting. But most importantly, our children are waiting. Why can we not at least sit down and have this conference committee?

I rise to support this motion to instruct, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to get to business. The American people are watching and they are waiting.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES).

(Mrs. JONES of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, every day children, young people, adults and seniors come to these hallowed halls to look to Congress for leadership, to set the example, to show democracy in action, to have a real debate and discussion on juvenile justice, gun control, and gun safety.

When tragedy strikes, who else should they look to but Congress to make the right decisions, to make the decisions that will affect their lives?

To the woman from the 11th Congressional District of Ohio whose son was a schizophrenic who was a convicted felon who purchased a gun in a gun show and came home and shot her, tell her it is enough. It is not enough.

It is time today to go back to conference and come up with true gun safety and true gun control. That is what the people expect. It is not the will of Congress. It is the will of the people that we need to listen to and follow through on.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARR).

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) for yielding me the time.

Let us step back from the shouting and the dire predictions for just a moment, Mr. Speaker, and focus on the facts, as we have been trying to do.

The record of this administration is not one that withstands scrutiny on gun prosecutions. Now, one might think if one asked the average citizen in America every time the President comes out and talks about so many hundreds of thousands of people who have been prohibited from purchasing or acquiring a firearm because of the Brady background check that if we were to ask that average citizen how many of those cases do they think the administration might have prosecuted, I doubt that there are many, outside of those of us on the Committee on the Judiciary who have inquired of the administration the answer to those particular questions, who would know that in 1996 there were zero, in 1997 there were zero, and in 1998 that shot up to one prosecution for under the Brady instant background check.

If this administration were serious about enforcing existing laws, those statistics, in light of the President's annual trumpeting of how many hundreds of thousands of people not authorized to possess firearms were stopped because of Brady, they would be far different.

The prosecution for the transfer of a handgun or ammunition to a juvenile, it dropped precipitously, not from the hundreds to the hundreds but from nine in 1996 to six in 1998.

With regard even, Mr. Speaker, to those individuals who were able to acquire firearms even though prohibited under Federal law from doing so, after the 3-day check there were in excess of 3,000, in other words, over 3,000 individuals prohibited from possessing a firearm who were able to acquire one after the 3-day check, this administration knows who they are. They could find them tomorrow, every one of those 3,000.

Yet, what has the administration done? Have they sent for prosecution 3,000? No. Two thousand? No. One thousand? No. Five hundred? No. They have sent less than 200 of those cases referred for prosecution.

This, Mr. Speaker, is why we are having such a problem with regard to enforcement of existing Federal gun laws. This administration is asleep at the switch. They are not enforcing them.

And again, although we may be saying this on deaf ears here today, we would implore our colleagues to work with us to try and understand why, in the face of a doubling over the last 8 years of this administration's budget for ATF and DoJ, these are the statistics, shameful statistics on prosecutions. Work with us to figure out why they are doing this and then solve the problem with us and not start blasting in political terms bringing up the NRA bogeyman out there. Work with us on real facts, on real policy, and let us get away from the politics.

I urge this motion to instruct to be defeated.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire what time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) has 10 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) has 9 minutes remaining.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, in 1994, the NRA told us we should not pass the Brady bill because the real problem was with the gun shows.

We passed the Brady bill. In the last 6 years, 500,000 felons and mentally disturbed people were prevented by the Brady law from acquiring guns; and numerous lives, obviously, were thereby saved.

Now we are trying to deal with the gun shows, and we are told we cannot require a 72-hour wait. Ninety-five percent of the time they will not need a wait of more than one day. Five percent of the people who want to buy guns cannot be cleared within a day. And those 5 percent are 20 times more likely, it turns out, to be felons or mentally disturbed people who should not get the guns, but they are the ones who would get the guns because we are told we cannot have more than 24 hours.

Now, in this country we have 4½ percent of the world's population and 86 percent of the gun deaths in the entire world, 86 percent. This is absurd.

Now we are told that the administration is not enforcing the law. Well, I think it has enforced the law, but the administration has asked for a large increase in enforcement. And, fine, we should increase enforcement. But what kind of foolish argument is it that says, they are not punishing people enough, therefore, do not do any prevention?

These bills are designed to prevent gun deaths. Enforcement is designed to punish them. Let us do both. An argument that we should have more enforcement is not an argument against intelligent preventive legislation.

No one would say, prosecute the drunk drivers more and eliminate the airbags and the seatbelts. That does not make sense.

Finally, all this resolution asks, Mr. Speaker, is not that these bills be passed, not that our version be adopted, but simply that the conference committee meet. It has not met since August. If the conference does not meet, if this resolution is defeated, it will simply confirm once again that the Republican leadership is totally subservient to the National Rifle Association.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ).

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I have listened for years and years, I have been here for 18 years listening to this debate; and I have come to some conclusions over that period of time.

I can understand the anxiety on our side of the aisle to have a conference. And I also can understand the anxiousness of people who want to stop children from getting killed. But the fact of the matter is that I think we are going about it the wrong way.

We have all kinds of things in our society that kill people: knives, bombs, cars. And it is not really those inanimate objects that are responsible for that. It is the people who are in control of those inanimate objects. I think we are addressing this thing in the wrong way.

Certainly in schools, the school teachers, the principals and all the other people ought to recognize behavior that is not right and normal and recognize that children ought to be counseled or adults. Certainly in our society we can tell the ones that are running around with anger in their hearts and such anger that they might pick up a gun and shoot somebody. But there are millions of gun owners in this country who keep their guns safely who have never killed anybody with that gun, who use them either for target shooting, for Olympic shooting, for hunting legitimately. They do not use many round magazines. They cannot have more than three rounds in a magazine at any one time in a hunting field, anyway.

But the fact is that I think we ought to be concentrating more on the deviant behavior of people who will pick up a gun and shoot somebody or the person that gets behind the wheel of a car drunk and will kill somebody or the person that will pick up a knife and stab somebody or the person that will poison somebody.

My colleague from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) talked about children building bombs in garages and the parents did not even know about it. I think we

ought to start looking at families and start to try to realize that we need to do more to bring family solidarity to where the parents know what the children are doing and how they are doing it and why they are doing it than concentrating on these other things which can be enforced every day anyway.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE).

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARR) says that we should get with the real facts and recognize the real facts. I say to the gentleman and all those in this chamber, these are the real facts. A 6-year-old little girl is dead and that is a real fact, and she was shot dead by a 6-year-old little classmate who was holding an inanimate object, a gun.

This is a trigger lock. And had this trigger lock been in place, that 6-year-old little girl would still be alive because the gun could not have discharged.

In my district, in June of last year, a 6-year-old boy picked up a rifle leaning against the wall in his apartment when his mom went next door and shot his 4-year-old brother in the ear, fortunately not the head but the ear. That little boy would not have been injured and that gun could not have discharged had there been a trigger lock in place.

We need to start getting with the real facts and recognizing the realities in this country. I do not want to take anybody's gun away that is not a convicted felon, a mentally ill person, or a child without adult supervision. But, as a prosecutor for 12 years, I have seen firsthand gun violence.

I believe in the Second Amendment. I own a firearm myself. But adults who are going to exercise the right to own a firearm should do it responsibly.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I want to respond to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MOORE) before he leaves the House chamber here.

In regard to that 6-year-old, what an extraordinary tragedy. But I think we have to talk about this in a rational, substantive way.

The fact is the biggest problem was the breakdown of that home, the fact that the mom was I believe in prison, the father was in prison, the mom was away, the gun was from an uncle, and the gun was found in a crack house. And I do not think in the circumstances of a crack house that someone is going to leave and say, oh, I forgot to put the trigger lock on.

Yes, I want my colleagues to know I support and I voted for safety locks to be sold with handguns, because we need to give parents the tools. But we cannot say to ourselves that this is going to solve the problems of violence. It would not have saved the 6-year-old.

What would have saved the 6-year-old is the strengthening of the home, the strengthening of our social service network, good welfare people who will help in that home environment. That is what would have saved that child.

And, yes, I am speaking as someone who supports the sale of safety locks with a handgun. But that will not carry over and mandate if they would follow it a crack dealer who has a handgun. And so, let us deal with this in a fair and substantive way.

I appreciate the gentleman for what he says. I believe that we can work together. We are so close on this. We want to do this. But we can carry out this battle in good faith. And I really hope that the conference will, as we work along the sides and discuss these things, that we will come to a closer agreement.

□ 1530

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

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan for a question.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to thank the gentleman for agreeing on the importance of safety locks on handguns. The overriding debate here is whether or not we will ask the conference to resume its sitting.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, that is right, and I will address that substantive point on this in just a moment.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute across the aisle to the gentleman from San Diego, California (Mr. BILBRAY).

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, this is an issue that does cross the aisle. I think that those of us that really believe strongly in the Second Amendment or the First Amendment or any of our given rights realize that reasonable restrictions on our freedoms are not a threat to our freedoms. They are one of the best foundations of guaranteeing our freedoms.

I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) for his tone of saying we can work together to address these issues. I would say to my Democratic colleagues, the President has identified in his State of the Union that we need more enforcement; we need to crack down on the people who are trying to purchase guns illegally. We need to do more. The President agrees with that. The Democrats should agree with it. The Republicans should agree with it.

When it comes to the trigger locks, I am going to introduce a bill next week that not only identifies trigger locks but also recognizes that gun owners who have done the responsible thing and locked up their guns should not be held liable for the abuses of criminals. I think that is something we can come together on. We are not talking about in this conference very extreme proposals. What is not extreme is for us to finally now come together and let us take action on this. Let us not delay it. Let us move it forward and then the Republican and the Democratic proposals can come together and make it an American proposal.

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I am quite honored to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY).

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Lofgren motion to recommit and commend the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) for her consistent leadership on this issue. It has been almost a year since the Columbine tragedy and still the conference committee has not yet held one substantive meeting. That is what this motion calls for. It calls for them to meet and review and act on gun safety measures.

How many children have to die before this Congress acts?

My colleagues have mentioned the death of one 6-year old by another 6-year old. How young must the victims be of gun violence before the House leadership acts? Will they finally call a meeting if a 5-year old kills a 5-year old or a 4-year old kills a 4-year old? When are they going to at least meet and discuss what people on both sides of the aisle have said they support, safety locks, child safety locks? If the child safety lock was on that gun, whether it was in the house or the crack house or the street, that child would be alive today.

The conference should meet. Pass the Lofgren amendment.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) a question. First of all, looking at the fact situation that we are speaking of, I will certainly concede that if there had been a trigger lock on the gun then the child would not have been able to pull the trigger.

Would the gentlewoman also concede, though, before that would have taken place that the crack dealer or whoever had the gun would have had to place the trigger lock on there?

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I will state that they would have, but the example of the rifle in the home, the degree of probability that a trigger lock would have been on that gun is if we had passed it into law. That would have been a provision of safety. We should take that step.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Reclaiming my time, I appreciate the gentlewoman's honest answer, and I think that is exactly where we are. We want to be able to provide a tool, but we have to recognize in this debate as well that it takes responsible parents and responsible people to use a trigger lock. There is no way we can mandate people to use something. We can mandate it, but criminals are not going to use a trigger lock when they are going out and doing criminal activity. That is just the fact of it.

We have to keep these guns away from children. We have to give parents

the tools, and that is what we are trying to do.

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

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on each side, and do I have the right to close?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). The gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) has 4 minutes and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) has 5 minutes. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) has the right to close.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would just make a couple of observations. No one law or measure will solve every problem. We know that. I think that we have heard a lot of discussion not only here today in these chambers but from individuals outside of this body critical of really very modest gun safety measures that if we do not have a 100 percent solution then we should just throw up our hands and do nothing.

That is not the way we operate in this country. Because there are some people who drive drunk and we do not effectuate an arrest and prosecution of every single person who has gotten behind the wheel drunk does not mean that we are going to say that it is okay to drive while drunk. Because the 408 children who died in accidental shootings last year in this country might not all have been saved because of a trigger lock is no excuse not to do what we can so that some of those children might have been saved.

I am hopeful that we can finally have a meeting of the conference committee on which I serve. When we met on August 5, we gave speeches to each other. I was there. I asked that we stay in that room and that we continue to work on the measure. At that point, my two teenagers were getting ready to start high school. Now my oldest daughter is getting ready to graduate from high school, and we have still done absolutely nothing.

We need to earn our paychecks. I travel 5,000 miles a week to come to this body to work, to hopefully serve the American people. I am coming here every week hoping that we can gain a law that will make some children safer, not just to rename post offices but to do something that actually will serve the American people.

Please, please, let us approve this motion to instruct conferees. Let us get to work.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, first of all, I think this has been a very healthy debate. I welcome the debate. I think it has been good and very instructive.

I do want to respond to a number of things that have been raised. First of all, the NRA has been used a number of times. In fact, I was debating a colleague from the other side of the aisle and he used that word in the debate maybe four times, NRA-controlled and so on.

We have to recognize, and I think people in an honest debate recognize, that on the pro-gun side or pro-gun control side would be Handgun, Inc. I do not think we ought to silence their trying to get information to the Members of this body; nor should someone who is concerned about the Second Amendment. I think people have a right to speak, but the fact is that we are individual Members of this body elected to represent our constituents and that is who we are trying to represent in this debate.

I know the folks on the other side of the aisle are trying to do the same thing.

The substantive issue that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) raised is we are talking about a motion to instruct conferees, just wanting to get the conferees together.

Now, I would just make the case that the way the conferees have worked in my experience in this body is that they meet and then they go apart for a time and try to negotiate and come together on the issues.

The fact is, we just passed the conference report on AIR 21, the aviation trust fund. I would dare say that that conference committee met and then they went away and negotiated, and whenever they negotiated the bill back together, and it took awhile to do it, they went back in there and they said we have a deal and they voted on it.

That is exactly what is happening with our conferees. Now I understand that my colleagues might want to have them meet together more often but the fact is that they are not doing nothing. The fact is that the conferees met on one occasion, and secondly they are continuing to negotiate.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) did a great job really, in essence, in responding to the proposal of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE). The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) has a proposal that is out there on the table right now that we are real close to coming together on this conference committee, and I think that the discussion has even continued today in this House.

So it is, I think, an artificial time constraint, artificial time lines, instructing the conferees, whenever our Members really do not have the control over it and it is the chairman of the Senate side that really calls the meeting together. I think it would be ill-advised to pass this motion to instruct conferees. I think it has been a healthy debate and again I congratulate the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) for raising this issue, and I believe this debate should continue.

Once again, what we agree upon, and I should not say we all because some of the Democrats do not agree with what I am saying and some of my Republican colleagues do not agree with what I am saying, but the fact is we want to keep guns away from children. We want to keep guns out of the hands of criminals.

We passed a number of provisions in this body by amendment that accomplished that, the juvenile Brady law, the ban of juvenile possession of semiautomatic weapons; child safety locks, we passed in this body; a ban on importation of large capacity ammo clips, we passed. Then whenever it was attached to the main bill, again it was defeated by 190 Democrats voted against that, voted against each of those things that I just said. A provision that we could have had child safety locks was voted down by 190 Democrats.

Some Republicans joined in that because they did not believe it went far enough. I appreciate their point of view on that but the fact is, it is a difficult issue. Our conferees are struggling with that.

So I would ask my colleagues to oppose the motion to instruct conferees. I believe we need to continue the discussion and whenever we say we are not going to have the conferees forced to meet, I hope they do meet. I hope they meet, but I hope they meet because we have reached some common ground and we can move this issue forward.

Again I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN) for her courteousness today in this debate and I look forward to continuing it.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) spoke what he thought was accurate, but I do not believe it is, in fact, accurate. I understand from our staff on the Democratic side that there has been no discussions at all at a staff level since October. There has been discussion about all of these negotiations that are going on behind closed doors. No one has spoken to me, and I am a member of the committee. No one has spoken to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) and she is a member of the conference committee.

The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) has tried very mightily and in good faith, and I believe that the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) is also operating in good faith, trying to find a way for us to reach conclusion, but that is over. We are not getting anywhere.

It may be that we will not, in fact, be able to find common ground but I do know this: If we never talk to each other, if we never have a meeting, if we never share in public what we think, then we will never get to where the country needs us to be.

We were in the middle of the night last year when we ended up with the juvenile justice bill before us, and I thought it was ironic that the final bill that we had was actually a retreat from current law. It would have actually weakened the current state of the law and that is why I believe the NRA

urged a yes vote on that bill and handgun control, the other side of the coin, urged a no vote. That is why we had so many people who believe in sensible gun safety measures opposing that measure because it actually was a retreat from where we are today.

Since that time, we have had many tragedies. We have had a 6-year-old kill another 6-year-old. We have had a preschool assaulted by a maniac with a gun and shooting little children. We have had firefighters shot at. We have had many tragedies and it may be that the 21 individuals and Members of this House who did not understand the need for modest gun safety measures last year may have received a wake-up call.

□ 1545

It is possible that we can come together, but it is not going to be possible if we never try.

Mr. Speaker, we have had a lot of rhetoric and discussion about various interest groups. I have not mentioned the NRA, but I will include for the record their missive urging a ''no'' vote on the Lofgren motion to instruct, because they have inserted themselves into even such an innocuous motion to instruct such as this.

We are not saying where the conference committee has to end up in this motion to instruct, although I have made no secret of the fact I hope we can adopt measures. Just that we can try.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge adoption of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the missive from the NRA.

SUPPORT THE SECOND AMENDMENT—THE NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION URGES YOU TO VOTE ''NO'' ON THE LOFGREN MOTION TO INSTRUCT TODAY!

Rep. Lofgren's motion to instruct demands a date certain deadline for the Juvenile Justice Conference Committee to begin deliberations on H.R. 1501. Yet at the same time, Rep. LOFGREN is also demanding that the House Conferees accept nothing less than the Senate-passed version of H.R. 1501.

In a letter, of March 2nd, from Congressmen GEPHARDT and BONIOR, and signed by Rep. LOFGREN and other Members, to Senator ORRIN HATCH, they demand the following ''Such a conference report *MUST* include gun safety measures that are *AT LEAST* as strong as those passed by the Senate.''

How can Rep. LOFGREN expect the House conferees to agree to something that failed in the House twice already last June (McCarthy and Conyers amendments) and will fail again if brought up for a vote? Do they really want to help address the juvenile crime problem in this country or are they just politically posturing in an election year?

There is no reason to force a deadline other than to allow political grandstanding on issues that Members are already trying to resolve in good faith, the National Rifle Association urges you to vote ''no'' today on the Lofgren motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 1501.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, the American people are urgently waiting for the Congress to take meaningful action on gun safety control—and the American people are not patient on this issue, Mr. Speaker. The American people are not patient. Despite repeated requests from our Democratic colleagues in this body and repeated requests of the Democratic members of the conference committee on H.R. 1501, the Juvenile Justice legislation, we are still awaiting action by the Republican leadership and the Republican members of the conference.

I strongly support the motion to instruct conferees that is being offered by my distinguished colleague and fellow Californian, Ms. LOFGREN. Her motion instructs the conferees to hold its first substantive meeting within the next two weeks. As President Clinton has said: ''How many more people have to get killed before we do something?'' The Senate adopted gun safety measures that close loopholes on our gun laws. The American people are strongly supportive of the type of provisions that are under consideration in this legislation. Now is the time for the conference committee to bring legislation back to this House.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the will of the American people to be respected in the Congress of the United States, and it is time for us to tell the reprehensible representatives of the National Rifle Association that the will of the American people will prevail over the narrow special interests of groups like the NRA. The appalling attack on President Clinton last Sunday by Wayne LaPierre, Vice President of the National Rifle Association, only indicates how desperate that organization is to stop any meaningful effort to control gun violence and to enact needed gun safety legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the San Francisco Chronicle published an excellent editorial today which puts this issue and the desperation of the National Rifle Association into context. I ask that the editorial from the Chronicle be placed in the RECORD, and I urge my colleagues to read it. Mr. Speaker, I also urge my colleagues to support this motion being considered by the House today.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, March 15, 2000]

NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION TAKES DESPERATE NEW TACK

National Rifle Association Executive Vice President Wayne LaPierre has crossed over into absurdity in his efforts to stymie gun control legislation this year.

LaPierre's outrageous accusation that President Clinton is ''willing to accept a certain level of killing to further his political agenda'' can do nothing but backfire. Clinton can be accused of many things, but few would agree that he considers any number of fatalities acceptable.

LaPierre and his crony, NRA President Charlton Heston, appear to have decided on a take-no-prisoners strategy against gun control even when their statements sound ludicrous.

Thoughtful NRA members should be embarrassed by the tactics and may want to remember former President George Bush's action after the NRA sent out a fund-raising letter calling federal law enforcement officers ''jackbooted government thugs.'' Bush quit his NRA life membership in protest.

If it chose, the NRA could be a serious player at discussions on gun control legislation. The proposal that Clinton is trying to push through Congress this year would require background checks of prospective buyers at gun shows, mandate child safety locks on handguns, prohibit imports of large ammunition clips and punish negligent adults if children commit violent crimes because of easy access to guns.

But NRA arguments on the specifics are drowned out by its leadership's over-the-top rhetoric and knee-jerk opposition to any legislation that smacks of gun control. Contentions that the Clinton administration has not enforced current gun control laws, which may have some merit, also get lost because they appear to be a diversionary tactic to avoid talking about the details of proposed legislation.

The wave of school killings over the past few years stunned a nation into supporting more restrictions on obtaining guns. Last year, about a month after the Columbine killings, the Senate approved the first gun control measure since Republicans took over Congress in 1994. Agreement later fell apart, but the NRA is all too aware that Congress has been moving in a direction the gun organization detests.

Its latest tactics show a desperation and an apparent feeling that anything, no matter how outrageous, goes in an election year.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the motion to instruct conferees on the Juvenile Justice legislation. This motion would instruct the conferees to meet within the next two weeks to have substantive meetings to offer the President a viable gun bill.

The American people have waited long enough for us to act on this legislation. We can no longer delay and wait for the next tragedy in order to take action.

Last week's tragedy in Memphis where 2 firefighters, 1 sheriff's deputy, and a woman died due to gun violence; underscores the country's need for responsible gun legislation.

It would seem that in almost the year since the Littleton shootings, we have done little to more forward on the Juvenile Justice Bill. If you recall, it took a considerable amount of time before this bill even got to the conference committee.

In the Crime Subcommittee, the original bill, H.R. 1501, was a bipartisan effort that was cosponsored by the entire subcommittee. This bill passed the day after the tragedy at Columbine.

However, after much partisan maneuvering, the bill never made it to the full Judiciary Committee. There were several delays and eventually, we left for the Memorial Day holiday without any action.

Through more partisan maneuvering in June, the bill bypassed the Committee and proceeded to the floor. The bipartisan bill that emphasized prevention and intervention as alternatives to punishment only, became a vehicle for a variety of issues—except for protecting children. This is a critical mistake.

Today, I support Senator DASCHLE's past statement that the Juvenile Justice Bill, which concerns access to guns and was adopted by both the Senate and the House, should move forward.

Furthermore, I support his believe that if the Juvenile Justice Bill does not go to conference; each Member of Congress should file independent bills until safe legislation is adopted.

I am taking the initiative by announcing, my legislation which would increase youth gun

safety. My bill, ''The Children Gun Safety and Adult Supervision Act,'' is a comprehensive gun safety proposal, but I still encourage the Conferees to first pass the current Juvenile Justice Bill so that affirmative action will finally be taken.

Through enhanced penalties for reckless supervising adults, gun safety education programs and limitations on the admittance of children into gun shows, my legislation seeks to prevent tragedies like the one that most recently occurred in Mount Morris Township, Michigan. This child shooting is the latest in a series of preventable shootings that occurred as a result of adults recklessly leaving firearms in the presence of children.

It is a shame that political maneuvering is still stalling even a non-binding resolution like Senator BOXER's that simply supports child gun safety legislation. Yet, I would like to say how delighted I was to hear of Senator DURBIN's amendment that would offer more funding for providing gun safety education.

In the past few weeks my office has received many calls and letters from constituents who believe that we support legislation that will take away their guns.

It is obvious that the propaganda machine of the National Rifle Association is working to change our focus from the issue of children and guns and gun ownership in general. Like many of my colleagues, I do not oppose responsible gun ownership.

However, like President Clinton, I am concerned about children and their access to guns. I am concerned that guns are not regulated in the same way that toys are regulated. I am concerned that we do not have safety standards for locking devices on guns. I am concerned that we do not prohibit children from attending gun shows unsupervised. I am concerned that we have not focused on the statistics on children and guns.

This motion to instruct urges the conferees to act immediately on the Juvenile Justice Bill. We cannot wait for another tragedy to occur. I urge my colleagues to support this motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD). Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LOFGREN).

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 218, nays 205, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 50]

YEAS—218

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barrett (WI)
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Bonior
Borski
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Camp
Campbell
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Coyne
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gilman
Gonzalez
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hastings (FL)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kingston
Kleczka
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
Lantos
Larson
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Moore
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Northup
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ose
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Quinn
Ramstad
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sawyer
Saxton
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stupak
Tancredo
Tauscher
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NAYS—205

Aderholt
Archer
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blunt
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Boswell
Boucher
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Canady
Cannon
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crane
Cubin
Cunningham
Danner
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Emerson
English
Everett
Ewing
Fletcher
Fossella
Fowler
Gekas
Gibbons
Gillmor
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Istook
Jenkins
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kasich
King (NY)
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Lampson
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
Martinez
McCollum
McCrery
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Nethercutt
Ney
Norwood
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Paul
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Rahall
Regula
Reynolds
Riley
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sandlin
Sanford
Scarborough
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Toomey
Traficant
Turner
Vitter
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—11

Boyd
Cook
Hinojosa
John
Klink
Mascara
Myrick
Rush
Stark
Tanner
Walden

□ 1600

Mr. COLLINS, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. COX, and Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Mr. CAMPBELL changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion to instruct was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H. RES. 396

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as cosponsor of H. Res. 396.

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

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2372, THE PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS IMPLEMENTATION ACT OF 2000

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–525) on the resolution (H. Res. 44) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2372) 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, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

SPECIAL ORDERS

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

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

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

THE PRESIDENT'S VISIT TO PAKISTAN IS NO ENDORSEMENT OF MILITARY COUP

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, as President Clinton prepares for his historic trip to South Asia, I wanted to address some of the key concerns that are sure to arise during his visit to Pakistan. While most of the President's trip will be spent in India, the world's largest democracy, and in Bangladesh, the President will also be traveling at the end of his trip to Pakistan. He will meet with General Musharraf, who seized power from the democratic, civilian government in a military coup last October.

Mr. Speaker, recently, Lally Weymouth of the Washington Post conducted an interview with Pakistan's military dictator, General Musharraf, and in the interview the general made some statements that cannot go unchallenged.

It is apparent from the general's comment that Pakistan is trying to create the appearance that the visit by the President of the United States constitutes an endorsement of the military coup. In particular, Mr. Speaker, General Musharraf stated of the President's decision to go to Pakistan, and I quote, ''It is also recognition of the righteousness of our stand in Kashmir.''

Now, Mr. Speaker, the White House has tried to make it clear that the trip does not represent an endorsement of the overthrow of Pakistan's civilian, elected government by General Musharraf.

In case there is any doubt, I would like to quote from President Clinton directly. Last Thursday, March 9, President Clinton said of his upcoming visit to Pakistan, and I quote, ''I think it would be a mistake not to go, but it would be a grave mistake for people to think that my going represents some sort of endorsement of a nondemocratic process which occurred there.''

The President went on to say that his visit is a ''recognition that America's interest and values will be advanced if we maintain some contact with the Pakistani government.'' But he added, ''I think that our ability to have a positive influence on the future direction of Pakistan in terms of the restoration of democracy, in terms of the ultimate resolution of issues in the Indian subcontinent and in terms of avoiding further dangerous conflicts, will be greater if we maintain our cooperation.''

I want to emphasize that in this statement by the President and in all statements from the White House and the State Department about the President's decision to visit Pakistan, it has been stated and reiterated that the restoration of democracy is a key objective.

In her statement yesterday to the Asian Society, Secretary of State Madeleine Albright said that ''The President will make clear our support for an early return to democratic rule as well as our ongoing friendship with the Pakistani people.''

Mr. Speaker, what is even harder to take seriously is the General's statement about the righteousness of Pakistan's stand in Kashmir. Pakistan's involvement in Kashmir has consisted of supporting an ongoing terrorist campaign that has cost the lives of thousands of innocent civilians, mostly Hindus, but also many Muslims. Last year Pakistan further escalated tensions in the region by launching an attack against India's side of the line of control in Kashmir in the area of Kargil. This disastrous military campaign was condemned by the United States and other major nations.

It has been widely reported that General Musharraf was the architect of the Kargil attack. In his response to a question on this from the Washington Post the general said, ''Whatever happened was the government's decision.'' That is an interesting admission, given Pakistan's earlier insistence that the hostilities in the Kargil area were the work of indigenous Kashmiri forces. Clearly, the fact that this was a government decision indicates that the Pakistani armed forces were directly involved, and General Musharraf was the army chief of staff at the time.

□ 1615

Mr. Speaker, President Clinton has stated that the U.S. will not mediate the Kashmir dispute between India and Pakistan unless and until both countries agree to U.S. mediation. He clearly is not taking sides on the issue of whether India vs. Pakistan is more righteous with regard to Kashmir.

Mr. Speaker, I hope President Clinton's upcoming meeting with General Musharraf will be an opportunity to demonstrate to General Musharraf that he and the regime that he leads cannot continue with the current policy of suppressing democracy and on provoking a conflict with India over Kashmir.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) shares many of the same concerns that I have about General Musharraf's recent statements, and on the important issues that the U.S. has to stress in our relationship with Pakistan.

I would also like to associate myself with the remarks that I believe he will be making later this evening.

H.R. 1055 WILL HELP MILITARY PERSONNEL AND THEIR FAMILIES ON FOOD STAMPS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I want to start my comments by reading from an ABC 20/20 transcript that aired on June 25, 1999. The headlines of the feature were ''Front Lines, Food Lines.'' Highlights of the show: Low-paid military families cannot make ends meet. I am going to read a couple of the statements from the show.

Tom Jarriel, ABC News: ''In Kosovo, American troops again face danger from snipers and patrols through villages littered with landmines. It is a familiar example of American military troops deployed for peacekeeping while risking their lives serving on the front lines.''

I further quote Tom Jarriel in this script. He says, ''On this day, 115 families searching for clothing for their infants and food for their tables. Among them, Corporal Victor Miller and his wife, Deborah.''

Corporal Victor Miller said, ''We got lucky, we got a 10-pound ham.''

Mr. Speaker, we have too many of our men and women in the military that are willing to die for this country on food stamps. It is absolutely unacceptable that this Congress will not do something about it.

Let me further quote Tom Jarriel: ''Our men and women in service who carry the flag into battle, standing in line for a hand-out. It's a depressing reality. The reason—many in the military's lower enlisted ranks tell us they can barely support their families on government pay alone.''

Mr. Speaker, I introduced several months ago House Resolution 1055. This would help our men and women in the military who are on food stamps with a small, modest $500 tax credit. I believe sincerely that when we have men and women in the military that are willing to die for this country, and they are being deployed as frequently and as often as men and women are

being deployed, that we in Congress, both Democrat and Republican, should not allow men and women in uniform to be on food stamps. We have roughly 60 percent of the men and women in the military who are married.

Mr. Speaker, again, I want to say that I think that the Republican and House leadership should come together and pass legislation, whether it be this bill that I have introduced, H.R. 1055, which has 73 Members of the House, both Democrat and Republican, on that bill, but we need to speak during this session of Congress to those men and women in the military who are on food stamps, because I know when I speak to civic clubs in my district, when I speak to church groups in my district and I tell them that men and women in uniform are on food stamps, they cannot believe it. They say that it is deplorable and unacceptable.

Mr. Speaker, this Marine that I have in this photograph before me is getting ready to deploy to Bosnia. The little daughter on his feet, her name is Megan. If you can see, she is looking very intently with a worried look on her face. She is only 3 years old. In his arms he has a 6-month-old baby named Brittany. The little girl, I know she does not know that her father is going to be gone for 6 months to Bosnia, but when I look in her face I am seeing a child that might not ever see that father again.

I say to the Members of Congress today, it is absolutely unacceptable that we have men and women in uniform on food stamps. I hope that Members on both sides of the aisle will talk to their leadership and say, let us look at the possibility of moving H.R. 1055, and if not that, then let us use that as a vehicle to speak to those on food stamps.

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

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. I am delighted to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), who is on the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. SKELTON. To add a little to this, when the gentleman says there are young men and women, those who are married, on food stamps, that is absolutely correct. There was testimony in our Committee on Armed Services the other day wherein the former Secretary of Defense, Bill Perry, who is highly respected, regardless of the political party, testified to us that this year's budget, in addition to the budget recommended by the administration, this year's budget on modernization, which of course includes procurement, research, development, and spare parts, should be $10 to $20 billion in addition to what has been recommended.

There is also a matter of health care, which I know we are all looking at. I testified before the Committee on the Budget the other day suggesting very strongly that there be an additional $10 billion for modernization and $2 billion for health care for military retirees and for the active duty and their families, which of course might very well help in the picture that the gentleman now holds.

This is terribly important that we treat the young men and women fairly. It is a morale problem. We can have the finest barracks in the world, the finest places to work in the world, but if we do not have spare parts to fix the helicopters and trucks, it is a terrible morale problem. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. I thank the gentleman. I want to say that the gentleman is one of the leaders in this Congress, and I appreciate the support that the gentleman gives our men and women in uniform.

THE PRESIDENT'S UPCOMING VISIT TO PAKISTAN

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have taken the floor this afternoon to bring attention to the situation in the State of Pakistan. President Clinton has decided to include a stop in Pakistan during his upcoming tour to India and other parts of South Asia.

I do not agree with that decision to go to Pakistan. I do not believe it is right to reward this military government, which forcefully seized power from a democratically-elected government, with such a high level visit.

Pakistan has undergone political upheaval during most of its 52-year history. The military has overthrown the democratically-elected government four times, the latest being in November of last year. General Pervez Musharraf joined a long list of Pakistani generals who have usurped power in the unstable history of Pakistan. But unlike his three predecessors, General Musharraf has not laid out a plan to return to democracy.

He has said he will not allow a democratically-elected government to come to power unless there are major and deep-seated institutional reforms in place. However, he has not acted to institute any of the changes that would help Pakistan's government meet these rather vague requirements. As far as I am aware, he has only instituted minor revenue reforms.

Minor revenue reform is not what Pakistan needs. The Pakistani economy has all but collapsed. The judiciary is operating under loyalty oaths. A small upper class has a stranglehold on land and water, and the military and intelligence services have carte blanche to fly in the face of international law. Pakistan needs major overhauls of its institutions, not minor tax reforms.

Pakistan spends 50 percent of its budget on debt service and 40 percent of its budget on the military. That ratio is stunning. It is particularly alarming when we consider that Pakistan now has nuclear weapons. Economic growth is less than 2 percent, and foreign investment is almost nonexistent.

If the President or the general has not demonstrated his desire to invoke real reforms, it is hard for me to understand why we should go there. If he did, he would tax, for the first time ever, the agricultural sector. This sector contributes 25 percent of the Pakistani GDP, and employs 60 percent of the population, but the general is unwilling to take any steps that would anger the feudal landlords who run Pakistan.

The Constitution and the rule of law have been suspended in Pakistan. The judiciary is in turmoil. Defense attorneys are being gunned down, and judges are being forced to acquiesce to oaths of personal fealty to the strongman general. The total lack of justice as evidenced by the fate of Nawaz Sharif, the man who was elected by the people of Pakistan and overthrown by Musharraf.

In a recent interview by the Washington Post and Newsweek, Musharraf was asked why Sharif was on trial for attempted murder and hijacking, not just corruption. Musharraf answered, ''Because he did do that.'' His guilt was not decided in a court of law, it was an edict from a military leader. Nawaz Sharif will be found guilty and executed in accordance with the general's law.

The degradation of the rule of law in Pakistan defies the sensibilities of the world, and contradicts the definition of a modern Nation State. If Pakistan is to take its rightful place in the community of nations, Pakistan must reestablish the judicial process.

With the rule of law suspended, Pakistan's military and intelligence service, the ISI, has conducted illegal operations that are inciting violence and tension in South Asia. Musharraf said in the interview that he has total control over the intelligence service, and that they are not involved in terrorist activities. This contradicts what is commonly reported in the world media and Musharraf's previous statements about the ISI activities in Kashmir.

I ask Members again, how can Pakistan take its place in the world community if it constantly allows its services to defy international law by conducting military and terrorist activities? That is why I am concerned about the President's visit. Many experts have said that the Pakistani general hopes to use Mr. Clinton's trip to persuade the United States of what Musharraf calls ''the righteousness of Pakistan's position on Kashmir.''

I call upon President Clinton to refrain from any involvement in the Kashmir dispute until both sides ask for our help. Instead, Mr. Clinton should put aside the gentle language of diplomacy and use this opportunity to demand that Pakistan move without pause towards full and fair elections.

Pakistan is a sick state. Democratic elections will not cure what ails Pakistan. However, the healing process cannot begin without them.

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the time of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

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

There was no objection.

THE IMPORTANCE OF ADDRESSING THE ISSUE OF H1B VISAS

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I joined a number of colleagues this morning, some of whom will be speaking here this afternoon, about the importance of addressing the issue of H1B visas.

As I visit with local business leaders in central Texas, I know that the number one high technology issue in our community, and I think across this country, is work force development, the fact that we could have and do have already some serious shortages of skilled workers that can slow down the expansion that has fueled our economic growth throughout the country.

From offices regularly assisting our local high-tech companies in securing H1B visas, I also know that this is one of the answers that can assist us in addressing this worker shortage.

One of the reasons that central Texas prospers is that we live the lyrics of a great Lyle Lovett song: Oh, no, you are not from Texas, but Texas wants you anyway. And it is because we have been able to reach out and bring the best and brightest, not only from all over the country but from all over the world, that we have been able to keep our high-tech economy booming.

I support this bipartisan effort to get increases in the number of visas for highly-skilled high-tech workers to address this problem of worker shortage. It is a stopgap measure, however. We are only at March and we are already running out of the H1B visas. We need to solve the problem for our high-tech companies now, but we need to realize that this is not a permanent solution.

That is why this legislation also increases the fees for getting these visas, and then will plow that money back into developing our domestic work force and helping our teachers and our young people pursue careers in technology.

I believe that it is important also that we not only focus on the amount or the number of visas, or the amount of the money that will be charged to get them, but on the entire system that the Immigration Service and the Department of Labor use in addressing this issue.

I find it a system that is so plagued with bureaucracy that it is almost a daily problem for my office in Austin, as well as for the many companies with whom we work. It is time that that bureaucracy move into the electronic age in which our businesses operate at present.

□ 1630

So a principal focus of this bill is to see that the Immigration Service and the Department of Labor recognize that many people search for jobs now over the Internet and recognize those postings to fulfill the statutory requirements, and that we move to a system where one can file for an application on-line, where one can track an application on-line, and we reduce the level of bureaucracy in this entire process.

I am pleased to join in this bipartisan effort. I believe that it will be successful. There is already some legislation moving in the Senate. The White House has recently announced an interest in this topic. With good bipartisan support here, there is no reason that we should not be able to act and fulfill this very definite need in the very near future.

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

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

H–1B VISAS

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

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise also to talk about the H–1B visa issue. I think it is of critical importance that we expand those visas. But that is only part of the solution to that problem.

The bill we introduced this morning that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT) referenced has a package of ideas that I think will help deal with the larger issue, which is basically filling the high-tech jobs that we have a crushing need for in this country.

If we talk to any tech business, they will tell us their number one biggest concern is finding the people to do the work that they have to be done. We have to understand that the technology sector of our technology is the faster growing sector out there. It is generating jobs and generating a strong economy. If we can find the scientists and the engineers and the biologists to fill these jobs, we could grow our economy even more and secure our economic future. We need the people to fill these jobs.

The H–1B visa bill that we introduced this morning attacks this in two different directions. One, we go out and try to attract the best and the brightest from around the world. That is just common sense. Why would not we want the best, brightest, and most capable minds in the world here in the U.S., growing our economy and generating jobs for us. We need to expand those numbers and bring those folks in.

But we also increase the fee for those H–1B visas and will, therefore, generate $200 million in money to invest in educating our own population to fill those jobs as well. Because this is a long-term problem. Bringing in people from other countries is a short-term solution. We heed to educate our own workforce so that they want to be scientists and engineers and have access to those jobs so they start filling them as well.

This is absolutely critical to the future of our economy. I think we should support this bill in the House and in the Senate and hopefully move forward with our economic situation so that we can fill those jobs that need to be filled.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY).

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to be joining the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO) and a number of other Members in the new Democrat coalition that are advancing a policy we think is very, very important, to allow the United States to maintain its relative advantage in terms of clearly being the leader in the world in technology.

This is absolutely critical for the United States, because when one looks at that technology sector, it is an area where we have created more jobs, where we have created more wealth, where we are creating more opportunities for our families.

What the H–1B legislation that we are introducing today is, in many ways, is going to ensure that the United States has the top 200,000 draft choices, the top 200,000 draft choices for the brightest, the most intelligent, the most capable engineers throughout the world.

We should feel fortunate as a country that these bright minds are interested in coming and investing their time and energy in creating jobs, in creating opportunities which are so important to the longer term future of this country.

We have also have made the commitment to ensure that we are investing in education and job training programs, which are going to ensure that we are developing the domestic talent that can eventually fill these positions.

We have come forth with a balanced approach, one which will continue to ensure that the United States is providing the leadership in the technology sector and also a commitment to provide up to $200 million, in education for

our high school students, for our college students, for our post-college students to ensure that they are going to have the academic skills that are needed to fill the tremendous demand for employees in the technology sector.

EATING DISORDERS AWARENESS, PREVENTION AND EDUCATION ACT OF 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, food is one of life's greatest pleasures. Food is also one of life's greatest necessities. Yet, for many, food is the enemy, and the act of eating is torture.

Today it is estimated that 5 to 10 million Americans suffer from eating related diseases, including anorexia, bulimia, and binge eating disorder. As many as 50,000 of these individuals will die as a direct result of eating-related illnesses. High school girls are the most common victims of these deadly diseases, but a significant number of males also experience eating related problems.

We are all aware of the medical complications that result from anorexia or bulimia: malnutrition, liver damage, gum erosion, and, as I mentioned previously, even death. However, an often-overlooked consequence of eating disorders is the negative impact they have on a child's educational advancement. Due to lapses in concentration, loss of self-esteem, depression, and engaging in self-destructive behaviors, students with eating disorders often see their school performances decline.

Listen to how one young woman in my district described the destruction wreaked on her life by an eating disorder. I quote, ''I am a 16-year-old girl with anorexia. Having this disease has been the most horrible experience of my life. It completely takes control of your life. It breaks up your family, friends, and your actual thinking decisions. I have had this disorder for over a year and a half. Over that year and a half, I have slowly been killing myself.''

Despite the social and physical devastation these diseases inflict on young people, such as the girl I just mentioned, very few States or school districts have adequate programs or services to help children suffering from weight-related disorders.

It is for this reason that I rise today to introduce the Eating Disorders Awareness Prevention and Education Act of 2000. This legislation is made up of three separate but interrelated sections. Together these provisions are designed to raise national awareness of the problems caused by eating disorders and to expand opportunities for parents and educators to address them at the school level.

This last goal is particularly crucial, as 86 percent of all eating disorder problems start by the age of 20. It is even more important when one considers that 10 percent of all victims report the onset of their illness by the age of 10.

Here is a quick summary of what the Eating Disorders Awareness Prevention and Education Act will do to combat this growing problem. First, the legislation provides States and local school districts with the option of using title VI funds, also known as the Innovative Strategies State Grant Program, to set up eating disorder prevention, awareness, and education programs.

This provision is consistent with congressional efforts over the past decade to raise educational achievement and increase student performance across the board.

Let us face it, a student suffering from an eating disorder is not going to perform at the highest achievement levels. This was confirmed during conversations with educators in my home State of Illinois. Over and over again, they told me about students whose grades dropped substantially or in some cases had to withdraw from school because of an eating disorder.

The second major provision of this bill is to conduct a joint study by the Department of Education and the National Center for Health to report to Congress on the impact eating disorders have on educational advancement and achievement.

The study will evaluate the extent to which students with eating disorders are more likely to miss school, have delayed rates of development or reduced cognitive skills. The study will also inventory the best practices of current State and local programs to educate youth about the dangers of eating disorders as well as assess the values of such programs.

The third and final section of this legislation calls for the Department of Education and Health and Human Services to carry out a national eating disorder public awareness campaign. This campaign will be similar to the anti-drug campaign now run by the Office of National Drug Control Policy.

Mr. Speaker, eating disorders present a serious threat to health and educational advancement of our Nation's children. They must be addressed.

The Eating Disorders Awareness Prevention and Education Act gives States, local school districts, and parents the tools to address this problem at its root, in schools and classrooms across the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I thank those of my colleagues who have joined me in introducing this bipartisan legislation.

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

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

COLOMBIA IS NOT VIETNAM

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, we are about to consider a supplemental appropriations bill here in Congress. One of the things I keep hearing is, is the antinarcotics effort in Colombia going to lead us into another Vietnam. The ridiculous thing is that it shows what happens when we have a President without a clear foreign policy and no clear definition of compelling national interests.

We are certainly embroiled in another potential Vietnam. It is Kosovo. If one looks at the front page of the Washington Post today, it says ''Kosovo Attacks Stir U.S. Concern. Official Says NATO May Have to Fight Ethnic Albanians.''

When we were on the ground just before we voted the funds here in the House and Senate to support this effort, visited the camps of the Kosovars in Macedonia and other places, they said, no, we are not going to go back under the Serbs. Of course we are going to fight to take over this. We are going to be independent. There was not a single person who did not believe that they were going to continue their internal civil war.

What defines a clear compelling national interest is how it relates to the United States. In this bill, we are putting money back into the military that the President stripped out for Kosovo, but I do not hear complaints about that.

But in Colombia, we do have a clear compelling national interest, and it is most certainly not like Vietnam. In Vietnam, we were across the other side of the continent. Here, Colombia is a 2-hour flight from Miami, Florida, and produces 80 percent of the cocaine that comes into the United States, the drugs that are on the streets of Fort Wayne of northeast Indiana and all over this country.

Colombia has 40 million people. It is the second largest country in our hemisphere known historically as the area of the Monroe Doctrine, the fifth largest economy, and the oldest democracy in Latin America. This is not a propped up government like we were dealing with at multiple times in Vietnam. This is a democratically-elected government. In fact, the narco-guerillas do not have any popular support unlike the Viet Cong, which we could argue about how much they had.

But here is the latest approval ratings in Colombian polls: 73 percent for the Catholic Church, 71 percent for the Colombian National Police, 69 percent for the Colombian military, 9 percent for the terrorist paramilitary, and only 4 percent for the FARC and ELN. They know they do not even have the popular will in any village in their country. They control rural areas by force, but they do not control the major metro areas. The only way they can control the rural areas is by force.

Furthermore, in addition to the narcotics that are coming into this country being a compelling national interest. Obviously, Panama used to be part of Colombia. Panama is now vulnerable. It is right up against the areas, and the narco-terrorists have moved into that, threatening trade routes.

It is our eighth largest producer of oil in the United States. The government oil pipeline there has been attacked 700 times in the last number of years. They are predicting that they are going to be a net importer in 3 years if we can control the narco-terrorism.

Basically, they would not have this drug problem if we and Europe were not consuming the cocaine. This is not a domestic Colombian problem, this is a domestic Colombian democracy problem caused by our consumption and consumption in Europe.

They have a national police that is willing to fight. They have a military that is willing to fight. We are not proposing to put American armies on the ground like we have in Kosovo.

How in the world can this be compared to Vietnam? Vietnam is over in Europe. But we do not hear people yelling about that.

This is a clear compelling national interest on energy prices, on narcotrafficking going into this country, and our kids and families on the streets who are being destroyed by this, and because of trade related to Panama, and because it is the second oldest democracy in South America fighting for its life because of our problems here. We have the obligation to at least assist them with some additional fire power with which to fight the druggies who have been using our dollars to buy weapons to fight the people there who are trying to preserve their democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following fact sheet for the RECORD, as follows:

FACT SHEET: THE GROWING EMERGENCY IN COLOMBIA

The Crisis: Narco-guerillas, funded by the illicit drug trade, now threaten the oldest democracy in Latin America. The Colombian government has the political will, but not the resources to combat this threat. Failing to provide U.S. ''Supplemental'' aid now will further weaken Colombia's democratic institutions, jeopardize its fragile economy and undermine its ability to negotiate a peace.

THE WORLD'S DRUG SUPPLY LINE

Colombian cocaine production has skyrocketed from 230 metric tons in 1995 to 520 metric tons in 1999 and now accounts for 80% of the world's cocaine supply and 90% of the U.S. cocaine supply.

Colombia has replaced Southeast Asia as the number one supplier of U.S. heroin (producing approximately 70% of the heroin seized in the U.S.).

Colombian narco-guerillas earn an estimated $600 million from the illegal drug trade each year. The 17,000 member FARC and 6,000 member ELN insurgency groups were declared terrorist organizations by the U.S. State Department in 1997 and now control 40% of the Colombian countryside.

INCREASED HUMAN SUFFERING

Since 1990, 35,000 Colombians have been killed by the guerilla insurgency including a presidential candidate, Supreme Court justices and 5,000 policy.

At 27,000 homicides per year, Colombia's murder rate is the world's highest (10 times that of the U.S.). Fifteen American citizens are known to have died in Colombia as a result of the drug war and the internal conflict.

35% of all terrorist acts in the world are committed in Colombia (2,663 kidnappings last year alone). In fact, the longest held U.S. hostages are three missionaries from Florida, held by the FARC in Colombia since 1993.

Since 1990, the violence from the insurgency has displaced 1.7 million Colombians from their homes (more than in Bosnia, Kosovo or East Timor).

ECONOMIC CRISIS

Colombia is facing its worst economic recession in 70 years with 21% unemployment, a black market economy that undermines its tax base, and a lack of consumer and investor confidence.

Oil companies in Colombia are facing overwhelming security threats. One government-owned oil pipeline has been attacked 700 times by narco-guerillas (79 times in 1999 alone). These attacks have caused $100 millions in economic losses, and more than 1.7 million gallons of oil have been spilled.

FACT SHEET: WHY COLOMBIA MATTERS TO THE U.S.

DRUGS ARE KILLING AMERICAN KIDS

The U.S. Drug Czar says that illegal drugs account for 52,000 American deaths every year (compared to 58,000 during the entire Vietnam War).

One in every two American school kids will try illegal drugs before they graduate from the 12th grade.

The cost of illegal drugs to U.S. society is a staggering $110 billion a year.

U.S. prison population for drug-related crimes is approaching 2 million and 80% of all U.S. inmates are drug abusers.

A SIGNIFICANT TRADING PARTNER

Colombia is the 5th largest economy in Latin America and the 5th largest U.S. trading partner in the region.

Two-way trade with Colombia totals nearly $11 billion per year and accounts for 80% of the cut flowers and 21% of all coffee imports to the U.S.

20% of daily U.S. oil imports come from Colombia, Ecuador, and Venezuela (which has surpassed Saudi Arabia as the #1 supplier of crude oil to the U.S.). Colombia produces 820,000 barrels of oil daily and provides 330,000 barrels of crude oil per day to U.S. refineries in Texas and Louisiana.

Colombia is the 8th largest supplier of foreign crude oil to the U.S. reducing the U.S. dependence on oil from the OPEC nations of the Middle East.

REGIONAL STABILITY

Narco-guerilla incursions into neighboring countries (e.g., Venezuela, Ecuador, Panama and Peru) now threaten the stability of the entire region.

The strategically important Panama Canal is only 150 miles north of the Colombian border and is vulnerable to guerilla attacks since the pull-out of all U.S. military troops in accordance with the 1977 U.S./Panama Canal Treaty.

800,000 Colombians have fled their country in the last 4 years—seeking entry into the U.S. at an alarming rate (366,423 visa requests last year compared with only 150,514 in 1997).

Colombian political asylum requests have more than quadrupled (396 requests in the last quarter of 1999 compared with 334 in the previous 12 months).

FACT SHEET: THE ADMINISTRATION'S COLOMBIA AID PROPOSAL

$954 million in FY–00 . . . The ''Supplemental'' Request.

$150 million already passed in FY–00 Appropriations last fall.

$150 million in regular FY–01 budget submission.

$318 million ''plus-up'' to FY–01 budget request ($1.6 billion total over two years).

[In millions of dollars]

Additional Aid Request in six categories	*FY–00 Supplemental/ FY–01 ''Plus-Up''*
1. Push into Southern Colombia	$512/$88
2. Interdiction (Air, Water, Ground)	238/102
3. Colombian National Police Support	68/28
4. Alternative Economic Development	92/53
5. Boost Governing Capability	42/46
6. Economic (& Peace Process) Assistance	3/2
Total(s)	954/318

The proposal includes 85% for Colombia, 6% for other countries and 9% for U.S. agencies.

HIGHLIGHTS

30 new Blackhawks and 15 (State Dept) UN–1N Huey helicopters (in addition to 18 now in country) for Colombian troop air transport ($439M in FY–00/$13M in FY–01).

Two more Colombia counterdrug battalions ($30M in FY–00/$12M in FY–01).

Enhanced Colombian Army bases and air facilities ($18M in FY–00/$23M in FY–01).

Upgrade OV–10 interceptors, FLIR for AC–47 aircraft ($16M in FY–00/$5M in FY–01).

Relocate Ground Based Radars/build command center ($25M in FY–00/$12M in FY–01).

Upgrade airplanes, helos & bases for CNP eradication ($68M in FY–00/$28M in FY–01).

PROPOSED REGIONAL FUNDING

Peru Interdiction ($10M in FY–00/$12M in FY–01) eco. development, ($15M in FY–00).

Bolivia Interdiction ($2M in FY–00/$4M in FY–01) eco. development, ($12M in FY–00).

Ecuador Interdiction ($2M in FY–00/$4M in FY–01) eco. development, ($3M in FY–00) in addition, Manta FOL ($38.2M in FY–01) included under DOD funding.

PROPOSED FUNDING FOR U.S. AGENCIES

State Department ($61M in FY–00/$61M in FY–01) for support of Colombian military air mobility and police eradication operations.

Defense Department ($106M in FY–00/$41M in FY–01) for Manta FOL and training of Colombian counterdrug battalions.

Treasury Department ($2M in FY–00/$2M in FY–01) for ''Kingpin Act'' (Foreign Assistance Control).

US Customs ($68M in FY–00) for upgrade of four P–3 AEW aircraft.

DEA ($7M in FY–00/$3M in FY–01) for support of in country operations.

21% for Human Rights/Rule of Law/Economic Development and 79% for Interdiction & Eradication.

FACT SHEET: WHAT ABOUT HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES IN COLOMBIA?

MORE AID FOR HUMAN RIGHTS RULE OF LAW, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

The Administration's proposal has allotted 21% for combined Human Rights training and monitoring, the Rule of law including judicial reform, and Economic Development—(compared to only 10% last year).

Plan Colombia addresses systemic changes to get the cause of many human rights violations, including: the illicit drug trade, the peace process, the lack of government institutions in rural Colombia and a weak judicial system.

THE LEAHY LAW (VETTED UNITS)

The Leahy Amendment requires that all foreign units receiving U.S. economic assistance must be ''vetted'' for past or current human rights violations.

Leahy still applies—no U.S. aid will be provided to any Colombian military unit where there is ''credible evidence'' of serious human rights violations.

Supplemental funding supports Colombian military human rights training and ombudsmen, as well as security protection for human rights monitors. Personnel vetting includes the use of lie detector tests and NGO monitoring.

COMMITMENT AND IMPROVEMENTS BY THE COLOMBIAN GOVERNMENT

President Pastrana and his government are committed to reducing human rights violations whether conducted by the paramilitaries, narco-querillas, or Colombia security forces. He fired four military generals with ties to the paramilitaries and involvement in human rights violations.

Defense Minister Tapias has taken dramatic steps to deal with the human rights allegations. The Colombian military is undergoing a transformation into a more professional organization. The annual human rights report has documented a steady decline in human rights violations by the Colombian military.

President Pastrana has publicly acknowledged the importance of deploying properly vetted units as a condition of U.S. aid.

BLANCED AID TO THE MILITARY AND THE COLOMBIAN NATIONAL POLICE

The current Administration's proposal is heavily weighed toward assistance to the Colombian military. However, it does include $96 million for the CNP (the 1999 drug supplemental was heavily weighted toward the CNP).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. STABENOW addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Indiana (Ms. CARSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. CARSON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

H–1B VISAS A RENEGING ON THE PROMISE TO AMERICAN WORKERS

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, just a few comments on some of the things that we have heard over these last few 5-minute Special Orders. I hope the American people who were listening understand what H–1B Visas are all about. We had several Members come down to the well and talk in glorious terms how important H–1B Visas are and about how we are going to give jobs, 200,000 jobs, to people who are the first string picks from overseas.

No, I am sorry, I would like to have 200,000 Americans have those jobs. H–1B Visas is nothing more than a reneging on the promise to the American worker that, when supply and demand means that their wages will go up, that we will, instead, import people from overseas to keep their wages down.

□ 1645

We do not need to import people into this country for high-tech jobs. We need to make sure our high-tech industries, which are making a whopping profit right now, spend that profit in training Americans for those jobs rather than giving them to 200,000 Pakistanis or Indians or others who will work for $25,000 a year and taking those jobs away from Americans who would be earning $75,000 a year. So H–1B visas are no gift to the American people.

I hope those people listening to the arguments that were just presented understand who is getting ripped off and who is being attacked here and who is being rewarded. Big business is being rewarded so they can keep their wages low, and the American worker is getting shafted with these H–1B visas.

Now, as far as human rights, which is something that we heard about today, and the President's visit to the subcontinent, let me just say that this administration has the worst human rights record of any administration in the history of this country. And it will be underscored again when the President visits the subcontinent and also underscored, of course, by the President's ongoing policy towards China.

First, let us look at China. The President is now lobbying this body to provide China with permanent WTO status, meaning a membership in the WTO and giving it permanent normal trade relations with the United States of America. Again, a shafting of the American working people in order to grovel before a dictatorship that uses slave labor overseas.

Yet Beijing, while the President is lobbying us, saying, oh, this will make the Chinese better and a nicer regime, more hospitable to human rights and democracy, they are in the midst of a campaign designed to eradicate a small religious sect based on yoga and meditation, the Falun Gong sect. They are also in the midst of threats and bluster and arming themselves to the teeth in order to commit forceful action against the little democracy on Taiwan. This, the world's worst human rights abuser and belligerent country is now, what, the country that this President wants us to give permanent normal trade relations to, to make them part of the WTO. Again, an undermining of democracy.

When the President goes to the subcontinent, yes, there are a lot of issues to be had. It was a wrong decision on the President's part to visit Pakistan when we had just had a military clique overthrowing a democratic government in Pakistan. That in itself is a horrible message around the world to democracies that are struggling and in societies where the military might be inclined to take over that government. So at least the President should skip Pakistan until they have made a commitment to return to democratic government. Yet that will not happen.

And when he goes to India, the President will not, I am sure, mention the problem in Kashmir. Because although my colleagues in the well a few minutes ago ignored that issue, the Indian government is involved with massive human rights abuses in Kashmir. The problem is not terrorism in Kashmir; the problem is the fact that India will not permit the people of Kashmir to have a plebiscite, which was mandated by the United Nations 40 years ago, and give them an alternative to solve their problem through the ballot box as to what country they would like to be part of. Instead, India controls Kashmir with an iron fist.

So we have a President ignoring human rights and democracy, visiting Southeast Asia, undermining the very fundamentals that will make this world a better place. It will not be a better place by ignoring Communist Chinese violations of human rights and democracy. It will not be a better place if the President goes to South Asia and ignores the military takeover of a democratic government in Pakistan. And it will not be a better place when the President goes to India and ignores the human rights violations in Kashmir.

THE 2000 CENSUS

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

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, census day, April 1, may be 17 days away, but the census has begun. Almost 100 million questionnaires have been delivered by the postal service this week, and 22 million more are being delivered by the Census Bureau in rural areas. I received mine the other day, and I urge all Americans to fill out their questionnaires and mail them back. It is the civic responsibility of every American to participate in the census.

The news on preparations for the census is good. Things are going well. So far, over 2.4 million people have returned their forms to the Census Bureau, and they have actually processed over 1.5 million forms already. On Monday alone the census questionnaire assistance phone handled 636,000 calls, 636,000 calls in 1 day; and they handled

434,000 yesterday. That is over a million calls in 2 days.

All 520 local census offices are up and open, computers and phones are operating, and the major data capture centers are tested and are already working. Though there are localized problems, recruiting is already ahead of schedule nationwide, at about 80 percent of the total needed. Given the prosperity of our Nation, it is very impressive, with this historically low unemployment, that the recruitment is going so well.

Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of my colleagues here, the number that Members can give to their constituents who are interested in working for the Census Bureau is 1–888–325–7733. I urge all of my colleagues to share this number with any constituent who may want full- or part-time work helping to obtain an accurate count.

While the most labor-intensive phases of the census are yet to come, it is important as well to take note of the successful operational elements of the 2000 census which have already been completed.

The paid advertising campaign is in its most active phase; and I, for one, feel that the quality of that effort has been tremendously effective. Other promotional activities include the census road tour vehicles. There are 12 of them moving through our Nation's cities and neighborhoods. The master address file of 120 million addresses may be the most complete ever, due to some improved processes, including the LUCA, Local Update of Census Addresses, today and new construction programs.

One of my favorite initiatives, the census in the schools program, has exceeded its original goals and sent over 1.5 million teaching kits to schools around the Nation. Particularly noteworthy is a new USA Today-CNN Gallop poll, one just the other day which came out and said that 96 percent of the respondents say they will mail back their questionnaires. I doubt that it will be that high, but it is certainly an important indicator of the all-important mail response rate and Americans' willingness to participate in the census. And all of this is very good news.

As the GAO indicated in a hearing before the Subcommittee on Census yesterday, in the final analysis it is the American people who will determine whether we have a successful census or not. It all comes down to filling out and mailing back the form. A year ago, many prophets of doom questioned the likely success of the 2000 census. While we are far from done, I think we can all take pride in the excellent work of the career professionals at the Census Bureau in successfully meeting the milestones to date.

As Census Director Ken Prewitt has emphasized, unexpected problems could develop tomorrow. In any massive operation there will be problems. But as of today, the census, as a whole, is running well and it is on track.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SAWYER), who is the former chair of the Subcommittee on Census.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for the opportunity to speak today, and I thank her for her leadership in bringing this issue repeatedly to the floor during the time of her oversight responsibilities in preparation for this largest peace-time undertaking of the American government. But most of all, I thank her for the work that is going to lie ahead in the course of the summer.

The truth of the matter is that the conduct of the census is probably the closest thing to war in terms of undertaking a huge initiative with all kinds of planning ahead of time, but with the recognition that what is being done is being done in real-time. It is enormous. There will be slippage. It will be imperfect. And we need to understand that the work that we are doing will proceed and that the goal is indisputable: as complete and accurate a count as possible.

That really brings us to the $64,000 question. Can we conduct, in 2000, the census using the same design that we did in 1990 or 1980 or even 1970 and still expect to produce a useful and better outcome? The answer, quite clearly and quite simply, is no. That is the reason that census design over the decades, over the centuries, has changed as this Nation has changed.

The truth is there are no traditional methods in our history of census taking. There never has been a pure head count of the population. And reliability, sometimes called into question, is not a matter of opinion but is a mathematically measurable standard, not a political judgment.

The first census in 1790 took place on horseback. It took 9½ months to finish and visit a half million households and another year to compile the results. As the country grew, the methods changed. In the 1800s, people essentially would enumerate themselves by filling in schedules posted in town squares. And the country grew so fast after the Civil War, about a quarter per decade, 24 percent, that by 1880 census workers could not keep pace with the amount of information collected. It took 7 years to tabulate the results of that census. And that is why in the next decade, a young census employee, a graduate student from Columbia University, Herman Hollerith, developed the punch card system of tabulating data. It was that system that went on to lead to his founding of IBM.

The truth is that those kinds of changes have taken place in this century as well. In the 1920s and 1930s, W. Edwards Demming pioneered his now world-famous methods of statistical quality control at the Census Bureau. These same census methods will see wide application this year, after 7 decades of limited, growing, and now proven application.

The problem is that by 1990, the last census, the alarming drop in civic engagement that has plagued the electoral process also affected the census. Instead of the 78 percent return rate that we saw initially, or the 75 percent that took place in 1980, it fell to 65 percent of households nationwide. But even more tellingly, it fell to between 30 and 40 percent in the hardest-to-count neighborhoods. Not only had the holes in the census grown, the holes became larger than the fabric itself.

Costs skyrocketed in the 1990 census, not as a product of any failure of execution but a failure of design; and it earned the unenviable distinction of being the first census that was less accurate than its predecessor. That is why in the course of this decade so much effort has been made to combine the direct counting methods of the past with long proven scientific sampling techniques. Both techniques will be used in this decade. And it is important for us to understand that the result of that will be our ability to measure and control the quality of the count in ways that will help guide and inform policy for the next decade.

There is a lot that can go wrong in the course of a census. My colleagues heard the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) talk about some of the things that are going right. Those are important measures of success. But the kinds of things that happen in any large undertaking are going to happen this year. We are going to have some household somewhere that gets a dozen or a score or maybe 100 forms, and it is not a sign of a failure of the census. We are going to have some enumerator who falls asleep on somebody's front porch, and it is not a sign of a failure in the census.

□ 1700

We are going to have a whole city block who never got their forms and had to be remailed. And it is not a sign of failure. It is the kind of thing that happens in large and complex undertakings. The kind of things that we need to watch throughout this year are the kind of things that the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is looking at through the oversight process in a responsible way, staying out of the way of excuses but understanding what is going on, watching the mail return rates.

Those will be a critical measure of the kinds of adjustments that need to be made in the course of the conduct of the census. The length of time consumed in responding to nonresponsive households and to follow up to make sure that they are counted. The longer the length of time that that takes, the more the quality of data deteriorates.

Finally, and perhaps the most important, the personnel retention and turnover rates that are a critical part of this huge human enterprise.

I join my colleague from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) in thanking the career professionals at the Census Bureau and Ken Pruitt and his leadership team for the work that they have done. I wish

them the very best in the conduct of this enormously important national undertaking, and I thank all in this Congress who have been actively involved in our local communities to make sure that everyone has the opportunity to be counted. Because every one of us needs to count.

I thank my colleague for this opportunity to join with her today.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank my colleague for his consistent outstanding work and commitment to getting an accurate count.

Our goal in this body has been to get the most accurate census possible, conduct it using the most up-to-date methods as recommended by the National Academy of Sciences and the vast majority of the professional scientific community.

It is very important that we get an accurate count because the census has a real impact on the lives of real people. Information gathered in the census is used by States and local governments to plan schools and highways by the Federal Government, to distribute funds for health care and other programs, and by businesses in deciding where to build new stores and factories and provide new services.

We are pleased to have the gentleman from Patterson, New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) with us, a former mayor, and he has firsthand knowledge of conducting a census which was conducted during the time that he was mayor. I thank him for joining us today, and I yield to him.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I am alarmed to hear that the Republican candidate for President is opposed to use the sampling methodologies for the 2000 Census. That methodology has been certified by the National Academy of Sciences, which is the body which determines scientific methodology with regards to medicine, the environment, biology, etcetera.

I am alarmed because these studies that I have just defined have shown that this is the only true way to obtain an effective count of our population. There is no such thing as a perfect count regardless of which methodology we use. But certainly the least perfect, the one which brings us further away from the number, is to believe that we can count noses by counting noses. It just does not work that way.

In particular, members of the population that have been historically undercounted are ethnic minorities and immigrants where there is a tremendous mobility in domicile from month to month, from year to year.

That decision by the Republican candidate for President casts serious doubt on the claim that he wants to reach out to the minority communities of America.

The beauty of the census is that it has no barriers due to education, background, citizenship, income, or heritage. It is, in fact, one of the most democratic events we undertake in our Nation.

There is no anecdotal data reflecting any breach of confidentiality in the history of the United States census. I think that is quite a record. We would only hope that other agencies in Government had that record. We have debated it on this floor.

Unfortunately, entire communities are not counted each decennial due to inherent flaws in the process of traditional head counts. Sampling is the way to correct this. I know from experience how important sampling is.

In 1995, the Census Bureau spent $3.3 million to test the use of statistical methods in making the census more accurate. My hometown, a town where I was the mayor, Patterson, New Jersey, was one of these cities; and the results are staggering. Through this technique, we found that the 1990 Census had missed 8,000 people in one city alone in only one part of that city. Imagine what that means for other towns, large and small, across this greatest of all nations.

As a result of that undercount, that county within which Patterson sits lost over $60 million in those 9 years. Since much of Federal funding is distributed by many items, yes, but one of those items being population, that is an amazing number. It is almost $10,000 per uncounted person, this phantom population.

An independent study by PriceWaterhouseCoopers estimates that in the 2000 Census, the one in which we just sent out the forms, the questionnaires, one in every six gets the long form, the rest of us get the short form, in that census undergoing right now in New Jersey, we will be undercounted in New Jersey by 72,000 people. That should be unacceptable to all of us regardless of which side of the aisle we sit on. If it happens, this undercount would result in tremendous underfunding of Federal dollars.

To disenfranchise millions of Americans, disproportionately minorities, children and the poor, and prevent them from getting their fair share of resources for priorities like schools, hospitals and roads, that is not compassionate. That is not conservative. Indeed, it is not fair.

So what we are asking for is there has been a hiatus since the Supreme Court decision and we will, now that the questionnaires will be returned and the enumerators are being sent out, that we not get back into the partisan battles of 1998 and 1999, that we work together to make sure that sampling becomes a major part without defying the Supreme Court position.

Mr. Speaker, this is a critical issue for America. The Constitution mandates a count. The Constitution does not mandate how that count will take place. Hopefully, we will not have the undercount that we have had since 1960 and 1970 and 1980 and 1990. This, hopefully, will be a different census.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for his comments. I agree completely that the census is about people, it is not about politics, it is about getting the most accurate count possible. Because the census is so important, we must do everything we can to ensure that everyone is included in the count.

We know that previous censuses overlooked millions of Americans, especially children and minorities. That is not fair, it is not accurate, and it is not acceptable. We are determined to do better.

One of the programs that the Census Bureau has initiated is one called Partnerships With Community Groups and the formation of Complete Count Committees that work in the neighborhoods to help work with the Census Bureau to make people aware of the census, encourage them to fill out their forms, and to improve the counting of all Americans.

Our next speaker, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), is the chair of the Baltimore City Complete Count Committee. He is also one of the most active members on the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight on which the Census Subcommittee resides. I thank him for his work on the subcommittee and for taking a leadership role in his community, and I thank him for being here tonight.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) on behalf of the Congress and all the people of this great United States of America for all of her hard work. And she has worked hard. She has been working on this issue for a long time and we thank her. Because a lot of the things that were talked about a little bit earlier, the program that she just talked about and others, are because she was in there and she was fighting and she continues to fight. And we thank her, we really do, all of us.

I also want to take a moment to thank Ken Pruitt. He visited my district about 2 weeks ago and met with some young children at one of our elementary schools encouraging them to go home and remind their parents to make sure that they filled out the form and sent it off into the mail and make sure that it got back. And that shows how sensitive the Census Bureau is that he would come and spend an hour and a half with elementary schoolchildren and sending them as messengers back to their homes to make sure that these forms were properly filled out and returned.

But, Mr. Speaker, I take the time tonight because I believe that all Americans regardless of race, ethnicity and socio-economic status deserve livable communities. All must share equitably in this great American dream.

In Baltimore, people work hard. They do not ask for a lot, but they deserve to have communities that are safe and healthy, communities where children can obtain quality educations. Creating livable communities for our Nation's residents greatly depends upon a complete and accurate census count.

I recently learned that Governor Bush has sided with the Republican majority in Congress that has objected to the use of modern scientific methods to provide accurate census data. As a candidate for the presidency of these diverse United States of America, his opposition to using modern scientific methods casts very serious doubts on his efforts to reach out to minority communities.

It is so unfortunate, but not surprising, that the compassionate conservatism does not include the community I represent. Use of modern scientific methods ensure that those communities traditionally missed will be counted.

In 1990, approximately 23,000 citizens, let me repeat that, 23,000 citizens, in Baltimore City were missed. The City lost as much as $650 million in critical Federal grants and loans. However, an accurate count is not just about the money, it is also about quality of life.

Census information impacts programs like Childcare and Development Block Grant, a program that enables low-income families to obtain child care while they are at work or obtaining a job or obtaining job training or going to school.

The Labor Department uses census estimates in support of the Workforce Investment Act to prepare young people and adults facing serious impediments to employment by providing jobs and skilled training.

The Department of Education uses census data to identify school districts and allocate funds under title I program, helping to provide extra help in basic education to students most in need, particularly communities and schools with high concentrations of children in low-income families.

□ 1715

The Treasury Department uses census data for the Community Reinvestment Act to help determine whether financial institutions are meeting the credit needs of minorities and low- and moderate-income areas.

As the honorary chair of Baltimore City's Complete Count Committee, my focus has been on the most difficult groups to enumerate; and the gentleman from Baltimore, Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), has joined me in those efforts.

We have worked hard to make sure that we reached the African American male population between 18 and 30 years old, children under 5 years old, undocumented residents, Hispanics, and native Americans. Using Governor Bush's method, even our best efforts will not ensure that these groups are counted. A complete and accurate Census 2000 will ensure that education, accessible health care, child care, access to jobs, and the protection of civil rights are the foundation of livable communities. Our citizens deserve no less.

I thank the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) for yielding.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to really elaborate on a tremendous threat to an accurate count which has been brought up by some of my colleagues. At a press conference from Oakland on March 5, 2000, Governor George W. Bush finally revealed what we, many of us, suspected all along.

He has no intention of helping minorities, children and even the people of Texas by supporting the use of modern statistical methods for the census.

Let me read directly from the transcript. A reporter asked Governor Bush, and I quote, ''Governor, you mentioned the similarities between California and Texas. One of the issues in the minority community in California is regarding the census and an undercount that they experienced 10 years ago and can expect to experience again. What is your position on the idea of using sampling methods which would count minority communities more fully? Your party is against it,'' end quote.

Governor Bush responded, and I quote, ''Yeah, so am I. I think we need to count, an actual count. I think we need to spend the money, make the effort and work hard to get an actual count,'' end quote.

That was a very telling exchange. Governor Bush is willing to put his party's position ahead of what is right for the American people. Governor Bush sided with those in Congress who believe their partisan political power is best served by pretending that minority voters do not exist.

Why is this important to the presidential race if the census is now, if the census is this year? Let me say why. Under the plan that the professionals at the Census Bureau have devised, the more accurate data will correct the historical undercount of minorities. This will not be available until the beginning of the term of the next President.

The next President, if he should choose, could try to stop the numbers from being released to the States. This is exactly what President Bush did 10 years ago. That is why his statement from last week cast serious doubt on Governor Bush's claim that he wants to reach out to minority communities. The Bush census plan would effectively disenfranchise millions of Americans, disproportionately minorities, children, and the poor, and prevent them from getting their fair share of resources for priorities in their neighbors like schools, hospitals, and roads.

That is not compassionate. That is not conservative. That is not fair.

This decision puts Governor Bush at odds with the entire scientific community; from the National Academy of Sciences and the American Statistical Association to current Census Bureau professionals and even Dr. Barbara Bryant, former President Bush Census Bureau director.

All of these individuals and organizations agree that millions of Americans, disproportionately minorities, children and the poor, will again be missed if corrected numbers are not released. That is why a fair and accurate census is a priority for the civil rights community and groups like the Children's Defense Fund. Many civil rights communities have called getting the use of modern scientific methods to correct for the undercount the most important civil rights issue of the decade.

The governor's remarks remind me of something former Speaker Gingrich said in his book, Lessons Learned the Hard Way. Speaker Gingrich wrote about the error he made in holding the 1997 flood bill hostage in his effort to stop modern scientific methods. In explaining his actions, he said he stopped the flood bill because preventing a fair and accurate census was an issue, and I quote, ''of great importance to our party,'' end quote.

Still it seems that Governor Bush did not always share the party's view on the census. Like our former speaker, who used to support modern statistical methods, the Texas Office of State Federal Relations under Governor Bush's leadership used to be in agreement with the scientific community on this issue. I quote from the 1997 Texas State Federal Relations Office priorities, and I quote,

> All sides in the census debate concede that traditional methods of calculation which seek to identify and count each individual resident will never provide a full and accurate portrait of the U.S. population. At issue is how to correct that so that everyone can acknowledge it is an undercount and specifically an undercount of certain populations, most often urban minorities. This issue is important to Texas, because many Federal funding distributions are made according to census results. Most Texans do not realize that well over one-third of the State budget is derived from Federal sources, and all of these Federal sources are tied to census numbers. Consequently, the accuracy of the census is vitally important to the State, and even members of his own State.

end quote.

This is a tremendously important issue. There was a report that was issued earlier last week by PriceWaterhouseCoopers and it was based on the impact of an accurate census data across the Nation; but on my city it stated that New York City stands to lose approximately $2.3 billion during the next decade if the Census Bureau is blocked from releasing the most accurate population data; $2.3 billion over 10 years. That is a lot of teachers; that is a lot of police officers, roads, bridges. It is important that we get an accurate count. It means a great deal to the people of America.

I have with me the next speaker, the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA). He is a first-term Congressman, a former Senator and he has direct knowledge of the problem of the undercount in his State.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), for giving me the opportunity to speak on this important issue. I appreciate the leadership that she has taken on this issue, especially urging and demanding an accurate count on the 2000 Census.

This is not about political wedges. This is about improving the quality of life. That is what this issue is about. It is not about political wedges. It is about improving the quality of life. This issue affects all Americans. This issue affects every man in America. This issue affects every woman in America. This issue affects every child in America.

During the census of 1990, nearly 18,000 residents of my congressional district were not counted. I state 18,000 residents of my congressional district were not counted. The undercount resulted in a loss of Federal dollars and funds that would have benefited, nearly $50 million in revenue, that would have gone over the past 10 years. Because we failed to do an accurate count, we lost $50 million over the last 10 years.

$50 million could have gone a long ways in providing much needed resources to my congressional district. $50 million would have brought the Inland Empire roads and infrastructure. $50 million could have brought the Inland Empire housing programs and projects and educational services, law enforcement for cities, parks and recreation, senior citizen services, youth centers, educational services. Overall, the State of California has lost out on more than 2.2 billion Federal dollars, and I state overall the State of California has lost out on more than 2.2 billion Federal dollars due to the 1990 census undercount.

Last week, the lieutenant governor of California, Cruz Bustamante, warned that our State could lose $5 billion, and I state $5 billion, in Federal funding if the undercount this year is similar to the 1990 undercount. That is why I commend our colleague from New York for urging for an accurate count and demanding an accurate count, not only what it means to my State but what it means to many other States across the Nation.

As Lieutenant Governor Cruz Bustamante said, we will have less than we deserve, and I state we will have less than what we deserve. This is not just a matter of loss of Federal dollars. People are being overlooked. Millions of Americans are being overlooked. It is a shame that California will not get its fair share of dollars if we do not do an accurate count. That is why it is important that we do an accurate count, not only for California but for others.

Ten years ago, millions of Americans were not included in the census count, a count that would have placed them equally alongside each and every other American. In 1990, 2.7 percent of people of California were not counted, 2.7 percent. 2.7 percent. That means one out of every 37 people in California were not counted. Yet our population continues to grow.

We have 34 million people or more in the State of California. It would be a shame if California did not have an accurate count and it did not receive its fair share of dollars back into our State.

The census undercount does not affect all Americans in the same way. Again, during the 1990 census, 7.6 percent of the black population was overlooked in that counting; I state, 7.6 percent. That means one out of every 13 black residents of California were not being counted.

Also, during the 1990 Census, 4.9 percent of Hispanic residents of California were not counted. That is 4.9 percent. That means 4.9, roughly one out of every 20 Latinos in California were not being counted. Imagine what it is going to be like this year if we do not do an accurate count. It is a shame if we do not do that. It is a shame that the leadership on the other side does not want to do an accurate count.

I am appalled that Governor Bush does not want to do an accurate count. I think it is important that we all do it in the State of California, that we do it in every State. I am truly appalled. 4.9 percent equals nearly 400,000 Latinos in California not counted the last 10 years. 400,000 is more than the population of Fresno, California; 400,000 is more than the population of Sacramento. It is more than the population of Oakland. 400,000 people not being counted is 400,000 too many.

However, it is not just a matter of blacks and Latinos not being counted. Millions of children also were overlooked over the last 10 years. Nationwide, more than 2 million children were not counted 10 years ago.

In California alone, 342,000 children were not counted in the 1990 Census. That is 342,000 children. Imagine the services that could have gone back to our schools, to our communities, to our State. This represents 4.2 percent of the children of California not being counted in 1990. This represents nearly one of every 24 children in California not being counted.

I join my colleagues here on the floor this evening in urging all Americans to stand up and be counted this year. I join with those who have been undercounted in the past in stressing the importance of being counted during the year 2000 Census. All Americans should be counted this year. If we do not do an accurate count, the Federal dollars do not come in and the taxpayers will have to pay for the services that we want and deserve.

I urge all of us to stand up and be counted. Whether we are white or whether we are American Indians, African Americans, Hispanic, Asian Americans, we should all stand up together and be counted. We are one Nation, a great Nation; and we are one people together unified and inclusive, and I state inclusive, and that is important that we are all included in this process and that every one of us is counted.

Filling out the forms and mailing them back is important. As the Chair indicated that April 1, everyone has received it, we urge everyone to return those back and to participate in the process. It is the responsibility of a partnership between all of us. It is not just the legislature's responsibility. It is a partnership for the total community, for businesses, for schools, for churches, for our communities to come together and do what is necessary for our States. If we come together collectively, we will put our political wedges aside and we will do what is good for America. We will do what is good for our country. We will do what is good for our State.

I thank my colleague for providing me the opportunity to speak on this important issue, and I yield the balance of my time back to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), who has done an outstanding job, who is a true fighter and a true leader leading us in this important issue that is affecting all Americans.

□ 1730

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, our next speaker is the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ), an outstanding and consistent leader on this issue and others. He is the Chair of the Latino Caucus's Task Force on the Census and Civil Rights.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentlewoman's efforts. It is a great honor to serve with her.

Mr. Speaker, it is of great importance. It is just not a matter of partisan politics. It is just not a matter of Latino politics. I am very privileged to be the Chair of the Hispanic Caucus's Task Force on Civil Rights and the Census, but they really are one and the same. That is what I want to talk about this evening.

It is brief, but it is going to be very important. I am going to digress from the Federal funding aspect of what happens when we have inaccurate numbers. Not that that is not important, and I will give you a couple of examples why it is so important to Texas and for my district.

The 1990 census resulted in half a million Texans being missed, not counted. That is astounding. What was more astounding though is that 330,000 of those that were not counted were Hispanic or African Americans. That is something that we cannot tolerate and should not tolerate.

But, you may ask, why is it a civil rights issue? Because when the census misses people, it is not missing all people equally. The reality is that the people undercounted in the census are disproportionately Hispanics, African Americans, Asian Americans, Native Americans, and all other American minorities.

The unquestionable result of undercounting American minorities is not only a reduction in Federal funds for services in minority communities, which are in the greatest need, obviously; it is a blatantly unjust reduction in the political voice of those communities. This is indeed a political fight. It is a fight for the political representational rights of millions of Americans.

Based on these numbers we will be redrawing all lines. What do I mean by that? I mean we will be setting up what comprises school districts, city council districts, county commissioner districts in the State of Texas, State representative and State senators, as well as Congressional districts. Minorities will be underrepresented. They will not be counted. They will not exist for the purposes of making sure that they are represented when they draw those lines in the State legislatures.

We cannot start a new millennium with inaccurate numbers. This is not 1990. We have the ability; we have the science; we have the method; and it is there at our disposal, only if we use it.

Think of it, a new millennium; and we start it off with an inaccurate census that does not count everyone, and for 10 years going into the next century, we live with these inaccurate numbers, at great cost to the quality of life of our fellow Americans. That will not be tolerated, that should not be tolerated, and that is why I come here tonight to join my colleague from New York in a single voice to say that we are here to remind the American public, whether they be Republican, Democrat or Independents, that we must join together and use the best method to have an accurate census, because it truly impacts all of us.

The old quote, ''For whom does the bell toll,'' well, it tolls for you and me, because we are all Americans in this great country. If one American goes without a voice, then all Americans are without a voice. This is not what this great country has been built on all these years. This is not what we have fought great wars over. This is a representational democracy, and we can never achieve that if we do not have an accurate census and if we do not utilize proven scientific methods, such as sampling.

So I beseech and implore everyone out there that has any questions about it, they can come and talk to us. We will be happy to have a dialogue. But let us not let this be reduced to some petty partisan squabble, where the only end game and end product will be some sort of perceived political advantage. There is much more at stake here.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), a member of the Census Subcommittee, who has been our most consistent advocate for an accurate count and a strong voice for civil rights and social justice and all scientific methods to correct the undercount.

I thank the gentleman for all of his hard work and leadership this year. We all appreciate it.

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I certainly want, first of all, to thank the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), who has done such an outstanding job of providing leadership on this issue over the past 2 years and more. As a matter of fact, the gentlewoman has been all across the country looking at different approaches, methods, techniques, talking to as many people as she possibly could, trying to get the message out; and I think all of America owes the gentlewoman a tremendous debt of gratitude for her unselfish efforts in trying to make sure that we do in fact have an accurate count. I certainly want to thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. Speaker, an accurate census is in the best interests of our Nation. In less than 22 days the Census Bureau will undertake the enormous task of counting the entire population. It is an exercise that has been done since 1790 when the first census was commissioned.

Unfortunately, during the first census, not everyone was counted. As a matter of fact, Africans in America were considered three-fifths of a person. Since 1790, we have evolved as a Nation to include at least on paper women and minorities as equal citizens of this democracy.

However, the proposed methods of counting the population by many in the Republican Party, including its most likely presidential nominee, Governor George Bush, could lead to a serious undercount of our citizens. This is tantamount to moving backwards instead of going forward.

The constituents of my district, the Seventh District of Illinois, deserve and demand an accurate count of the entire population. They realize, as many others do, that too much is at stake to get less than an accurate count.

In 1990, for example, we lost millions of dollars in Chicago in Federal funds because of a census undercount. According to the Census Bureau, at least 10 million people, at least 113,831 in the State of Illinois, 81,000 in Cook County, and 68,000 in the City of Chicago, were not counted in the 1990 census. Many of those missed were children and women who live in minority communities, people who are in need of Federal programs to assist them in their daily living.

Because the 1990 census miscounted thousands of people in Chicago, every one of our residents were shortchanged on money to repair roads and streets. They were shortchanged on money for mass transit and senior citizen programs. They were shortchanged on money for schools, parks and job training.

Perhaps the most egregious shortchange was that of political representation. In a democracy, representation is essential to having a voice in local, State and Federal Government, and when those in powerful positions fail to do what is right, America loses. It is unfortunate that the census has become so political that those in power would ignore the voices of the National Academy of Sciences and others who have said that strict enumeration could result in millions more people being missed by the census.

I often say that when elephants rumble, it is the ground that gets trampled. In this case, it is the rights of those in rural and urban America, the rights of the poor, the rights of the needy, who will be abridged if they are not counted.

Perhaps Lincoln said it best when he said that you can fool some of the people some of the time, but you cannot fool all of the people all of the time.

So I am pleased to join with my colleagues in urging that those in powerful positions to lead do so, and not follow what many predict is a flawed way of counting our citizens. The essence of leadership requires that one do what is right and not politically expedient.

This is a great opportunity for Governor Bush to show that he is concerned about women, children and minorities in urban and rural communities. I urge him to reconsider his position on the census question and do the right thing, to make sure that every citizen is counted, because, if you are not counted, then truly you do not count.

Mr. Speaker, I want to urge all citizens of this country, and especially residents of the State of Illinois, to make sure that when you get the form, that you too do the right thing: Fill it out, complete it, send it in.

Again I say to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), I commend her for being a stalwart, a true trooper, a real soldier, as one might say, of the cause, carrying the message throughout all America that if you are not counted, then you truly do not count. I tell the gentlewoman, she counts in the hearts of millions of Americans who know the great work that she has done, and we all appreciate it.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very, very much for those kind statements and his professional statements.

Mr. Speaker, our next speaker is the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Vice Chair of the Democratic Caucus, who has been a leader on this issue and many other issues that are important to our country. I thank the gentleman for coming tonight.

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentlewoman for organizing this special order this evening to speak to one of the most important peacetime activities that take place in our country, which is the census, and for

her leadership as the ranking Democrat on the committee of jurisdiction that has dealt with the census. The gentlewoman has done a fantastic job in ensuring that the census be as full and as accurate as every American I think wants it to be, and we salute the gentlewoman for her work.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that as Americans throughout the country get that census form in the mail, this is, again, one of the most important peacetime activities that we will conduct, because the census is about over 100 programs, with $150 billion every year, that in a great part are determined by the demographic information, the statistical information that the census derives.

So it is about schools, it is about seniors and home health care, it is about transportation dollars, it is about community-oriented policing, it is about housing, it is about every imaginable thing that we face in our communities, and the census dictates, to a large degree, the resources of Federal and State governments in the context of that information.

It is also about representation. This is more than a snapshot about who we are at a given time, although that is important throughout our country, for us to know who we as Americans are. But it is also about representation, because from Congressional districts in our various States, to legislative districts in our respective States, to even our local council people who may run a ward or district across the entire spectrum of the political landscape, the question of who represents us will be determined again by the census and its demographic information.

Lastly, it is about private sector decisions, which in fact make billions of dollars in decisions. Am I going to market to this part of the country? Am I going to open up my corporate headquarters in this part of the country? Am I going to open up a regional headquarters in this part of the country? Is this where I am going to put some of our stores?

Mr. Speaker, the repercussions are enormous, and that decision is made to a large degree by the demographic information in the census. In essence, democracy requires demography. That is why the census is so important.

For each one us who does not get counted, this is not about, well, I did the right thing, I sent my census form in. This is about being our brother's keeper.

□ 1745

It is about making sure that our family and our friends and everyone else that we know, our neighbors, make sure that their census form goes in, because when they do not get counted, each and every one of us is diminished. I am a New Jerseyan. When a New Jerseyan does not get counted, all New Jerseyans suffer. When someone from my community where I live does not get counted, all of the residents of my community suffer, because each person has actually a value. Roughly, that is about $1,000 per person for 10 years. For each individual person who does not get counted, roughly about $10,000, multiply that by the numbers of people undercounted and it is enormous. That means less opportunities for our children, for our grandparents, for our communities, for a better way of life.

Now, that is why we Democrats have been fighting to ensure that we have the most accurate census possible in this millennium year. This fight began with an agreement within the scientific community that the use of modern scientific methods, which we call statistical sampling, would greatly improve the accuracy of the 2000 Census. But despite the evidence from the scientific community, Republicans have persistently opposed an accurate census that includes that scientific determination to have a sampling.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when the Labor Department puts out labor statistics and we see what the unemployment rate is and Wall Street reacts to that and other businesses react to that, that is a statistical sample. It is in essence what scientists have said we can use and we already use that in the government. Why should we not use it for the census to ensure that we have the best possible count?

I am really concerned when I see that one of the two Presidential candidates, George W. Bush, falling in lockstep with his Republican congressional leadership, has made his true intentions known that he does not support what scientists say makes sound science, which is a full and accurate count by using modern statistical sampling methods. When he takes that position, which came about only after various caucuses in the Congress wrote to him and said, what is your position? We have heard the position of GORE on this. What is your position on the question of the census and sampling? He finally came forth and said, I do not support sampling. Therefore, I do not support good science. But more importantly, when he fails to support sampling, he fails to support having every citizen ultimately counted. He has no interest in an accurate census, he has no interest in a fair and full representation for all Americans, and he has no interest in ensuring that my constituents in New Jersey, much less his constituents in Texas, receive the Federal funds their communities are entitled to receive.

Mr. Speaker, let me give an example of that. In the 1990 census, for example, more than 486,000 Texans were missed in the 1990 census. This translated into a loss of $1 billion, $1 billion in Federal funds to the State of Texas during this past decade. Now, George W. Bush's decision earlier this month to oppose the use of modern statistical methods and thus oppose an accurate census demonstrates that he is not committed to correcting a problem.

But it is not just about affecting the Texans. It affects my constituents in New Jersey. Because when we fail to use statistical sampling, we fail in every State that has realized an undercount to realize for those citizens their full potential and the resources that they deserve.

So this decision actually means double trouble for Texans in the next decade. Estimates indicate that an undercount in 2000 similar to the one in 1990 could mean a loss of $2 billion in Federal funding for the State of Texas over the next decade, twice the amount in 1990. Now, usually when we identify a problem, common sense dictates that we try to solve it, I say to the gentlewoman; and so that ultimately is what we are trying to do here.

Ultimately, what the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is trying to do, what we are trying to do is to ensure an accurate count. In my own district, over 20,000 people were not counted in 1990. The State of New Jersey lost $231 million in Federal funding in that time period because of the undercount. That, and also lastly, because Hispanic Americans and other minorities who are among the greatest people who were undercounted, I hear all of these candidates talking about how they are reaching out to this community to ensure that, in fact, they vote for them. Well, if they want us to be counted on election day, they need to count on us in the census.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman and all of the other speakers tonight. I urge my colleagues and all Americans to support and participate in the census, to fill out their forms and mail them in and finally to urge this House to let the professionals at the Census Bureau do their job so that the 2000 Census will be the most accurate and inclusive ever.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, the Census, as we are all aware, is important to our nation for a host of serious reasons. Not only is the decennial census the largest peace-time mobilization of American resources and personnel, it is a great day for civic participation and engagement! This is perhaps one of the most important features of the Census.

The day the Census is taken is the one day in which everyone has the opportunity to make their presence known! On April 1st, everyone is equal—every response is equally important to the nation; to states and local communities.

In this great melting-pot we call the United States, the significance of Census participation cannot and should not be understated. Everyone—every citizen in this nation counts—and everyone should be counted—as the implications of the Census count are critical to each and everyone of us.

The Census count influences the manner in which billions of federal dollars are allocated to states and local governments. This affects all of us—rich and poor alike—as these funds are used for our roadways, educational systems, hospitals, health care and for so many other important initiatives.

That is why, I am dismayed with those who oppose using modern statistical methods to provide a more accurate Census count.

We now know with certainty that the undercount of minorities is well-documented.

For example, the 1990 census missed 8.4 million people. The majority of those overlooked were children, the poor and people of color. The 1990 census missed: 4.4 percent of African Americans; 5 percent Hispanics; 2.3 percent of Asians and Pacific Islanders; and over 12 percent of Native Americans.

The 1990 census missed 7 percent of Black children, 5 percent of Hispanic children, and over 6 percent of Native American children.

What is compassionate and logical is to guarantee the right of each and every American to both accurate and fair political representation and a fair share—a fair share—of federal funds for education, health care and transportation and the like.

I am committed to ensuring that all Americans are counted and that all Americans receive their fair share of political representation and federal funds to which they are entitled.

In my District, the devastation caused by Hurricane Floyd has displaced many residents of eastern North Carolina. My staff and I, as well as numerous Census officials have taken steps to ensure that displaced citizens are informed about how to participate in the Census.

It is clear that Census 2000 is a civil rights issue. As such, it affects every citizen. Each of us is concerned with one or more of the following: Medicare; Medicaid; special education preschool programs; job training programs; disabled veterans outreach programs; adult education programs; bilingual education programs; child care programs and education programs; and Voting Rights Act.

This list could continue because the Census count affects a wide-range of programs and persons. However, what is fundamental regarding the significance of obtaining an accurate Census count is fair political representation and a fair distribution of federal funds.

The Census Bureau will provide us with two sets of numbers for the 2000 Census—an actual count and a statistically adjusted count. The Supreme Court ruled that statistically-based figures cannot be used for the reapportionment of U.S. House seats. However, states have the discretion as to which set they may use.

I encourage everyone to seriously consider the implications of obtaining an accurate Census count—one that reflects the U.S. population in its totality and diversity. I am quite cognizant of the fact that all Americans count, that is why I am committed to ensuring that every American gets counted!

CONGRESS NEEDS TO FACE FACTS ABOUT AMERICA'S WAR ON DRUGS

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

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, every day politicians talk about a drug-free America. Now, the Clinton administration is proposing to spend another $1.6 billion for drug eradication in Colombia so that we can become ''drug-free America.''

Mr. Speaker, let us get real. We have already spent $600 million to eradicate drugs at their source in Colombia, and what has happened? Both cocaine and heroin production in Colombia have skyrocketed. Despite eradication efforts, cocaine production in Colombia has more than doubled since 1995.

Colombia is now the source of 80 percent of the cocaine that comes into America, 75 percent of the heroin; and there is absolutely no sign Colombia's government can stop it or even make a dent in the problem any time soon, even with additional American dollars.

Let us face it. Our supply-side efforts have been a colossal failure. When will Congress and the President wake up and face reality?

Over the last 10 years, the Federal Government has spent over $150 billion to combat the supply of illegal drugs. Yet, the cocaine market is glutted, as always; and heroin is readily available at record-high purities. While the number of casual drug users may have declined slightly, the number of hard-core addicts has not.

In short, Mr. Speaker, the war on drugs by the United States Government has been a costly failure.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a soldier in that war is saying just that, telling it like it is, and Congress should listen to him. We should listen to retired Navy Lieutenant Commander Sylvester Salcedo, who served 3 years as a United States intelligence officer working closely with law enforcement officers and agencies doing antidrug work. As Lieutenant Commander Salcedo put it, quote, ''The $1.6 billion being proposed on drug-fighting efforts in Colombia is good money thrown after bad.''

Lieutenant Commander Salcedo also said recently that the stated goal of the aid package that is to disrupt the production and exports of drugs into our country is unrealistic and unrealizable. In fact, the lieutenant commander was so upset by the proposal, he wanted to return a Navy medal he received for his work with the Defense Department's Joint Task Force 6.

Rather than spend more money in Colombia, we should confront the issue of demand here at home in the United States, providing treatment services to the addicted population.

Mr. Speaker, this veteran of the drug war is absolutely correct. The lieutenant commander's stated goal, to get us to focus on our own drug addiction problem here in America, should be our goal as a Congress and as a country. As the lieutenant commander put it, quote, ''Washington should spend its money not on helicopters and trainers, but on prevention programs and treatment for addicts.''

Mr. Speaker, the cost of helicopters alone for Colombia would provide treatment for 200,000 American addicts. We are about to spend almost $2 billion, with a B, $2 billion on Colombia, while here at home we have 26 million addicts and alcoholics and most are unable to get into treatment.

When President Richard Nixon declared war on drugs in 1971, he directed 60 percent of the funding into treatment. Today, we are down to 18 percent.

The evidence is clear. We have had a misguided use of resources to put the emphasis on interdiction, crop eradication, border surveillance, more helicopters to fly into Colombia. We will never even come close, Mr. Speaker, to a drug-free America until we knock down the barriers to chemical dependency treatment right now for 26 million Americans already addicted to drugs and/or alcohol. That is right, 26 million addicts in the United States today, most unable to access treatment.

Last year, Mr. Speaker, 150,000 Americans died from the disease of addiction. Mr. Speaker, 150,000 of our fellow Americans died. We spent $246 billion in economic terms, lost productivity, absenteeism from work, more jail cells, social service costs, Ritalin for kids from families of addicts. American taxpayers paid over $150 billion for criminal and medical costs alone last year. That is more than we spent on education, transportation, agriculture, energy, space, and foreign aid combined; and 80 percent of our 2 million prisoners are in prison tonight because of drugs and/or alcohol.

How much evidence do we need here in Congress that we have a national epidemic of addiction crying out for more treatment, not more of the same, not more supply side?

Mr. Speaker, let us pass substance abuse parity, knock down the discriminatory barriers to treatment. Let us get real about addiction.

Mr. Speaker, this is not just another public policy issue; this is a life or death issue for 26 million chemically-dependent Americans. If we can pass parity legislation, provide the necessary treatment, then some day we can honestly talk and realistically talk about a drug-free America.

Mr. Speaker, every day, politicians talk about the goal of a ''drug-free America.'' and now the Clinton Administration is proposing to spend another $1.6 billion for drug eradication in Colombia so we can become ''drug-free America.''

Mr. Speaker, let's get real! We've already spent $600 million to eradicate drugs at their source in Colombia and what's happened? Both cocaine and heroin production in Colombia have skyrocketed. Despite eradication efforts, cocaine production in Colombia has more than doubled since 1995.

Colombia is now the source of 80 percent of the cocaine and 75 percent of the heroin coming into the United States. And there's absolutely no sign Colombia's government can stop it or even make a dent in the problem any time soon, even with additional American aid.

Let's face it! Our supply-side efforts have been a colossal failure! When will Congress and the President wake up and face reality?

Over the last 10 years, the federal government has spent over $150 billion to combat the supply of illegal drugs, yet the cocaine market is glutted as always, and heroin is readily available at record-high purities. And while the number of casual drug users may have slightly declined, the number of hard-core addicts has not.

In short, the war on drugs by the U.S. government has been a costly failure.

And now, Mr. Speaker, a soldier in that war is saying just that, and Congress should listen to him.

We should listen to Retired Navy Lt. Comdr. Sylvester L. Salcedo, who served for 3 years as a U.S. intelligence officer working closely with law enforcement agencies doing anti-drug work.

As Lt. Cmdr. Salcedo put it, the $1.6 billion being proposed on drug-fighting efforts in Colombia is ''good money thrown after bad.''

Lt. Cmdr. Salcedo also said recently that the stated goal of the aid-package—to disrupt the production and export of drugs to the U.S.—is unrealistic and unrealizable. In fact, the Lt. Commander was so upset by this proposal he wanted to return a Navy medal he received for his work with the Defense Department's Joint Task Force Six (JTF–6).

Mr. Speaker, we need to listen to this experienced Naval commander who says, ''I don't think we can make any progress on this drug issue by escalating our presence in Colombia. As in Vietnam, this policy is designed to fail. Rather than spend more money in Colombia, we should confront the issue of demand in the U.S. by providing treatment services to the addicted population. That's what's not being addressed.''

Mr. Speaker, this veteran of the drug war is absolutely correct. The Lt. Commander's stated goal—''to get us to focus on our own drug addiction problem''—should be our goal as a Congress.

As Lt. Commander Salcedo put it, ''Washington should spend its money not on helicopters and trainers but on prevention programs and treatment for addicts.''

The cost of the helicopters alone for Colombia would provide treatment for 200,000 Americans who are chemically dependent. We're about to spend almost $2 billion on Colombia, while here at home we have 26 million addicts and alcoholics, and most are unable to access treatment.

When President Richard Nixon declared ''war on drugs'' in 1971, he directed 60 percent of the funding into treatment. Now, we're down to 18 percent!

The evidence is clear that it's been a misguided use of resources to put the emphasis on interdiction, crop eradication and border surveillance.

John Walsh of Drug Strategies, a private company, says $26 billion has already been spent solely on interdiction programs. Yet, by key measures of drug availability, they are all going in the wrong direction. He said ''the focus of anti-drug efforts should be switched from interdiction and eradication to treatment of drug addicts.''

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Walsh is absolutely right! We will never even come close to a drug-free America until we knock down the barriers to chemical dependency treatment for the 26 million Americans already addicted to drugs and/or alcohol.

That's right—26 million addicts in the U.S. today! 150,000 Americans died last year from drug and alcohol addiction. In economic terms, this addiction cost the American people $246 billion last year. American taxpayers paid over $150 billion for drug-related criminal and medical costs alone in 1997—more than was spent on education, transportation, agriculture, energy, space and foreign aid combined!

In addition, more than 80 percent of the 1.7 million prisoners in America are behind bars because of drug/alcohol addiction.

Mr. Speaker, how much evidence does Congress need that we have a national epidemic of addiction? An epidemic crying out for a solution that works. Not more cheap political rhetoric. Not more simplistic, supply-side fixes that obviously are not working.

Mr. Speaker, we must get to the root cause of addiction and treat it like other diseases. The American Medical Association told Congress and the nation in 1956 that alcoholism and drug addiction are a disease that requires treatment to recover.

Yet today in America, only 2 percent of the 16 million alcoholics and addicts covered by health plans are able to receive adequate treatment.

That's right. Only 2 percent of addicts and alcoholics covered by health insurance plans are receiving effective treatment for their chemical dependency, notwithstanding the purported ''coverage'' of treatment by their health plans.

That's because of discriminatory caps, artificially high deductibles and copayments, limited treatment stays and other restrictions on chemical dependency treatment that are different from other diseases.

If we are really serious about reducing illegal drug use in America, we must address the disease of addiction by putting chemical dependency treatment on par with treatment for other diseases. Providing equal access to chemical dependency treatment is not only the prescribed medical approach; it's also the cost-effective approach.

Mr. Speaker, as a recovering alcoholic myself, I know firsthand the value of treatment. As a recovering person of 18 years, I am absolutely alarmed by the dwindling access to treatment for people who need it. Over half of the treatment beds are gone that were available 10 years ago. Even more alarming, 60 percent of the adolescent treatment beds are gone.

Mr. Speaker, we must act now to reverse this alarming trend. We must act now to provide greater access to chemical dependency treatment.

That's why I have introduced the ''Substance Abuse Treatment Parity Act''—the same bill that had the broad, bipartisan support last year of 95 cosponsors.

This legislation would provide access to treatment by prohibiting discrimination against the disease of addiction. The bill prohibits discriminatory caps, higher deductibles and copayments, limited treatment stays and other restrictions on chemical dependency treatment that are different from other diseases.

This is not another mandate because it does not require any health plan which does not already cover chemical dependency treatment to provide such coverage. It merely says those which offer chemical dependency coverage cannot treat it differently from coverage for medical or surgical services for other diseases.

In addition, the legislation waives the parity for substance abuse treatment if premiums increase by more than 1 percent and exempts small businesses with fewer than 50 employees.

Mr. Speaker, it's time to knock down the barriers to chemical dependency treatment. It's time to end the discrimination against people with addiction.

It's time to provide access to treatment to deal with America's No. 1 public health and public safety problem.

We can deal with this epidemic now or deal with it later.

But it will only get worse if we continue to allow discrimination against the disease of addiction and ignore the demand side.

We can build all the fences on our borders and all the prison cells money can buy. We can hire thousands of new border guards and drug enforcement officers. But dealing primarily with the supply side of this problem will never solve it.

That's because our nation's supply-side strategy does not attack the underlying problem of addiction that causes people to crave and demand drugs. We must get to the root cause of addiction and treat it like other diseases.

All the empirical data, including extensive actuarial studies, show that parity for chemical dependency treatment will save billions of dollars while not raising premiums more than 0.2 percent, or 44 cents a month per insured, according to a recent Rand Corp. study.

That means, under the worst-case scenario, 16 million alcoholics and addicts could receive treatment for the price of a cup of coffee per month to the 113 million Americans covered by health plans. At the same time, the American people would realize $5.4 billion in cost-savings from treatment parity, according to another recent study.

Of course, no dollar value can quantify the impact that greater access to treatment will have on the spouses, children and families who have been affected by the ravages of addiction: broken families, shattered lives, messed-up kids, ruined careers.

This is not just another policy issue. This is a life-or-death issue for 16 million Americans who are chemically dependent covered by health insurance but unable to access treatment. It's also a life-or-death issue for the other 10 million addicts and alcoholics without insurance.

This year, Congress should knock down the barriers to chemical dependency treatment and pass treatment parity legislation. The American people cannot afford to wait any longer for Congress to ''get real'' about addiction!

Then someday, we can realistically and honestly talk about the goal of a ''Drug-Free America.''

CENSUS 2000

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

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to respond to some of the comments by some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle concerning the upcoming 2000 Census. The census forms are in the mail, and people should have received them by now or will receive them shortly. Please complete those forms. I think, unfortunately, my colleagues tried to make it feel that it was not necessary to complete the forms, because only statistical sampling should be used or something. That was settled by the Supreme Court last year.

The important thing now is to complete the forms. We need to get everybody counted. Everybody living in this

great country needs to be counted, and there is no excuse not to fill out your form. If you do not fill out your form, it costs the Government more to collect the data, it hurts your local community, and there is nothing to be gained by not completing that form, and I am saddened that my colleagues gave the impression that the Republicans do not want to count people. That is so sad that we have to stoop to that level of politics to say that we are not interested in counting people. That is so, so unfortunate. Because we are doing so much more this year to try to get everybody counted.

I am really pleased with what the Census Bureau is doing on a lot of important things to get the undercounted population raised up so that they are fully counted. In fact, this census cost 150 percent more than 1990. We spent less than $3 billion in 1990, and we are going to spend almost $7 billion; and we have given every penny that the Census Bureau has asked for.

Now, I know my colleagues say oh, let the professionals at the Census Bureau do it. The professionals know what to do. Let us look at the first major thing the Census Bureau did in sending out a prenotification letter that was just received last week by 120 million people in this country. Well, what happened with that letter? 120 million were sent out and guess what? All 120 million were misaddressed by the Census Bureau. That is the largest mass mailing mistake in history. Mr. Speaker, 120 million mistake, because one digit was added to everyone's address. These are the professionals that do not make mistakes.

Then this form letter has a return envelope. It explains that the form is coming in the mail and on the back it gives a chance if you want it in five different languages. Unfortunately, for the large number of people who just speak English, they do not understand what it was all about because it never explained in English why the letter was coming. So the Census Bureau is getting all of these questions, being tied up with phone calls, why are we getting this letter. I do not understand what it is all about. They forget to put it in English.

I am also glad that my colleague from New York put up the phone number to call, because we do need to work in the local census offices. Because the Census Bureau in their letter, instead of giving the number, what they gave is call directory assistance. Well, that is nice. That only costs 50 cents, whatever it is, in your particular phone provider area, but they did not even have the ability to put down the phone number.

□ 1800

Now these professionals have botched the first big job. I want to make sure we have everybody counted, so I am saying that these mistakes were unfortunate, it is embarrassing for the Bureau, and we need to do everything we can to get everybody counted.

Now they say that Governor Bush will not release another set of numbers. First of all, the Supreme Court has ruled. The Supreme Court ruled last January, a year ago January, and said we cannot use these statistically-adjusted numbers. I am a former statistics professor. We have a lot of use for sampling and adjustments, but the court has ruled, so stop going on about that issue.

They tried this in 1990. They did something called the PES, similar to what is called the ACE this time. It was a failure. What they did was they did a full count and then they tried to adjust it and get a second set of numbers.

When they came up with the second set of numbers, they were not reliable. They played around with them for 2 years and they never used them. They still have never found a use for those numbers because it did not work.

To say, oh, we are going to have this adjusted set of numbers and they are going to be great, the statisticians will even tell us they are not sure it is going to work. They are going to take a sample of 300,000 and adjust the entire population, the 270 million people in this country, based on that 300,000 sample.

What we are working with in this is what is called census blocks, with maybe 25 people in them. It is a very complicated process. Here is a Census Bureau that cannot even send a letter out to tell us about the other matter straight. They botched it three different ways. And they are going to have the ability to do this extremely complicated experiment in statistics and get it right? I am really concerned about it.

Governor Bush is right to say, let us see what we can come up with. I do not think it is going to work. I feel very confident the Supreme Court is going to rule it is illegal and unconstitutional. In that case, we only have this set of numbers.

So please, everybody should complete their form. That is the best record we have. Everybody please complete their form, whether they get a short or long form. One out of every six people get the long form. I know there are a lot of questions on there, but we really need to get the best Census possible this year.

THE PRIORITIES OF THE FEDERAL BUDGET

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

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, just across the street here, the Committee on the Budget is working on unveiling the blueprint for the Federal budget. We do this every year to pay for everything from social security for our senior citizens to Head Start programs for America's preschoolers.

The budget, introduced by House Republicans this week, has a few important priorities. I would like to spend the next hour talking about those priorities.

First, we save and protect social security by walling off the money and making sure it cannot be spent on anything other than retirement for America's seniors. We pay down public debt.

Republicans disagree with the Democrats and the leadership coming out of the White House, the Clinton-Gore team over there, on the matter of spending. We on the Republican side do not think it is right to make our children pay tomorrow for money that we are spending today. We think, frankly, that we ought to have the courage to find the cash to pay for the things we want to buy now, rather than make my children and their children pay for it many, many years from now at many times the expense, after we factor in interest and just the general cost of bloating the Federal debt.

We also provide Americans with relief from the unfair tax on marriage and the unfair social security earnings limit, which penalizes senior citizens who want to work beyond retirement age. In fact, for those who earn over $17,000 this year, they will be penalized. They will actually have to pay dollars back to the Social Security Administration for every $3 over that $17,000 cap that they earn. For every $3 they earn, $1 has to go back to the government.

I just met with some constituents out in Colorado just last week at Wal-Mart, and found a number of individuals working there beyond traditional retirement age. One woman approached me and said she had to write a check. It was for $88. She said it was not the dollar amount that bothered her so much as it was the principle of the thing, the notion that just to work she has to pay. If she wants to be ambitious and continue being productive in the work force, she has to pay the government back as a result of this penalty.

We found the funding in our budget to eliminate that penalty altogether, and make it possible for people to go on working beyond retirement age without fear of being penalized and punished by their government for their entrepreneurial spirit, their dedication to work, and for their personal enterprise.

Finally, we strengthen funding for important priorities like education and defense, so both our children and our Nation have a more secure future.

These are the things I will be fighting for as the budget continues to work its way through Congress. These are the things I will continue to work for as I will help Congress craft a budget that meets the needs of people of all ages across my district in the Eastern Plains of Colorado.

Over the course of this next 55 minutes of the special order, we expect other members of the Republican majority to make their way down to the

floor to talk about the various components in the budget bill that they find to be of particular interest to themselves and to their districts and to the American people at large.

I think the first and most dramatic reality of this budget, and a point of tremendous pride, deals with the Social Security surplus. The reason is because we have accomplished something this year that for many, many years the people in the media and our Democrat colleagues on the other side of the aisle said could not be done, and that is to save Social Security and to stop raiding the Social Security fund in order to pay for the rest of government.

In fact, the President would like to continue dipping into Social Security to pay for the kinds of spending and new programs and growth in government that he envisions for the country and that the Clinton-Gore team has been promoting.

Our budget does something very, very different. First of all, that budget reserves every penny of the Social Security surplus to strengthen the Social Security program.

Here are some key points. The budget creates a safe deposit box to assure the Social Security surplus is not spent on any other government programs. It reserves the entire Social Security surplus, $978 billion, over the next 5 years to pay down the debt held by the public. It reduces the government's interest payments to the public, thereby making funds available to pay Social Security benefits.

I brought a chart along here, Mr. Speaker, that shows exactly where we have come and how the history of this has gone. We have stopped raiding Social Security and spending beyond our means. This chart represents total spending for every dollar that comes into the Federal government. This is just tax dollars. This does not take into account the Social Security contributions of the American people.

As we can see, way back over here in 1995, the government was spending $1.23 for every dollar it brought in in terms of tax revenues. A portion of that, the blue portion here, 6 cents, involves Social Security spending, and 17 cents involves additional public debt. In other words, this is what the addition to the debt was back in 1995. The brown area here is financed by the tax dollars that the American people sent here to Washington, D.C.

This is what we inherited when Republicans took over the majority in Congress. This chart, if we could look backward into the past, continues here. It starts even higher with greater quantities of deficit spending and spending here in Washington.

What changed this chart and began to move our country in a direction of more responsible spending, as we see here, is a change in the leadership of the House of Representatives. This was the year that the American people threw the Democrats out of the majority in the House and Senate both and instituted Republicans as the majority party, because they believed that we were sincere and that we were quite intent on our promises to be more responsible with the taxpayers' dollars in Washington; that our goal would be to reduce the deficit quantities of spending in Washington, D.C. as quickly as possible.

If Members will remember, at the time we proposed a Contract with America, which were ten items that we promised we would introduce if elected. One of those promises was that we would find a way to balance the budget and actually get to the point we are here in 1999 in 2002. In other words, we suggested that we would accomplish this goal not in 1999, but 2 years from where we are now, and we managed to come in fully 4 years ahead of schedule.

So I think as a Republican majority we have in fact proven to the American people that we were serious about getting the Nation's fiscal house in order. We were quite serious about eliminating these huge red blocks in fiscal spending that are the legacy of the Clinton-Gore era of reckless, runaway spending in Washington; that we would reduce this in this case in 3 short years, and beyond that, stop raiding the blue area here, which is the Social Security funds that were used or borrowed essentially to pay for the rest of government spending.

It is an exciting accomplishment, and one that has solidified and is a commitment that is made in a more forceful way in the budget that is making its way as we speak from committee over here to the House floor.

Let me go through these numbers again. In 1995, the budget entailed, for every dollar in spending or for every dollar in taxation, tax revenues, about $1.23 in spending. In 1996, we reduced that to $1.16. In 1997 we reduced that to $1.09. In 1998 we reduced it to $1.02. In 1999, we managed to spend dollar for dollar. It was the first year that we no longer borrowed funds or increased the size of the debt in order to pay for government.

In 2000, we are actually spending less. In the year we are in now, we are actually spending less on government than the revenue coming in. That is significant because it allows us to reduce the debt much more quickly than we had anticipated.

Just by way of example, in 1998 we put $51 billion into debt relief reduction, into public debt reduction. In 1999, we put $89 billion into debt reduction. In 2000, we put $178 billion into public debt reduction.

That is what we can achieve by being more responsible and frugal with the taxpayers' dollars, realizing that this government spends far more money than it needs to, and that the Federal government in general simply taxes the American people too much. So we have some things we need to accomplish.

We do have growing needs in the country: Defending our Nation, for example; trying to find ways to get dollars to classrooms to help the students throughout the country who rely on certain Federal programs for their academic pursuits and goals.

But we also think that a government that taxes the American people too much and keeps too much of that cash here in Washington is a government that is irresponsible, so we want to take some of this savings and return it to the American people. That is a significant item, and I will spend a little more time on that, too.

But the other thing we want to do is make sure we pay down the national debt quicker. We think we can do that not only through being responsible and frugal, as we have been, as we can see over the last few years from 1995 when the Republicans took over the House right on up to today, but we also believe that by returning a portion, about one-third of the surplus savings that we are realizing back to the American people, that we can continue to stimulate the kind of economic growth that has made for a robust economy for our Nation that has resulted in tremendous prosperity.

What Republicans believe that is very, very different and distinguishes us from our friends over on the other side of the aisle is that the American people can spend their money more wisely than the government can. That is a huge distinction between the two parties. We are seeing that not only in the presidential race, but we are seeing that with respect to the debate of whether reducing this debt is a good idea.

There really are people over on the Democrat side who would prefer these red blocks to continue, who believe that the government can do better at spending the American people's cash than the American people themselves can. We, on the other hand, are firmly convinced that the American people make wise decisions about making family investments, about making investments about whether to expand the farm, buy new equipment, buy new business equipment; whether to buy a new business, whether to hire a new employee, whether to invest in education and improve the marketability of one's own children or themselves, for example, when it comes to obtaining marketable careers and jobs in the work force.

All of these are important items, and I am excited that the budget that the House Committee on the Budget is about to send over here to the full Chamber is one that just keeps us on track of spending less, saving more, and putting money aside for quicker debt relief.

I am joined here by a couple of Members who I know share my concern for not only staying on track with a responsible budget plan, but also for making sure that the dollars we do spend get those priorities and items that we need most. One of those is education.

The gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON) is one of our colleagues who has been one of the most forceful advocates of getting dollars to the classroom. She is one who has also been an articulate spokesperson for the Individuals With Disabilities in Education Act. This is the one program that the Supreme Court requires the Congress to fund, and since that requirement has gone into place the Clinton-Gore team has not allocated the funds necessary to make this unfunded mandate work smoothly back in our home States. It ends up robbing our classrooms of the vital resources that are needed in order to reach our children.

It is an item that we have been working on in common, and our constituents care about equally, I believe. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON).

□ 1815

Mrs. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to come down tonight to talk a little bit about the budget and about public education, because really the reason that I got into public life is a concern about public education and how we are going to prepare kids for the 21st century.

I was very pleased to see what was coming out of the Committee on the Budget this afternoon, because we have had a lot of discussions about things; but when it really matters is when they start to get the numbers down on paper.

I wanted to see, like many of the people in this House and actually on both sides of the aisle wanted to see, a balanced budget that protected Social Security, did not raid Social Security anymore; but within that budget, we wanted to see some priorities.

National defense is certainly one. All of us know that we have been eroding our national defense over the last decade, and we may pay a price for that in the lack of readiness.

But the second and the one I would like to talk a little bit about tonight is education, where we are going on public education in this country.

There may be folks today who are listening to me tonight who remember when all a kid needed to get ready for school was a Big Chief tablet and a number 2 pencil. It is not that way anymore. We do not get protractors and slide rules in high school anymore.

We are on the verge of the 21st century. It is a wonderful opportunity, but it will only be an opportunity for our children if they are prepared for that century with a great public education. I do not mean just some kids. I mean, every kid in every neighborhood.

We can no longer tolerate the gaps between rich and poor, the gaps that have grown since many of these Federal programs were instituted, like title I, between rich and poor, and black and white and brown. They have grown wider. We cannot afford that as a Nation if the 21st century is to be just as much of an American century as the 20th century was.

So what are our dreams for the next decade? What do we want to see with respect to public education? How is that reflected in the commitment we are beginning to make here tonight and today with the next year's budget?

I think that there is kind of a myth out there that the Republican Congress does not care much about education. It always bothers me. It bothers me as a parent. It bothers me as a Member of Congress. I try to spend a lot of time talking with people about it because I think it is a myth, both in terms of financial commitment, but also in terms of personal commitment to the future of children. Because I happen to be one of those folks who believe that, unless America does have a strong system of public education, we cannot survive as a democracy. It requires an educated populous. We have to remain committed to that for every child.

I would like to talk a little bit about what is in this first budget with respect to education, this first look at this year's budget. For elementary and secondary education, the budget that came out of the committee today in the House Committee on Budget provides an increase of over $2.2 billion over the last fiscal year, fiscal year 2000, and an $20.6 billion increase over the next 5 years. That is a 9.4 percent increase in our commitment to public schools and Federal funding of public schools. That is the largest increase in the budget for the fiscal year 2001.

So the priority in the budget for this next year will be twofold: Defense, but first and foremost, public education.

The one area where we really differ, aside from how much money we should put into it, with the administration is flexibility. I want somebody making decisions about my child education who knows my son's name. I want teachers and principals and parents to have as much control as possible over the way that dollars are spent. I want those dollars to get into the classroom where they can pay for books and bricks and teacher salaries and teacher training. I do not think that Washington has the answers on public education. I have much more confidence in the principal of our local school than I do confidence on anyone that works in a Federal building here in Washington.

So where is the money going in education in this budget, and where have we been over the last 5 years? Over the last 5 years, this Congress has increased education spending by 26 percent. Last year, fiscal year 2000, we added $200 million over the previous year, a total of $1 billion more than the President requested in his budget.

The emphasis was on special education kids, and that is what I want to talk a little bit about here with this chart. The Federal Government assumed a responsibility for special education, that there is a civil rights issue around special education.

When we passed the IDEA Act originally, we promised to pay for 40 percent of the cost. But the Federal Government never met that obligation. The States and local school districts still have to meet those Federal requirements. So because the Federal Government did not pull its share of the load, States and local governments are having to foot the bill; and that money that could go for other priorities in education goes to special ed to meet the Federal requirements.

So the first requirement of this budget is to say let us meet the obligations the Federal Government has already assumed with respect to education and IDEA.

In the 2001 budget that just passed out of the Committee on Budget today, there is a $2 billion increase in IDEA funding, and that will boost us up to 12.6 percent of the cost of educating a special needs child.

This is the IDEA funding here on what we have done since 1996, and it shows the President's request, and it shows the amount that the Republican Congress has put into special ed, which every single year has been larger than the President's request. We want to fund our obligations before we bring in new programs and new programs created or controlled in Washington, and get this money down to the kids that need it in special education classrooms across this country.

I also want to talk a little bit about title VI, which is for innovative programs in education. It is not a huge program. But it does have a lot of local flexibility to fund things that, maybe, are just too much for a local school's budget, but they want to try something new, they want to try a new curriculum, they want to try teaching math using manipulatives or whatever they want to do.

Title VI is that kind of flexible funding. Every single year, the President has proposed to eliminate this funding. Every single year, the Congress has said give the local communities some flexibility and some funding to make some decisions, and fund title VI.

We are going to do that again. It was funded at $365 million last year, and we are going to continue to fund that in this year's budget, despite the President's request to zero out the program again this year.

Impact aid is a major issue for those of us in the West with a lot of public lands. I see the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) is here.

If one is in the Four Corners area of New Mexico, the counties there are 90 percent Federal land. So if one is funding one's schools based on property taxes, it is really tough. Fortunately, in New Mexico, we do not have property taxes that are funding our public schools. A lot of schools do.

What this says is, when the Federal Government owns the land, they have got to make a contribution to that school system; and that is what impact aid is for. It is the same if one has got a huge military base in one's town. There are kids there, and there is land

that is owned by the Federal Government. It is kind of the contribution in lieu of taxes that might otherwise go to the local community.

Again, the President has requested very small amounts of money for impact aid, and the Congress consistently over the last 5 years has increased that funding.

I do not know if the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) would like to comment on impact aid.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER) will yield, I would like to reiterate the point about impact aid, because we talk so much about education. Certainly it is our philosophy within this common sense majority, as the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON) has outlined, to transfer dollars and decisions back home, home to the family, home to the local school boards, home to the teachers.

But there are three clear and compelling places where the true Federal involvement in education cannot be disputed. As the gentlewoman from New Mexico reiterated, for children, dependents of men and women who have worn the uniform of our country, who are on active duty. So military dependents. For Native American children, because of the tribal trust treaty obligations ratified by the United States Senate and part of our law. Also for children within the District of Columbia. We have clear unassailable constitutionally mandated Federal involvement in education. Impact aid really affects, more than anyone else, children of military dependents and Native American children.

I watch with curiosity many things that go on here in Washington. I can remember before my colleagues on this floor joined me in this endeavor, relatively early in my time here, I introduced an amendment to add some $18 million to impact aid funding that would come out of the National Labor Relations Board. That is the Taj Mahal down the street encased in marble where each of the five commissioners has a private shower, a private dining room, and a private car, and, oh, yes, up to 22 lawyers working under his or her supervision.

To put that into perspective, across the street at the Supreme Court, an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court can have three clerks, three lawyers in his or her employ. The Chief Justice of the United States is only given five attorneys.

But when I came here and offered that modest amendment, the hue and cry from those who claim to be friends of Native Americans and who claim to want to add money to school funding for construction was resounding. Sadly, the modest amendment was defeated.

Yet, here we have again ample evidence, as the gentlewoman from New Mexico points out.

We all are certainly enthralled in hearing our President come and stand at that podium and offer a masterful, empathetic, sympathetic oratorical review. But the advice we learned long ago is not to listen necessarily to what is said; watch, instead, what is done. Plenty of folks can come and talk the talk. But can they walk the walk?

The gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON) provides the evidence, the promise of the President in meager requests, the reality of Congress stepping forward with those funds for those schools where there is a clear and compelling and, ofttimes, described as a constitutional role to provide dollars for education.

It has been very interesting for our time here in Washington. We understand the notion of three separate and co-equal branches of government. But promises made by the executive are seldom followed up unless the responsible actions are taken here by a common sense majority. The gentlewoman from New Mexico offers that ample evidence.

Mrs. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER) will continue to yield to me, I would like to talk a little bit about some of the other things that are going to be in this budget that came out of the committee today.

One of the things that I hear from kids in my district about is going to college. Fortunately, in New Mexico, we do have a program to give scholarships to kids who graduated from high school and who keep their grades up and can go to the University of New Mexico or New Mexico State.

A lot of kids, to get to college, which some of them want to do because they know they need to go, they need grants and loans. Most of us in this Congress required grants and loans and scholarships to go on to school.

The Pell Grant is one of the biggest ones funded by the Federal Government. This is what has happened with Pell Grants, the maximum award for Pell Grants since 1991. The change since 1995 is startling.

Americans and Republicans are willing to invest in education. They are willing and we are willing to say to a kid, if you will go to school and work hard and go to college and get a degree, we all know you are going to be contributing more to this country, because you have got a great education. We will provide that opportunity through Pell Grants.

The cost of a college education is going up. That means that the amount that a kid can get through a Pell Grant needs to go up, too. So we have made that continued commitment, and we will do so again in the budget this year.

□ 1830

We want a great school in every neighborhood. We want teachers that are well trained and that can work with us as partners in the education of our children. We want charter schools in this country to give people choice. Tomorrow, along with my colleague from Colorado, we will be introducing a charter school loan guarantee fund bill. The biggest barrier to charter schools in this country is they cannot get the capital money to fix up a building or a storefront in order to open and operate because most of them cannot get bond money.

So we are introducing a bill that will set up a Federal loan guarantee fund, so that people who are trying to set up charter schools can go to a bank and, without all of the signatures and putting their houses on the line and so many other things that people have been willing to do to start charter schools, there will be a Federal loan guarantee available there if the bank will loan them the money.

The concept in the bill is to make a $600 million Federal loan guarantee program, which should leverage $9 billion in public school construction in charter schools through the private markets. And what does that mean? It means a charter school, instead of paying 11.5 percent in interest to redo that old building or to redo the shopping mall, strip mall site for their school, can pay 5 or 5.5 percent. That is a lot more money that can go into teachers' salaries and materials for that charter school that does not have to be paid in interest. And we should make that investment in choice and public charter schools.

I call on the administration and my colleagues, because I expect this will be a bipartisan bill, to see if we can get this moving and get this through this year. I think it is up to us to commit ourselves and recommit ourselves to a decade of dreams for American education. We can no longer afford to leave any child behind, and that is why I wanted to come here tonight.

I thank the gentleman for his time.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, it occurred to me, listening to the gentlewoman from New Mexico, that people monitoring our proceedings and this discussion during this special order might be confused actually to see on the charts that Republicans are leading the way of investments and dollars in education. Confused, I say, because the media and our friends on the other side of the aisle have year after year tried to persuade the American people that we somehow are unconcerned about quality schools around the country.

We are not just talking about spending more money, although in the case of these priority projects we are talking about spending more money, but in the case of the Individuals with Disabilities and Education Act, this is an acknowledged obligation we have under the Civil Rights Act to carry out this program. And the problem is that this administration is, frankly, not interested in spending dollars on a program that we are obligated to carry out. They instead would like to keep the Federal Rules but have our local school principals figure out how to come up with the dollars to pay for it.

So in the case of the four examples that were just presented, these are priority items for us. The IDEA program is our highest priority in the education budget this year.

But I want to keep it all in the proper context, again going back to the budget track record since the American people threw the Democrats out of the Speaker's chair, out of the majority, and put the Republicans in charge. We have dramatically dropped the amount of deficit spending in the country. What we are talking about today are the fruits of prioritization.

For too long in this town, Democrats, when put in charge of our national budget, talked about spending, but only spending. They did not talk about prioritization, picking those programs that truly make sense, that are truly in the best interest of the country, and getting rid of lesser priorities that, frankly, we have gotten rid of. And most Americans have not noticed that they are gone. That is the way we are able now to show and to establish for the House and for the American people that a Republican majority in Congress has delivered a balanced budget fully 4 years ahead of schedule.

We have eliminated these deficit spending blocks that my colleagues see here in red. We have ended this business of borrowing money from the Social Security Administration in order to pay for the rest of government, which is represented in the blue blocks, and now we are to the point where we are actually spending fewer dollars in Washington than the American people send us, which allows us to establish priorities, to make priorities for the American people, which the gentlewoman from New Mexico just described with respect to education.

We have other priorities, too. Not only do we want to elevate the stature of those priority programs that make sense for America's schoolchildren and for the defense of our country and for seniors and so on, we also want to send a certain amount of that money back home to the people who work hard to earn it, and we want to work harder to pay the debt down quicker. And we can do all these things by just being smarter in Washington.

That is what the American people believed we would do when they gave us the majority. They understood that the Democrats were incapable of building a responsible budget. They threw them out. They took the gavel out of a Democrat Speaker's hand and put it into a Republican Speaker's hand; and we are here now, in 2000, getting ready to bring a 2001 budget to the floor which keeps us on track for more responsible spending.

I know the gentleman from South Dakota is one who has been instrumental in helping us fight the hard fights of bringing responsible budgets to this Congress and helping to make the priorities not just to spend more money but to spend money on things that really and truly do matter and are in the category of legitimate functions of our government at the expense of waste, fraud and abuse. I yield the floor to him.

Mr. THUNE. I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding, and would echo much of what he said, and the gentlewoman from New Mexico, who so very eloquently made the case for the investment that we have made in education, as well as the gentleman from Arizona and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) here on the floor this evening, who all share the same commitment.

I think that when we get right down to it on a very basic level, a budget is a statement of priorities. The budget resolution that will be adopted in the House, and I will admit I have not read the fine print at this point, but from all I have been able to gather about the work that the Committee on the Budget has under way, this is a budget that will be a reflection of the priorities that we have for this country.

Now, the people of South Dakota, the hard working people in my State, day in and day out, month in and month out, year in and year out have to go about balancing their budget. They do not have the luxury the Federal Government has had for so many years of going so far in the red and mortgaging their children's future. That is what has happened here in Washington.

So I think to suggest that we can, in a very straightforward way, make better use of the dollars that are at the disposal of the Washington government here and achieve the savings that are necessary so that people can keep more of what they earn and that we can distribute that power out of Washington and back home, I think is a very real commitment on the part of the Republican Congress.

Now, I will say that if we look at the statement of priorities that was evident in the President's budget, it was, is, and always will be the extension of the reach of big government and higher taxes. Make no mistake about it, that is exactly what was in the President's budget this year; and it has been in the President's budget every year since I have been here. And the gentleman from Arizona who was here in the Congress prior to our arrival here knows that we have made hard decisions about trying to come up with ways to achieve additional savings, come up with a budget that makes sense, that finds the waste, fraud and abuse in the Federal Government and roots it out so that we are being responsible to the people of this country who, again, day in and day out have to go about the process of coming up with a budget that makes sense for them and their families.

I just want to add that as I look at this budget resolution that we are in the process of considering this year. And look at the statement of priorities, it is a reflection of the things that we believe in profoundly. First off, I also have to note that if we look at the accomplishments of the past 5 years, which the gentleman from Colorado noted, where we have come from, the budgetary priorities that have been established in the last several Congresses since we took control of this institution, have allowed us to, for the first time since I was 8 years old, in 1969, balance the Federal budget. Even more importantly than that, last year, balance the Federal budget without raiding Social Security. That is a remarkable accomplishment.

And that is coupled with the first time in a great many years of actually retiring a portion of the 3.6 publicly held Federal debt. The last couple of years we have paid down $140 billion in debt. They said we could not do that. They said we could not reduce taxes. We reduced taxes in 1997, which has led to additional revenues. This program is working for the American people.

This year, this budget is a further reflection of those same priorities because they make essential investments in areas like the gentlewoman from New Mexico mentioned, and that is education. A program that is near and dear to my heart and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) is impact aid, because we have a lot of federally impacted lands.

Special Ed. The Federal Government made a commitment that it has not fulfilled, not honored. We have a promise to the American people and the school districts in this country that we need to live up to, and we move down the path farther this year toward honoring that commitment.

The commitment to our seniors to protect Social Security and Medicare, to ensure that the programs that they rely upon in their retirement years are going to be there. We are, for the first time, walling off that money and saying we are not going to spend the Social Security surplus. That is a significant and radical departure from what has been happening in the past several years here in the Congress.

Commitment to our veterans. Last year we increased spending on veterans health care by about $1.7 billion. This year, again, this budget resolution will recognize the commitment that we have to those who have served this country honorably and nobly. We need to ensure that we honor the promise that we made to them in the area of health care. This is a budget which will increase funding for veterans health care substantially.

Farmers. My State of South Dakota, farmers and small business people, farmers and ranchers, people working the land and trying to make a living and have had to deal with the tremendous terrible cycle of low prices, bad weather, and everything else associated with it, this budget puts aside about $8 billion for crop insurance reform. That is the risk-management tool that producers can use to help manage the risk and manage, as best they can, to try to avert the devastating effect of weather disasters that are so frequent.

Additional assistance, emergency assistance, to combat low prices in agriculture. We have made a commitment to our farmers in this country that we are going to stand with them and at the same time we are going to go after the markets that we have lost, to ensure we are doing everything we can to open additional market. And, frankly, there has been a tremendous failure on the part of this administration in that respect. But having said that, that is an effort that we will step up and intensify, to open those markets; and in the meantime we are going to see that our farmers have the income they need to pay the bills.

Our families. We make a commitment to our families, because we are also including in this budget resolution a significant piece of tax relief. Earlier this year we passed the marriage penalty relief tax measure, which, unfortunately, is still hung up, I think, in the other body but, hopefully, will clear there and get sent down to the White House. And I would urge the President to sign it into law because this is an important piece of legislation that recognizes we can no longer punish and penalize people in this country in the Tax Code for making a choice to be married. We need to deliver the additional tax relief that is called for in the budget resolution.

So we will make a commitment so that the families of this country have more money in their pockets to spend on their priorities, whether it is making the mortgage payment on the house, the car payment, day care payments, buying tennis shoes for the children, whatever that might be. Those are decisions that ought to be made in the family living room and not here in Washington. And that is again a reflection of our philosophy.

We make a commitment to our children by ensuring that the funding levels are there for education and, furthermore, by ensuring that we continue to systematically pay down the Federal debt so that we are not saddling the next generation with an incredible, enormous burden of debt that they are never going to be able to get out from underneath.

Finally, we make a commitment to our military by increasing spending on defense. The record of this administration on defense is deplorable. Regarding the military today, in terms of equipment, weapon systems, personnel, pay for military people, we are having a terrible problem with retention. This budget goes a long ways toward addressing the very important priority that we place on ensuring that we have a safe and secure America. And the only way that we can have a safe and secure America is to have a strong America. And that means investing, making the necessary investment, in our national security.

This is a budget which is a reflection of our priorities. These are the things that are important to us as we begin to plan the future, as we move into this next century, and how best to allow the American people to realize their dreams and do it in a way that incorporates our belief in the principle of allowing them to make more of the decisions that affect their lives and distributing power from Washington, D.C. back into the living rooms of this country so individuals and families are making decisions and we are not wasting their money here in Washington, D.C. on new programs which, frankly, most of which do not do very much to help the hard-working Americans that we are here to represent.

So I just would add this evening to what has already been said by my colleagues, that if we look at this budget as it is being proposed and the priorities that it places and how those priorities fit in with the priorities of the good people of South Dakota, this is a budget which honors our commitment to our seniors, to our children, to our families, to our farmers and ranchers, to our veterans, and to those who wear the uniform of the United States of America.

□ 1845

This is a budget which ought to be passed and that we ought to put into law and begin the process of moving forward in a way again that incorporates the principles and values that we here share and that I think are shared by the American people and continue to do the good work that has been started in paying down debt, reducing taxes, and balancing the budget and doing it in a way that is efficient and smart and does not waste Federal dollars and doing it in the same way that the families of this country have to do on a day-in and day-out basis.

I am pleased to be here this evening to participate in this special order, and I thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER) for yielding.

I would again simply say, I hope we have a number of other opportunities to debate this issue. This is a budget that is right for the people of this country, it is right for America, and we need to move it forward.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER) for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I thank all those who join us this evening to assess where we are headed with the majority budget plan which we will pass shortly from the Committee on the Budget for the American people to offer a roadmap that means continued prosperity for the American family for Main Street as well as Wall Street and all those avenues in between, for those who make their living from the soil in terms of farming and resource-based industries, and for those quite simply, Mr. Speaker, who work hard and play by the rules.

In the 1960s, there was talk of a credibility gap. Sadly, in this town at this time with the current administration there exists a credibility canyon that, quite frankly, eclipses for its sheer magnitude the dimensions of that incredible wonder that is found in the State of Arizona, Grand Canyon National Park. And sadly, it is not beautiful. Because the ugly truth of this credibility canyon is beautiful rhetoric, notwithstanding, sadly, when it comes to the administration and those who, Mr. Speaker, some have dubbed the Clinton-Gore gang, we cannot listen to what they say, we must watch what they do.

And even as we have seen the spectacle of our Vice President coming out for campaign finance reform saying he will renounce soft money, even on the same day when he directs his party to raise some $35 million in the same soft money, he stands and says he does not want to have happen, even when he talks about campaign finance reform while his former campaign aid Maria Hsai is convicted of campaign finance abuses over an appearance at a Buddhist temple, the Vice President tells us he did not realize was a fund-raising event, even as we see these different words and actions and contradictions, not limited to the campaign trail, not limited to one's conduct in office, but part of the budget process, again, my friend from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER) pointed out the gulf between the rhetoric of the administration, the reporting of those Washington journalists and the reality of what has been done here. And our colleague from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) is quite right, the responsible, common sense, conservative majority understands that true compassion is not reflected with endless promises and pronouncements and phrases for focus groups and sound bites.

We understand that governing is hard work; and, accordingly, we have fashioned a budget that emphasizes education not simply with dollars but understanding who controls or who should control the priorities of education: parents in the home, teachers in the classroom, and locally elected leaders who can reflect a community's priorities. We have also stepped into the breach, as our colleague from New Mexico pointed out.

A point of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker. Two weeks ago I was honored with a visit from my cousin, who is a very special person. She has Downs syndrome. She is now 32. And I think about her years in different programs living at home with her aunt and uncle, working hard, always learning even with the challenges she confronted; and I think about the local school district in which she lived where there were empty promises made by a so-called compassionate group in Washington that left the funding to local leaders even when they had promised to pay for those programs.

This Congress has stepped up. In terms of national defense, this Congress has stepped up. Even as our

President would strip those great funds and send them to Kosovo and the Baltic for misadventures, we have stepped up.

We want to do what is responsible for people who play by the rules, for people who need a helping hand. And just as people have left welfare and gone to work, and just as the American people have more of their hard-earned money to spend on themselves and their families, to save and invest as they see fit, we present a budget that reflects those priorities.

I am honored tonight to join now my two colleagues from Colorado to review that process, with the closing words, Do not listen to what is said. Watch what is done. Actions speak louder than words. This Congress is prepared to take the right kind of actions.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I want to yield the floor over to somebody who has done the hard work of freedom and help make some of the tough choices here in Congress, my good friend and colleague from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO).

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague's providing some time for me; and I appreciate him taking this hour to explain to the American public that there, in fact, is a difference.

We have all heard the lament, Mr. Speaker, when I go home, and I am sure when all of my colleagues, every Member of Congress, goes home; and some time or other someone says something like this. You know, there really is not all that much difference between the two parties. There is not really a dime's worth of difference between the two parties. I have heard it. We all have heard it. Sometimes I probably have said it.

But I must tell my colleagues that there is nothing that brings home the reality of the situation more than a budget resolution and nothing more that defines the differences between the two parties that, in fact, do exist than the budgets presented by the President of the United States, in this case, and by the Republican majority in response to it.

On February 7, 2000, President Clinton and Vice President GORE submitted their budget for fiscal year 2001. Their budget raises taxes and fees on working families by $250 billion. It creates 84 new Federal programs. It places Government spending increases on ''auto pilot'' and, as usual, takes a pass on any serious reform of Social Security or Medicare.

Now, that is the reality of the Democrat budget. So when we say things like there is not a dime's worth of difference, we may be right. There is not a dime's worth of difference. In this case, there are hundreds of billions of dollars' worth of difference between the two parties.

Because the Republican party has, in fact, submitted a budget set on priorities, as my colleague from South Dakota and my colleague from Colorado has indicated. We have, in fact, established education, defense, the preservation of Social Security and debt reduction as priorities.

These are not the priorities of the minority party. These are not the priorities of the President. We all recall the President of the United States standing right there, Mr. Speaker, where the Speaker is right now and telling the Nation not all that long ago that, in fact, ''the era of big Government was over.''

Now, words are supposed to have meaning. We are supposed to be able to define exactly what is meant when people use them. ''The era of big government is over.''

Perhaps, in fact, he was right. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, in Clintonian double-speak this era of big Government is over and what we are anticipating now is the era of huge government. Maybe that is what he meant. I mean, that is the only way we can interpret the words as applied to his budget. Right?

What in here, 84 new programs, $250 billion more of taxes, what indicates to anyone that there is smaller Government on the horizon?

How about the following: These are taken directly out of the President's budget. These are proposals for new programs in an era of huge government, which he would like to see us enter into.

Let us see, new programs: Increase Amtrak funding by creating a new capital grant program for high-speed rail funded out of the Highway Trust Fund. Even though, by the way, Congress passed legislation to reduce Amtrak's dependence on the Government. It goes on and on. I am not going to read all of them, just a few I pick out as I go through.

Create a conservation security program; income payments to farmers who engage in ''voluntary environmental efforts''; provide subsidized banking services in low-income areas; encourage the creation of low-cost bank accounts; increase access to ATMs; and enhance financial education. All might be wonderful ideas. I mean, all these things sound great.

What is the Federal Government's role in this and how do they fit an era of smaller government?

How about funding greening the globe initiatives, increased debt for nature funding. Create an initiative to prevent the spread of HIV within African militaries. Fund a clean partnership. Build a visitors center, an interpretive center. And acquire lands to preserve World War II Japanese-American internment camps in the West. Provide homeless vouchers, set-aside incrementals. Provide welfare-to-work set-aside incrementals. Create a voucher success fund. Create a housing production fund. Create an Indian home ownership intermediary initiative.

I mean, this all goes to Housing and Urban Development. Even though we know that HUD, of all the agencies of Government, and this is hard to say, I mean, when we are talking about the agencies that waste more of Government, I mean, I do not even know how we can prioritize it, it is so difficult. But let us look at what Congress discovered with HUD. They had hired hundreds of politically favored employees at salaries up to $100,000 a year each to promote department programs and publicize its activities.

The department dubbed these things ''community builders.'' They have over 900 of these people, 10 percent of HUD's total staff, and these were never granted approval by Congress. The program was supposed to be reduced significantly and phased out by September 30, 1999. It has not happened. The President has asked for an increase in all of these things.

I know we are coming to the end of this hour, and so I want to return to my colleague from Colorado for his closing comments. I just want to say this, that the next time anyone says to you there is not a dime's worth of difference between the two parties, say, you know, you may be right because I think there are really billions, hundreds of billions of dollars of difference between the two parties, as evidenced by the budget.

This is the real world. This is not the world of rhetoric. This is where the rubber hits the road, so to speak. We can talk about era of less Government, but here is where we actually see what the President is talking about. Once again, I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the President has, in fact, deceived the American public.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for recognizing us for this hour of special order to talk about the difference between the Republican vision of a budget that secures America's future and contrasting that with the Democrat version of a budget which simply spends us in oblivion and taxes us more.

We hope the Republican version is the one that emerges victorious over the next few days, and we will commit our efforts to see to it that that actually occurs.

□ 1900

AGRIBUSINESS CONSOLIDATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the lovely gentlewoman from Idaho (Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE. Mr. Speaker, I begin my remarks tonight with the words from one of our Nation's greatest orators, Daniel Webster. This great Senator eloquently sums up the mission of agriculture for this Nation in a rally cry, and that rally cry is placed, Mr. Speaker, right above the Speaker's head in this very Chamber. That rally cry says, ''Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests and see

whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered.''

Mr. Speaker, this foundational principle largely responsible for bringing the prosperity to this Nation is now being threatened. In fact, the market power struggle between corporate giants and helpless farm families is divesting rural America, especially when consumers are buying record amounts of food at record high prices while our family farm producers are going broke.

Mr. Speaker, few of us realize that approximately four big companies control most of the processing and distribution of all of the beef, pork, chicken and grain in this United States. Even further, on the distribution and retail side, there are only a handful of companies that control the United States grocery industry. Well, what has happened is that today these giant concentrated companies, with their economic market power, have usurped the farmers' and ranchers' share of the retail dollar, draining the lifeblood from the family farm and threatening our safe, sustainable and dependable American food supply. That is unacceptable.

I have to say, Mr. Speaker, I really appreciate the Albertsons Grocery Company that is headquartered in my district because they have realized the unrest that is growing with the American people in this concentration issue, and I am very pleased that they are now labeling their meat in most of their meat counters as to where the meat has been grown and processed, and my hat is off to a company that I am very, very proud of.

In the livestock industry, for instance, four meat packers control over 80 percent of the beef market and are using captive supplies and abusive market power to drive down the prices paid to producers. Specifically, our family farmers and small cattle producers are providing approximately 88 percent of the total investment it takes to put a steak on the consumer's plate but at the same time packers' and distributors' costs are making up the additional 12 percent of the remaining investment.

Now, unfortunately, while these big packers and retailers overpower the industry, cattle producers and consumers are losing big time every day on price, quality, consistency and food safety. The current situation in the cattle market is analogous to economic theories presented by the Nobel Prize winning economist Frederick August von Hayek over 50 years ago. Mr. Hayek points out that market capitalism is strongest when resource owners who are close to the economic circumstances of time and place.

When they are the ones that make the economic decisions, such a market structure results in the most efficient use of resources and competitive market.

On the other hand, Hayek demonstrates that the concentration of economic decision-making in the hands of a relatively small number of individuals is extremely harmful and counterintuitive to the capitalistic principles that have built this great Nation. It does not matter whether those individuals are government bureaucrats in a Soviet-styled Communist regime or are corporate executives in large companies. We must not let American agriculture fall into this trap. This concentration of power creates a cartel that is monopolistic by nature and rewards power and greed. This must stop, Mr. Speaker.

This phenomenon was confirmed by a study by Auburn professor and agricultural economist C. Robert Taylor, and the study reports that, and I quote, ''The increasing gap between retail food prices and farm prices in the 1990s is due largely to exploitation of market power and not to extra services provided by the processors and retailers.''

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out this graph that I have here. As we can see, the red is the retail price and the green is the farm price. We see retail price leveled off at a very high mark while farm prices are taking a precipitous drop.

As we can see clearly in this chart, while the price of meat in the supermarket continues to climb, the price paid to producers continues to decline dramatically. This portion in the middle of the chart represents the inequitable market power that is growing that is gained by the retail industry.

Now, another glaring example is evidenced in the hog sector of our economy, Mr. Speaker. In 1999, Smithfield, the number three hog producer, bought out the number two producer, Carroll Foods. This catapulted them into the top spot ahead of Wendell Murphy. Then in September of 1999, Smithfield, the world's largest pork producer, announced intentions to purchase Murphy Family Farms, the new number two hog producer.

Well, this gives them 660,000 sows or one-eighth of the total breeding herd in this country. Imagine owning one out of every eight sows in an industry where only a few short years ago no single entity had even 1 percent of the market.

Mr. Speaker, the raw, robber baron, market power does not just stop here. In grain crop production we have gone from 80 individual companies selling seed down to 10, from 80 to 10, and out of these 10 players left, 3 of those 10 sell 75 percent of the seed in this country. With this high level of concentration among seed companies, we see great efforts to seize control of the entire process.

We might logically ask if anyone is aware of this trend besides the small producers who are being run out of business? Yes, Mr. Speaker, many people are aware. In fact, in 1997, the National Commission on Small Farms appointed by Agriculture Secretary Dan Glickman recommended actions for the U.S. Department of Agriculture to ensure the future for family farming and ranching. Unfortunately, after assessing USDA's responsive actions, an overwhelming majority of members who served on the Commission recently gave the USDA a ''D'' for implementing its recommendations to ensure fair market access for family farmers; not a good record for this administration; a failing grade, Mr. Speaker, and a failure to protect the livelihoods of these American farmers.

The Commission's major finding was that the erosion of the family farm in agriculture was not the result of inevitable market forces but of a bias at USDA towards, quote, large scale enterprises.

Now, despite the Commission's recommendations, I am sorry to report the USDA is continuing to allow the American producer to be exploited by an agribusiness monopoly.

Mr. Speaker, as a result, in my State, farmers and ranchers are on their knees. Our American food producers in rural communities are being destroyed while the processing and distribution conglomerates are gorging on unprecedented profits.

Let us not forget our responsibility to protect the American farmers and ranchers. As Thomas Jefferson said, and I quote from Jefferson, ''Those who labor in the earth are the chosen people of God, if ever he had a chosen people, whose breasts he has made his peculiar deposit for substantial and genuine virtue. It is the focus in which he keeps alive that fire, which otherwise might escape from the face of the earth. Corruption of morals in the mass of cultivators is a phenomenon of which no age nor nation has furnished an example. It is the mark set on those, who, not looking up to heaven, to their own soil and industry, as does the husbandman, for their subsistence, depend for it on casualties and caprice of customers.''

How can we have a fair marketing system when these conglomerates make record profits and my agricultural constituents in Idaho and those in America are being run out of business? How can that happen?

To complicate matters even further, listen to what Mr. Drabenstott, vice president of the Kansas City Federal Reserve, said before the House Committee on Agriculture in February 1999, and I quote from his testimony, ''As supply chains become more dominant in their structure, farmers face a simple test; build new relationships or be left out of the game. The emergence of bigger players means producers must be more nimble and savvy in adjusting to the market realities.''

Mr. Speaker, this shocking statement suggests that Mr. Drabenstott would like to see the American food producers subjugated to the status of serf. Under this scenario, the big corporate agricultural giants would severely hamper the farmer's ability to earn a fair return for their product as

they are forced to get in line in the chain supply, a growing food for a narrowing market. Even further, it will erode the independence of farmers by shifting major decision making to a handful of corporate firms and executives. America is a great Nation because we were built on a strong moral threshold. That is to say, in part we have strongly encouraged small businessmen to freely enter the fair market system.

Unfortunately, the corporate conglomerates now stand between hundreds of thousands of producers and millions of consumers as they manipulate the markets to their own advantage. This is seriously handicapping our farmers and ranchers and consumers also, Mr. Speaker.

We all know that big agribusiness, like ConAgra, Cargill and IBP, need American producers more than farmers and ranchers need big agribusiness. So, again, remember we know from history that concentration of economic decision making in a small number of hands is the least productive and the least beneficial system. Ultimately, it only serves as the road to serfdom for American farmers.

Take, for instance, Communism. It took what Karl Marx called, quote, the means of production, and consolidated it into one giant entity, the government. That is what Communism did. It gave a small group of people control over the farms, the factories and even the roads and rivers. Yes, that is precisely what is happening here today, except that it is the corporate monopoly that is gaining a stranglehold on the means of production.

To make matters worse, the Federal Government is giving its winking approval. This is brutally wrong and against American principles and public policy that we have historically been able to rely on.

Mr. Speaker, the time has now come for the Clinton administration to use the powers at its disposal under the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921 to provide a fair beef marketplace. The measure was enacted to prevent these kinds of anticompetitive practices by the big corporate giants. Undoubtedly, there is something wrong when the conglomerates are allowed to operate in blatant violation of Federal laws.

□ 1915

In fact, meat packers today look right into our eyes with a straight face, when their monopolistic practices remain unchecked by existing law, but they go ahead and deny that they are even regulated. This is a mockery of our existing laws and the justice system that we are supposed to be able to rely on.

I believe in a fair and competitive marketplace. However, I am very concerned that the individual agricultural producers have been overwhelmed by threats of predatory pricing. The time has come to restore the market balance between small producers and big agribusiness.

To help in this, legislative measures such as H.R. 1144, the Country of Origin Meat Labeling Act of 1999, which I introduced, complete price reporting, as well as other measures addressing anticompetitive practices by the meat packers, will give hope and encouragement to American producers and security to American consumers, because with this act coming into law, American consumers will know the country of origin which the meat came from.

Let me conclude by pointing out that the very powerful words of Theodore Roosevelt still ring true. President Roosevelt states in his March 4, 1905, inaugural address, ''Never before have men tried so vast and formidable of an experiment as that of administering the affairs of a continent under the forms of a Democratic republic. The conditions which have told our marvelous material well-being, which have developed to a very high degree our energy, self-reliance and individual initiative, have also brought the care and anxiety inseparable from the accumulation of great wealth in these industries.''

Mr. Speaker, these are important words.

TRIBUTE TO JAMES L. CADIGAN

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

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, throughout American history, our men and women in uniform have constantly risen to the challenge of our national defense, putting life and limb at risk for our security. This Nation, and the liberty for which it stands throughout the world, owes our veterans a deep and ongoing debt of gratitude.

Some would say that this debt is repaid in Memorial Day observances. But we all know what veterans, from the Revolution to the Kosovo campaign, appreciate most is respect. Respect for their commitment. Their sacrifice. Their medical needs. Respect for what they went through, so that we would not have to suffer. Respect for the families of friends who never made it home.

Tonight I take the floor of the United States House of Representatives to share with you the story of one soldier who has never received the respect I believe he is owed. His picture is to my right in his uniform holding a child. His name is Jim Cadigan, from the community of Hingham in the district in Massachusetts which I represent.

Once in a great while an individual serves this country with special distinction. When ordinary people demonstrate such extraordinary valor, official recognition not only honors the heroism, but also uplifts the entire Nation, whose freedom is safeguarded by such courage. Unfortunately, official recognition of this soldier's bravery has been less than forthcoming.

On a German battlefield in 1945, Lieutenant James Cadigan acted instinctively and against almost inconceivable odds to protect his platoon and apprehend dozens of armed enemy troops. For his selflessness, he earned the lifelong admiration of his comrades. But the Army that Jim served with such fierce loyalty has dismissed repeated recommendations, to express the degree of respect his bravery deserved.

Over the 3 years I have been privileged to serve in this chamber, I have labored to ensure a fair shake for Mr. Cadigan's candidacy to receive a Congressional Medal of Honor. Regrettably, Jim had more success on that German battlefield than in the corridors of the Pentagon. Thus, to honor the 55th anniversary of his heroism, I rise tonight as one grateful Member of Congress to salute Lieutenant Cadigan publicly for all he did for us.

To do so, I need only describe his remarkable acts of heroism. As you will see, the facts more than speak for themselves.

On February 26, 1945, Second Lieutenant James Cadigan, a Member of Company C, the 20th Armored Infantry Battalion, 10th Armored Division, led a platoon advancing on the German town of Zerf. Upon hearing that a second platoon had been ambushed and was pinned down by enemy fire, Lieutenant Cadigan, without concern for his own safety, charged fortified enemy positions perched on high ground and single-handedly wiped out two German machine gun nests.

Dozens of witnesses have testified that Lieutenant Cadigan killed or wounded 50 Germans, then took another 85 prisoner. The trapped U.S. platoon was able to escape and reorganize, saving scores of American lives. Most of these men made it back to the United States after the war. Without Jim Cadigan's heroism, it is likely that none of those men, or their children, grandchildren or great grandchildren, would be alive today.

One of Jim's comrades, Thomas Tomae of Irvington, New Jersey, reported, ''Like the other men, I know that we never would have gotten out of there alive if Lieutenant Cadigan hadn't knocked out the 2 Nazi machine guns that were closing in on us.''

From another comrade, John Milanak of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania: ''All of us were sure we would be killed that day. It was just like a miracle. I thanked God many times, but never more than that day. I say thank God for Lieutenant Cadigan. He saved so many lives.''

When the smoke of the battle of Zerf cleared, Lieutenant Cadigan's commanding officer, Captain Melvin Mason, immediately began preparations to recommend him for the Congressional Medal of Honor. Before Captain Mason could submit the referral, however, he was seriously wounded in action himself and spent over a year convalescing in the hospital. Jim Cadigan's battalion commander was killed in action shortly thereafter.

With both of Lieutenant Cadigan's superiors out of action, and in the swirl of post-war homecomings, the Medal of Honor recommendation was not filed in a timely fashion under the statutory requirements then in effect. In fact, it was not until 1950 that Captain Mason inquired whether the commendation had been awarded.

When told that Jim Cadigan had not been recognized for his heroism, Mason and other comrades-in-arms began the arduous task of assembling eyewitness affidavits and other documentation from around the United States establishing his claim to the Medal of Honor.

This resolve resulted in Jim's being awarded the Silver Star in 1977, pending resolution of Captain Mason's Medal of Honor recommendation. The Silver Star is indeed a great honor, but not what those who know of Jim's deeds feel his heroism earned.

Why did Captain Mason devote himself to this task? Just listen to his account of that day in Zerf some 55 years ago. Again, I am quoting.

> Through these acts of bravery, two platoons were saved from being wiped out. His actions made it possible for us to get our wounded evacuated, reorganize and continue our attack. His inspiring leadership and amazing acts of courage revived the spirit and energy of all of the men and contributed most significantly to the capture of Zerf.
>
> These acts were most extraordinary, since Lieutenant Cadigan repeatedly exposed himself to deadly enemy fire, and again and again risked his life to save the rest of his comrades from what seemed to be certain death and defeat by the enemy. It would not normally be expected that any one man should carry a machine gun by himself through deadly enemy fire and single-handedly knock out two enemy machine guns.

Lieutenant Cadigan's quick reactions had changed his comrades' lives, but they carried far less weight within the Pentagon. Having awarded him the Silver Star, the Army washed its hands of his case. Why? Because the Medal of Honor paperwork had not been turned in on time. There was no chance for a review of the merits of his case because, as far as the Army was concerned, proper procedure had not been followed.

Imagine how many American lives would have been lost on that day in 1945 if Jim Cadigan had followed ''proper procedure.''

As word spread about the way the Army was treating Jim, veterans from across the country proceeded to rally to his cause. At his division's annual Labor Day reunion, the question is always the same: Has Jim received his Medal of Honor yet?

Many of you here this the chamber have heard from his supporters, his admirers. Some of you have joined with my predecessors and with me in introducing and cosponsoring specific legislation on his behalf. But the Army successfully argued against each of these bills, ostensibly because of the missed paperwork deadline.

As you know, Congress went to the lengths of amending Federal statutes governing cases like Jim's. Section 526 of the 1996 Defense Authorization Act explicitly provided for Pentagon review on the merits of potential Medal of Honor awards upon the personal petition of a Member of Congress.

Where I am from, Jim's story is well known. To say ''Jim Cadigan'' is the same as saying ''hero.'' It has also become legendary how the military has treated him.

When I was sworn in as his Congressman in 1997, Jim Cadigan became one of my top personal priorities. I studied how the Army had handled my predecessor, Congressman Gary Studds', Section 526 review, and found an inexcusably inaccurate interpretation of its obligations under the statute.

In calling for reexamination of the evidence, I wrote to then Secretary Togo West that the Pentagon was required to ''review the case afresh, not merely post-date an old rejection letter.'' It seemed to me that this was the time for proper procedure. Accordingly, I resubmitted a personal request for reconsideration of his case on its merits in accordance with Section 526 and backed it up with new legislation.

At the risk of raising Jim's blood pressure, let me recount what the review which followed by the Senior Army Deliberations Board was, what happened.

□ 1930

Well, the offices conducting this review never interviewed lieutenant Cadigan or any of the surviving eyewitnesses. They never requested a single document. They made a habit of ignoring inquiries from Members of Congress, and they took nearly 2 years, literally, to complete the review.

The result consisted in its entirety of a handwritten checkmark in a preprinted box which indicated that the petitioner did not meet the standard for the award of the medal of honor: as an expression of basic human compassion, I implored Army officials to speak directly to Mr. Cadigan or at least to review the results of this torturous process. Even a simple expression of common courtesy took on cosmic proportions within the Pentagon.

By the second year, when it became rather clear how this review of the merits would end, I requested in advance a copy of the complete record on which any final decision was based. The package I ultimately received fit in a very small envelope.

Notwithstanding the affidavits about the Battle of Zerf, it appeared that Army officials either did not read the materials or concluded that Jim and so many others were not to be believed.

Since a checkmark does not really answer these questions, I again sought a clarification of the rationale for the Pentagon's decision. I was told that the Army saw Jimmy's heroic acts as nothing more than what ''we expect a platoon leader in combat to take'' and that ''the evidence presented did not meet the standard for an award of the Medal of Honor.''

That sounded to me like a lot less like a rationale than like a rationalization.

It came as no surprise that I disagreed with the Army's decision, but I was most deeply disappointed that the decorations board record contained no analysis, no discussion, and no justification for the decision. It was, thus, impossible to determine how this decision was reached.

I understood from the beginning that this was an uphill battle. This is one brave soldier for whom adversity has never been an obstacle. While he expects no charity, however, he also abides no disrespect. Nor do the many comrades who have stood shoulder to shoulder with Jim Cadigan through the years, like Len Morris, an Army infantryman who landed on Omaha Beach and whose unit was fighting on February 26, 1945 in Luxembourg, only 10 miles from the Battle of Zerf. And John Donlon, another son of Quincy in the D-Day invasion who wrote me, and again I am quoting:

> Lieutenant Cadigan's gallant leadership for his men is an act of valor and the nobility of spirit and should be boldly and eloquently commemorated. We must glorify the values and ideals of a great Nation whose people came together in one of its finest hours and who offered up their lives to defeat the ruthless aggression of the forces of tyranny.

Mr. Speaker, over the past 55 years, international alliances have come and gone; the Cold War has boiled over and cooled down. Americans in uniform have served their country in many strange and far-away places. American society itself has been dramatically transformed and retransformed.

Throughout the tumult and turmoil of the last 55 years, certain universal values, however, have remained strong: commitment, courage, sacrifice, loyalty. But these are nothing more than lofty words chiseled in some granite memorial until they are brought to life by inspired acts like those of Lieutenant Jim Cadigan.

Jim Cadigan personified those values on that German battlefield 55 years ago; and he still does today, stirring the hearts of nearly all who hear his story.

None of this is lost on the members of Jimmy's family whose hearts ache every time they review this ordeal. Recently, his daughter, Mary, said to me, and again I am quoting, ''It is shameful that a great soldier and leader is ignored all those years.'' Well, I agree with Mary. So if the United States Army cannot see fit to adequately honor a true American hero like James Cadigan, then I will do so as a Member of Congress.

Jim, we recall all those you saved 55 years ago as well as those who never made it home; and we thank you for the sacrifices you and your generation made so that we can enjoy the freedom we take for granted today. Jim, we thank you for saving so many American lives on that battlefield in 1945, enabling those young men to return to

our soil and raise their own families, and for risking your life and your family's future for our sake.

Jim, thank you for proving that such qualities as commitment, courage, sacrifice, and loyalty still count for so much. And Jim, although the Army has denied you the Medal of Honor you deserve, in my eyes and in the eyes of those who really know what happens on the battlefield, you have already earned your Nation's highest honor and gratitude. You do not need a piece of medal pinned to your chest to prove that.

Jim Cadigan, in the name of the American people and the men whose lives you saved, I salute you as a true American hero.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. TANNER (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of attending a funeral of a personal friend in the district.

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of personal reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCNULTY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MCDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LIPINSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SMITH of Washington, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WU, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DOGGETT, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. STABENOW, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DOOLEY of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. CARSON, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WELDON of Florida) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, March 21 and 22.

Mr. GEKAS, for 5 minutes, March 16.

Mr. SOUDER, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. MILLER of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1000. An act to amend title 49 United States Code, to reauthorize programs of the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, March 16, 2000, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

6590. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Almonds Grown in California; Revisions to Requirements Regarding Credit for Promotion and Advertising Activities [Docket No. FV99–981–4 FIR] received February 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6591. A letter from the Administrator, RMA, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Common Crop Insurance Regulations; Potato Crop Insurance Certified Seed Endorsement—received January 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6592. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Onions Grown in South Texas; Change in Container Requirements [Docket No. FV00–959–2 IFR] received February 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6593. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the directive to study the need and appropriate criteria for two possible new decorations for individuals who are killed or injured in the line of duty while serving under competent authority with the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6594. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Prompt Corrective Action—received February 17, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

6595. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the 1996 activities report on environmental assessment, restoration, and cleanup activities required by section 120(e)(5) of the Comprehensive Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA); to the Committee on Commerce.

6596. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Over-The-Counter Human Drugs; Labeling Requirements; Final Rule; Technical Amendment [Docket Nos. 98N–0337, 96N–0420, 95N–0259, 90P–0201] (RIN: 0910–AA79) received January 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

6597. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Department's final rule—Findings of Significant Contribution and Rulemaking on Section 126 Petitions for Purposes of Reducing Interstate Ozone Transport [FRL–6522–9] received January 10, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

6598. A letter from the Deputy Chief, Competitive Pricing Division. Common Carrier Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Access Charge Reform [CC Docket No. 96–262, FCC 98–257] received January 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

6599. A letter from the Chief Counsel (Foreign Assets Control), Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Reporting and Procedures Regulations: Mandatory License Application Form for Unblocking Funds Transfers—received February 25, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

6600. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the new mileage reimbursement rate for Federal employees who use privately owned automobiles while on official travel; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6601. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the amended Commercial Activities Inventory; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6602. 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; Final Rule to List the Riparian Brush Rabbit and the Riparian, or San Joaquin Valley, Woodrat as Endangered (RIN: 1018–AE40) received February 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6603. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Water and Science, Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Information Requirements for Certain Farm Operations In Excess of 960 Acres and the Eligibility of Certain Formerly Excess Land (RIN: 1006–AA38) received February 17, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6604. A letter from the Acting Director, Fish and Wildlife Services, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Status for Erigeron decumbens var. decumbens (Wilamette daisy) and Fender's blue butterfly (Icarcia icarioides fenderi) and Threatened Status for Lupinus sulphureus ssp. kincaidii (Kincaid's lupine) (RIN: 1018–AE53) received January 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6605. A letter from the Director, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the report on the Apportionment of Regional Fishery Management Council (RFMC) Membership in 1999; to the Committee on Resources.

6606. A letter from the Chairman, Commission On The Advancement Of Federal Law Enforcement, transmitting the final report entitled, ''Law Enforcement In A New Century And A Changing World''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6607. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Aircraft Engines CF34 Series Turbofan Engines

[Docket No. 98–ANE–19–AD; Amendment 39–11422; AD 99–23–26] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6608. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737–200 Series Airplanes Modified in Accordance with Supplemental Type Certificate (STC) ST00969AT [Docket No. 96–NM–226–AD; Amendment 39–11562; AD 2000–3–05] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received February 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6609. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company CF6–80C2 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 98–ANE–79–AD; Amendment 39–11561; AD 2000–03–04] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received February 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6610. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model DHC–7 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99–NM–165–AD; Amendment 39–11470; AD 99–26–11] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6611. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A330–301, –321, –322 Series Airplanes, and Model A340–211, –212, –213, –311, –312, and –313 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99–NM–195–AD; Amendment 39–11471; AD 99–26–12] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6612. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Agusta S.p.A. Model AB412 Helicopters [Docket No. 99–SW–63–AD; Amendment 39–11474; AD 99–26–14] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6613. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300, A310, A300–600 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98–NM–303–AD; Amendment 39–11458; AD 99–25–15] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6614. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model MD–11 and MD–11F Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99–NM–71–AD; Amendment 39–11457; AD 99–25–14] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6615. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Model F27 Mark 050 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99–NM–317–AD; Amendment 39–11459; AD 99–25–16] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6616. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737 Model Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98–NM–383–AD; Amendment 39–11175; AD 99–11–05] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6617. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Various Transport Category Airplanes Equipped With Mode ''C'' Transponder(s) With Single Gillham Code Altitude Input [Docket No. 99–NM–328–AD; Amendment 39–11473; AD 99–23–22 R1] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6618. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; The New Piper Aircraft, Inc. Models PA–25 [Docket No. 99–CE–69–AD; Amendment 39–11464; AD 99–26–05] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6619. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the annual report on employment and training programs for veterans during program year 1998 (October 1, 1997 through September 1, 1998), pursuant to 38 U.S.C. 2009(b); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

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:

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 441. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2372) 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 (Rept. 106–525). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LEACH: Committee on Banking and Financial Services. H.R. 21. A bill to establish a Federal program to provide reinsurance for State disaster insurance programs; with an amendment (Rept. 106–526). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. WELLER (for himself, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mrs. BIGGERT):

H.R. 3926. A bill to amend the Illinois and Michigan Canal National Heritage Corridor Act of 1984 to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated to the Illinois and Michigan Canal National Heritage Corridor Commission; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. CARSON, Mr. WYNN, Mr. OWENS, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. UNDERWOOD, and Mr. CUMMINGS):

H.R. 3927. A bill to encourage greater community accountability of law enforcement agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BIGGERT (for herself, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. RIVERS, Mrs. EMERSON, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Mrs. KELLY):

H.R. 3928. A bill to amend title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to raise awareness of eating disorders and to create educational programs concerning the same, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 3929. A bill to prohibit the provision of financial assistance the Federal Government to any person who is more than 60 days delinquent in the payment of any child support obligation; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. CASTLE:

H.R. 3930. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on KN001 (a hydrochloride); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASTLE:

H.R. 3931. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Methyl thioglycolate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASTLE:

H.R. 3932. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on KL540; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASTLE:

H.R. 3933. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on DPC 083; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASTLE:

H.R. 3934. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on DPC 961; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASTLE:

H.R. 3935. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Pro-Jet Magenta 364 Stage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASTLE:

H.R. 3936. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Pro-Jet Black 263 Stage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASTLE:

H.R. 3937. A bill to supend temporarily the duty on Pigment Yellow 184; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASTLE:

H.R. 3938. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Pro-Jet Yellow 1 Stage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASTLE:

H.R. 3939. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Pigment Orange 73; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASTLE:

H.R. 3940. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Direct Black 19 Press Paste; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASTLE:

H.R. 3941. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Pro-Jet Black HSAQ Stage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASTLE:

H.R. 3942. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Pro-Jet Fast Black 286 Paste; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASTLE:

H.R. 3943. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Pro-Jet Yellow 1G Stage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASTLE:

H.R. 3944. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Pigment Red 255; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASTLE:

H.R. 3945. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Pro-Jet Cyan 1 Press Paste; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASTLE:

H.R. 3946. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Pro-Jet Black Alc Powder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASTLE:

H.R. 3947. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Solvent Yellow 163; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASTLE:

H.R. 3948. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Pro-Jet Fast Yellow 2 RO Feed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASTLE:

H.R. 3949. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Solvent Yellow 145; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASTLE:

H.R. 3950. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Pro-Jet Fast Magenta 2 RO Feed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASTLE:

H.R. 3951. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Pigment Red 264; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASTLE:

H.R. 3952. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Pro-Jet Fast Cyan 2 Stage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASTLE:

H.R. 3953. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Pro-Jet Cyan 485 Stage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASTLE:

H.R. 3954. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on triflusulfuron methyl formulated product; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASTLE:

H.R. 3955. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Pro-Jet Fast Cyan 3 Stage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASTLE:

H.R. 3956. A bill to reduce temporarily the duty on Pro-Jet Cyan 1 RO Feed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASTLE:

H.R. 3957. A bill to reduce temporarily the duty on Pro-Jet Fast Black 287 NA Paste/Liquid Feed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASTLE:

H.R. 3958. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Pigment Yellow 168; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 3959. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 4-(Cyclopropyl-α-hy-droxy-methylene)-3,5-dioxo-cyclohexanecarboxylic acid ethyl ester; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 3960. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 8-α-oxo-emamectin benzoate desmethylemamectin benzoate emamectin benzoate methanol adduct 2-epl-emamectin benzoate emamectin benzoate isomer, 4-epl-Δ-2,3-emamectin benzoate dihydroemamectin benzoate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 3961. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on propanoic acid, 2-[4-[(5-chloro-3-fluoro-2-pyridinyl)oxy]-phenoxy]-2-propyny ester; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 3962. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain end-use products containing benzenesulfonamide, 2-(2-chloroethoxy)N-[[4methoxy-6methyl-1,3,5-triazin-2-yl)amino]carbonyl]-and 3,6-dichloro-2-methoxybenzoic acid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 3963. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on benzeneacetic acid, (E,E)-α-(-(methoxyimino)-2[[[[1-[3-trifluoromethyl) phenyl] ethylidene]amino]oxy]methyl]-, methyl ester; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 3964. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 3-[4,6–Bis(difluoromethoxy)-pyrimidin-2-yl]-1-(2-methoxycarbonyl-phenylsulfonyl) urea; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 3965. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 5-dipropylamino-α, α α-trifluoro-4,6-dinitro-o-toluidine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 3966. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on sulfur; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 3967. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on end use products containing 3-(6-methoxy-4-methyl-1,3,5-triazin-2-yl)-1-[2-(2-chloro-eth xy)-phenylsulfonyl]-urea; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 3968. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 4-cyclopropyl-6-methyl-N-phenyl-2-pyrimidinamine-4-(2,2-difloro-1,3-benzodioxol-4-yl)-1H pyrrole-3-carbonitrile; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 3969. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on pigment blue 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 3970. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on (R)-2-[2,6-dimethylphenyl)-methoxyacetyl-amino]-propionic acid methyl ester propanoic acid, 2-[4-[(5-chloro-3-fluoro-2-pyridinyl)oxy]-phenoxy]-2-propynl ester; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 3971. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain end-use products containing benzothialdiazole-7-carbothioic acid S-methyl ester; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 3972. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on benzothialdiazole-7-carbothioic acid S-methyl ester; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 3973. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on O-(4–Bromo-2-chlorophenyl)-O-ethyl-S-propyl phosphorothioate; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 3974. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 1-[[2-(2,4-dichlorophenyl)-4-propyl-1,3-dioxolan-2-yl] methyl]-1H–1,2,4-triazole; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 3975. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on tetrahydro-3-methyl-N-nitro-5[[2-phenylthio)-5-thiazolyl]-4-H-1,3,5-oxadiazin-4-imine; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 3976. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 1-(4-methoxy-6-methyl-triazin-2-yl)-3-[2-(3,3,3-trifluoroproyl)-phenylsulfonyl]-urea; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 3977. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 1,2,4–Triazin-3(2H) one,4,5-dihydro-6-methyl-4-[(3-pyridinyl methylene)amino@; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 3978. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 4-(2,2-difluoro-1,3-benzodioxol-4-yl)-1H-pyrrole-3-carbonitrile; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COBLE:

H.R. 3979. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on 3-(6-methoxy-4-methyl-1,3,5-triazin-2-yl)-1-[2-(2-chloro-eth xy)-phenylsulfonyl]-urea-3,6-dichloro-2-methoxybenzoic acid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COBURN (for himself, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. PITTS, Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. DELAY, Mr. TERRY, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. TALENT, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. TIAHRT):

H.R. 3980. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act with respect to disclosures regarding transfers of human fetal tissue; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. CARSON, Mr. WYNN, Mr. OWENS, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. NADLER):

H.R. 3981. A bill to encourage greater community accountability of law enforcement agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COX:

H.R. 3982. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the 30-percent tax increase on highway gasoline, diesel fuel, and kerosene imposed by the 1993 tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DREIER (for himself, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. ARMEY, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. DUNN, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. LINDER, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. KOLBE, Ms. PELOSI, and Mrs. MORELLA):

H.R. 3983. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to promote a fairer and more efficient means for using highly skilled workers, to improve the collection and use of H–1B nonimmigrant fees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and Science, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey:

H.R. 3984. A bill to establish a National Clearinghouse for Character Education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Florida:

H.R. 3985. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 14900 Southwest 30th Street in Miramar City, Florida, as the ''Vicki Coceano Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. HASTINGS of Washington:

H.R. 3986. A bill to provide for a study of the engineering feasibility of a water exchange in lieu of electrification of the Chandler Pumping Plant at Prosser Diversion Dam, Washington; to the Committee on Resources.

By Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

H.R. 3987. A bill to prevent children's access to firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAHOOD:

H.R. 3988. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Carbamic Acid (V–9069); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAHOOD:

H.R. 3989. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on nicosulfuron formulated product (''Accent''); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAHOOD:

H.R. 3990. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on Rimsulfuron; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAHOOD:

H.R. 3991. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on DPX-E9260; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAHOOD:

H.R. 3992. A bill to extend the temporary suspension of duty on DPX-E6758; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York:

H.R. 3993. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act, title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, and title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require that group and individual health insurance coverage, group health plans, and MedicareChoice organizations provide prompt payment of claims; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. NAPOLITANO (for herself, Mr. DREIER, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD):

H.R. 3994. A bill to amend the Reclamation Projects Authorization and Adjustment Act of 1992 to increase the Federal share of the costs of the San Gabriel Basin demonstration project; to the Committee on Resources.

By Ms. NORTON (for herself and Mr. DAVIS of Virginia):

H.R. 3995. A bill to establish procedures governing the responsibilities of court-appointed receivers who administer departments, offices, and agencies of the District of Columbia government; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. TALENT (for himself and Mr. THUNE):

H.R. 3996. A bill to provide for grants to assist value-added agricultural businesses; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. WILSON (for herself, Mr. KASICH, and Mr. OXLEY):

H.R. 3997. A bill to improve systems for the delivery of dividends, interest, and other valuable property rights to lost security holders; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself, Mr. KLINK, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. HORN, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. LEE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. EVANS):

H. Con. Res. 283. Concurrent resolution recognizing and honoring the members of the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association (AHEPA) who are being awarded the AHEPA Medal for Military Service for service in the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BACHUS (for himself, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. BUYER, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. DEAL of Georgia):

H. Con. Res. 284. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that members of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries should immediately increase crude oil production in order to increase crude oil supplies and achieve stable crude oil prices; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SAXTON (for himself, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. SNYDER, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. TALENT, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. TIAHRT, and Mr. EWING):

H. Con. Res. 285. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding Internet security and ''cyberterrorism''; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TRAFICANT (for himself and Mr. NEY):

H. Res. 442. A resolution calling upon the President to take certain actions regarding imports of steel products from certain countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 7: Mr. HERGER and Mr. EHRLICH.

H.R. 175: Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. COBLE, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. BACA.

H.R. 218: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mr. WISE.

H.R. 352: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 405: Ms. DANNER.

H.R. 531: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. NEY.

H.R. 721: Mr. BISHOP.

H.R. 742: Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 816: Mr. WALDEN of Oregon.

H.R. 957: Mrs. MORELLA.

H.R. 1055: Mr. RILEY and Mr. LEACH.

H.R. 1070: Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. GOODE, and Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 1071: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 1178: Mr. SALMON.

H.R. 1187: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.

H.R. 1244: Mr. RYUN of Kansas.

H.R. 1272: Mr. VITTER.

H.R. 1304: Mr. HLLIARD, Mr. EVANS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 1310: Mr. NORWOOD, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. BACHUS, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. NEY, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. FOSSELLA, and Mr. PORTMAN.

H.R. 1311: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin and Mrs. FOWLER.

H.R. 1388: Mr. HUTCHINSON.

H.R. 1454: Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 1503: Mr. MCINTOSH.

H.R. 1510: Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 1577: Mr. MASCARA.

H.R. 1622: Ms. NORTON and Mr. CLYBURN.

H.R. 1640: Mr. FORD, Mr. LARSON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. STRICKLAND.

H.R. 1739: Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 1746: Ms. PRYCE of Ohio and Mr. BASS.

H.R. 1747: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H.R. 1760: Mr. BAKER and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1775: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 2121: Mr. OWENS and Mr. WU.

H.R. 2128: Mr. BARR of Georgia.

H.R. 2200: Mr. WATT of North Carolina.

H.R. 2298: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 2321: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 2328: Mr. MCHUGH and Mr. SABO.

H.R. 2420: Mr. STUMP, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. COBURN, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 2470: Mr. HUTCHINSON.

H.R. 2586: Mr. KLINK.

H.R. 2697: Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. QUINN, and Mr. SCARBOROUGH.

H.R. 2825: Mr. DOOLITTLE.

H.R. 2883: Mr. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 2894: Mr. BRYANT.

H.R. 2900: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. OWENS, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. CAMPBELL.

H.R. 2901: Mr. MCNULTY.

H.R. 2934: Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. RUSH, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. UNDERWOOD.

H.R. 3039: Ms. NORTON, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. GEKAS, and Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 3058: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 3180: Mr. OXLEY.

H.R. 3193: Mr. BERRY, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. LUTHER, and Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 3248: Mr. LARGENT, and Mr. WELDON of Florida.

H.R. 3301: Ms. BROWN of Florida and Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska.

H.R. 3408: Mrs. MYRICK and Mr. HYDE.

H.R. 3418: Mr. PHELPS.

H.R. 3420: Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska.

H.R. 3463: Mr. KNOLLENBERG and Mr. WEINER.

H.R. 3543: Mr. HILL of Indiana, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. PHELPS.

H.R. 3545: Mr. STUPAK, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.

H.R. 3554: Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. OXLEY, Mrs. MORELLA, and Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma.

H.R. 3571: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 3573: Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 3608: Mr. PHELPS, Mrs. KELLY, and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 3634: Mr. OLVER and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 3639: Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. STENHOLM, and Mr. BARCIA.

H.R. 3662: Ms. CARSON, Mr. KIND, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 3686: Mr. NADLER and Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 3691: Mr. SCHAFFER.

H.R. 3694: Ms. STABENOW.

H.R. 3710: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. DIXON, Mr. OLVER, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. BALDACCI, and Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 3807: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

H.R. 3809: Mrs. KELLY, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. CANADY of Florida, and Mr. DEUTSCH.

H.R. 3822: Mr. SALMON, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, and Mr. THUNE.

H.R. 3849: Mr. SUNUNU.

H.R. 3850: Mr. OXLEY and Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.

H.R. 3891: Mrs. THURMAN.

H. Con. Res. 228: Mr. KLINK.

H. Con. Res. 260: Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. STEARNS.

H. Con. Res. 261: Ms. MCKINNEY and Mr. OWENS.

H. Con. Res. 269: Ms. CARSON, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mr. FROST.

H. Con. Res. 273: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. ENGLISH, and Mr. ROTHMAN.

H. Res. 208: Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. KLINK.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

H. Res. 396: Mr. DOOLEY of California.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2372

OFFERED BY: MR. BOEHLERT

(Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute)

AMENDMENT NO. 1: Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Private Property Rights Implementation Act of 2000''.

SEC. 2. UNITED STATES AS DEFENDANT.

Section 1346 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(h)(1) Any claim brought under subsection (a) that is founded upon a property right or privilege secured by the Constitution, but was allegedly infringed or taken by the United States, shall be ripe for adjudication upon a final decision rendered by the United States, that causes actual and concrete injury to the party seeking redress.

''(2) For purposes of this subsection, a final decision exists if—

''(A) the United States makes a definitive decision regarding the extent of permissible uses on the property that has been allegedly infringed or taken; and

''(B) one meaningful application, as defined by the relevant department or agency, to use the property has been submitted but denied, and the party seeking redress has applied for but is denied one appeal or waiver, where the applicable law of the United States provides a mechanism for appeal to or waiver by an administrative agency.

The party seeking redress shall not be required to apply for an appeal or waiver described in subparagraph (B) if no such appeal or waiver is available or if such an appeal or waiver would be futile.''.

SEC. 3. JURISDICTION OF COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS.

Section 1491(a) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3) Any claim brought under this subsection founded upon a property right or privilege secured by the Constitution, but allegedly infringed or taken by the United States, shall be ripe for adjudication upon a final decision rendered by the United States, that causes actual and concrete injury to the party seeking redress. For purposes of this paragraph, a final decision exists if—

''(A) the United States makes a definitive decision regarding the extent of permissible uses on the property that has been allegedly infringed or taken; and

''(B) one meaningful application, as defined by the relevant department or agency, to use the property has been submitted but denied, and the party seeking redress has applied for but is denied one appeal or waiver, where the applicable law of the United States provides a mechanism for appeal or waiver.

The party seeking redress shall not be required to apply for an appeal or waiver described in subparagraph (B) if no such appeal or waiver is available or if such an appeal or waiver would be futile.''.

SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this Act shall apply to actions commenced on or after the 120th day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

H.R. 3843

OFFERED BY: MR. TRAFICANT

AMENDMENT NO. 1: At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 4. LOAN APPLICATION PROCESSING.

(a) STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall conduct a study to determine the average time that the Administration requires to process an application for each type of loan or loan guarantee made under the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 631 et seq.).

(2) TRANSMITTAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Administrator shall transmit to Congress the results of the study conducted under paragraph (1).

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

QUALITY TEACHER RECRUITMENT ACT OF 2000

HON. LINDSEY O. GRAHAM

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 2000

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, last week Representative GEORGE MILLER, Representative DALE KILDEE and I introduced the Quality Teacher Recruitment Act of 2000. This bipartisan bill will help recruit high-quality teachers for the low income school districts that need them most.

The Quality Teacher Recruitment Act of 2000 will allow new teachers to have their federal education loans forgiven up to $17,750 after teaching in an eligible school for five consecutive years. This bill is a win for everyone: school districts will have an easier time recruiting high-quality teachers and new teachers will have their commitment to high-need schools rewarded by allowing them to significantly reduce their student loan debt. Most importantly, students will benefit from having highly qualified teachers in their classrooms.

In 1998, Congress passed and the President signed into law the Higher Education Amendments. This bill provided up to $5,000 in student loan forgiveness for teachers that taught for five years in a Title I school with 30 percent or higher poverty. In addition, this provision required that eligible secondary teachers have a relevant major to the area in which they were teaching and that eligible elementary school teachers were certified in reading, writing, math and other areas of curriculum as determined by the local school officials.

The $5,000 in loan forgiveness now offered is helpful, however, education majors graduate with an average of $17,750 in federal student loans. The Quality Teacher Recruitment Act of 2000 will improve on the existing loan forgiveness in the Higher Education Amendments by allowing qualifying teachers to have their loans forgiven up to this higher amount.

The Quality Teacher Recruitment Act of 2000 will benefit teachers, students, and school districts across the country. Whether it is a low income school in rural America, or a high poverty urban district, schools who have had historically difficult times recruiting teachers will profit from the Quality Teacher Recruitment Act of 2000.

TRIBUTE TO JUDGE NICHOLAS H. POLITAN

HON. BILL PASCRELL, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 2000

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to your attention the deeds of an important member of my district, Nicholas Politan of West Orange, New Jersey. Nicholas is being honored tonight with the 58th Annual Humanitarian Award from the Columbian Foundation, because of his years of service to the community. It is only fitting that he is honored, for he epitomizes caring and generosity of spirit.

Judge Politan, a life-long resident of Essex County, is a graduate of Arts High School and Rutgers University, Newark, New Jersey. He furthered his education at Rutgers Law School, where he served as Managing Editor of its Law Review.

Nicholas has always been a community leader. In 1960, he served as a Law Clerk to the Honorable Gerald McLaughlin, a Judge on the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit. Following this trend in civic awareness Nicholas decided to open a law practice with his friend and partner James Cecchi in 1961. The time spent working in his practice instilled in him the attributes necessary for him to become the stellar force in the community he has now become. It was the small steps in the beginning of his career that taught him the fundamentals that would make him a role model to the people that he now serves.

Known for a questioning mind and an ability to get things done, Nicholas Politan worked in Lyndhurst, and practiced in many areas of the law. Along with his partner, he has served as both Director and Principal of the County Trust Company from 1980 through 1987. Politan's rise to higher office came with a personal call from President Ronald Reagan, who nominated him to the United States District Court.

On December 14, 1987 Judge Politan was sworn as United States District Court Judge. He has since presided over many significant and controversial cases. He has always served the people well, and remained fair and impartial. Described as affable and disarming by his colleagues, Judge Politan has proven that he has the intellectual integrity and fortitude to make difficult decisions.

Receiving the Columbian Foundation's Annual Humanitarian Award is a prestigious honor. The organization was founded in 1941 by business and professional men of Italian descent from Newark and the surrounding communities. The group's Annual Awards Dinner honors individual achievements. The Humanitarian Award is bestowed upon a man or woman that displays outstanding accomplishments, while supporting the works of the Foundation. These works include college scholarships for needy students, contributions to children's welfare and charitable organizations, donations to Columbus Hospital, the establishment of the Italian Institute of Seton Hall University and the support of similar programs at other colleges, universities and hospitals.

Nicholas, a native of Newark, was born on the city's West Side. A current resident of West Orange, he lives with his wife for forty years, Marian. The couple has two sons, Nick and Vincent and five grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me, our colleagues, Nicholas' family and friends, the members of the Columbian Foundation, and the State of New Jersey in recognizing Nicholas H. Politan as a Columbian Foundation 1999 Honoree.

TRIBUTE TO LOIS KOENIG

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 2000

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Lois Koenig, a dedicated citizen and employee of San Mateo County, CA, who is retiring after more than 20 years of service to her community as Manager in the Human Services Agency.

Lois Koenig's distinguished career in public service is exceptional. During her tenure at the Human Services Agency, Lois designed many special projects including Intake Process, GAIN, and the GIS automation system. As Assistant to the Director, Lois was instrumental in bringing together the implementation of SUCCESS, San Mateo County's version of the California welfare reform program, CalWORK's. She also played a key role in developing the Human Services Strategic Plan which identified three outcomes which were used to measure the success of SUCCESS.

Lois Koenig has also served as a leader and mentor to other volunteers and has inspired many in her community to volunteer. Her leadership and exemplary work in volunteer services earned her outstanding and deserving recognition from the San Mateo County Board of Supervisors. In 1998, she was chosen for the Outstanding Community Service by Women Award in Management and also voted Volunteer of the Year by the Mid-Peninsula YMCA.

Lois Koenig's contributions and accomplishments include working with ten major nonprofit organizations in the County of San Mateo, Assisting them in raising funds, training their staff in budgeting and financial strategy skills, and helping to raise more than a quarter of a million dollars a year for the citizens of San Mateo County. Lois cochaired the Crystal Springs Trail Day Fundraising Events in 1997 and 1998 and raised funds for the upkeep of trails and the expansion of Sawyer Camp Trail in San Mateo County. She was also a member of the 1994 Tenth Annual San Mateo County Women's Hall of Fame Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today in paying tribute to an exceptional person who has given much for the betterment of her community and our country.

INTRODUCTION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA RECEIVERSHIP ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2000

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 2000

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the District of Columbia Receivership Accountability Act of 2000. This legislation became necessary because of information

I have gathered that indicates that receiverships in the District of Columbia have been run largely unfettered by systematic supervision; guidelines for performance; monitoring to assure that promised actions are taken, and improvements achieved; cost and efficiency accountability; and other measures to assure that the agency is returned to the District promptly and in good condition.

The only District of Columbia agency to go promptly through receivership and emerge in good condition has been the D.C. Housing Authority. Its receiver, David Gilmore, demonstrated rare management and human relations talent. A Superior Court decision appointing a receiver for special education services for the District's juvenile detention center has been overturned by the D.C. Court of Appeals. Information concerning the other agencies in receivership have raised such serious questions that D.C. Subcommittee Chairman TOM DAVIS and I have requested GAO reports on all of the outstanding receiverships: Child and Family Services, the Commission on Mental Health Services, and the Corrections Medical Receiver for the D.C. Jail. However, information that we now have has led Chairman DAVIS and I to conclude that immediate legislation to assure adequate supervision of the agencies involved cannot await the completion of the GAO reports on these three agencies. Additional legislation may be necessary after completion of the GAO reports, but the bill we propose today is clearly necessary now to assure the safety and well-being of D.C. residents and cost effective reform of the receivership agencies.

Most of the outstanding receiverships appear to have similar problems, but the Child and Family Services receivership, appointed in 1995 by the U.S. District Court, caused special concern by D.C. officials and congressional members after the death of the infant, Brianna Blackmond. Brianna who was returned to her mother, after a judgment found that she neglected Brianna and her seven siblings, with apparent signoff from the court, lawyers, the child's advocate, and the social workers involved. Since the baby's death, no fair assessment of what went wrong, or fact-finding hearing by a court, and no effective remedial action to correct the problem, or assurance that more deaths of children might not occur, has been forthcoming. Instead, there have been reports of chaos and further deterioration in the agency. Chairman DAVIS has set a hearing on the Child and Family Services Agency receivership for April 14, 2000.

The Commission on Mental Health, charged with providing community-based and institutional mental health care to indigent residents of the District, was placed in receivership in 1997. The receiver has resigned and not only have the services not improved, but the plaintiffs agreed in a negotiated settlement to terminate the receivership because the agency appears to be in worse condition than when it was placed in receivership. Consequently, the court and all of the parties have agreed to a transition plan, and an interim receiver has been appointed by the court to return control of the agency to the city by April 1, 2001.

Medical services in the D.C. Jail were placed in receivership by the U.S. District Court in 1995 for a period of five years. Recently, the receiver let a contract at a cost three times the national average without comparing program and cost estimates regionally or nationally, and over the objections of the Corrections Trustee appointed pursuant to the 1997 Revitalization Act. The contract was given to an entity consisting of employees of the present receiver who have never had a contract before and whose only contract and only revenue would come from this D.C.-financed contract. In response to concerns I expressed, the court-appointed monitor detailed services provided without indicating if other jurisdictions provide similar services and asserted that medical conditions in the District were worse than other jurisdictions. However, she made no mention of the nearest comparable jurisdiction, the Baltimore Jail medical services, which also are operated by a private contractor pursuant to District Court supervision. The court monitor cited diseases at the D.C. Jail, which undoubtedly are found in big city jail populations throughout the country, and did not indicate why the District should have the same elevated costs and staffing levels now with presumably revitalized systems as it had under emergency conditions in the first years of receivership. The court monitor did not indicate why comparative costs assessments were never undertaken or what standards should guide a cost effective system and what completion of the receivership and return of control to the District should entail. No comprehensive outside professional audit was undertaken before the receiver approved large, ongoing costs for jail medical services.

Thus, three out of four of the existing receiverships present such substantial problems that Chairman TOM DAVIS and I have agreed that action to ensure higher standards and cost accountability cannot wait. The District of Columbia Receivership Accountability Act places affirmative duties on all receivers who are appointed by either Federal or D.C. courts to administer any department, agency, or office of the government of the District of the District of Columbia. These duties are:

First, best practices: The bill places an affirmative duty on each receiver to conduct all operations consistent with the best practices and financial stability and management efficiency of the District of Columbia.

Second, annual audit by the District's Inspector General: Each receiver must submit to an annual financial and program audit conducted by the Inspector General of the District of Columbia.

Third, controlling costs: Each receiver must ensure that costs are consistent with applicable regional and national standards (including personnel costs), except that this requirement may be waived during any initial two-year emergency period of the receivership.

Fourth, consultation with city officials on the budget: In preparing the annual budget for the entity in receivership, the receiver must consult with the Mayor and Chief Financial Officer of the District of Columbia. After this consultation, the receiver must prepare and submit her budget to the Mayor for inclusion in the city's annual budget. The Council may comment and make recommendations on the receiver's budget estimates.

Fifth, procurement practices: When entering into contracts, each receiver must fully comply with the procurement procedures of the District of Columbia and work through the District's procurement officials.

The bill applies to all receivers appointed beginning with 1995. Existing receivers must comply with the requirements of this bill beginning with fiscal year 2001. I urge my colleagues to support this important measure.

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF NEGRO WOMEN, INC., 17TH ANNUAL FOUNDER'S DAY LUNCHEON—''LEAVE NO ONE BEHIND: MOVING STRATEGICALLY INTO THE MILLENNIUM''

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 2000

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, March 18, 2000, the National Council of Negro Women, Inc. (NCNW), North Shore Area Section (NSAS) is sponsoring its 17th Annual Founder's Celebration Luncheon at Fort Monmouth, NJ.

On that occasion, the annual Mahala Field Atchison Awared will be presented to Dorothy McNish, an NSAS member. Since 1989, this award has been presented annually to a member of the North Shore Area Section, in memory of Mrs. Atchinson, an exemplary educator and humanitarian. Her lifelong devotion to enriching the lives of children and making our community a better place has been recognized in many ways. In 1973, the Primary School on Sycamore Avenue in Tinton Falls, NJ, was renamed Mahala F. Atchinson School. It is indeed a significant honor for Ms. McNish to receive this award, and I am proud to pay tribute to her on this occasion.

The keynote speaker at Saturday's event will be Major General Robert Nabors, the Commander of the U.S. Army's CECOM (Communications Electronics Command) at Fort Monmouth. Major General Nabors has been the Commander at CECOM since September 1, 1998. He has served our country in numerous posts, both internationally in Vietnam, Korea, Germany, and Italy, and domestically, most recently at the command of the 5th Signal Command, prior to assuming the command at CECOM. During his distinguished career, he has won numerous awards and decorations. Major General Nabors and his wife Valerie have three adult children.

The National Council of Negro Women, Inc., North Shore Area Section, is a non-profit community-based organization striving to ensure the educational, social, economic and cultural enrichment of African American women, their families and their communities. The NCNW, which was founded in 1935 by the noted educator and human rights activist Mary McLeod Bethune, fulfills its mission through research, advocacy, national and community based services and programs in the U.S. and in African countries. Born of NCNW, NSAS has been a part of the Monmouth County community for 18 years.

I would like to pay tribute to all of those who have worked so hard to make Saturday's event a success, particularly NSAS current president Laura Lewis and luncheon chairperson Girdie B. Washington.

TRIBUTE TO BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA TROOP 3

HON. BILL PASCRELL, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 2000

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to your attention the deeds of an important group from my district, Boy Scouts of America Troop 3 of Clifton, New Jersey. Troop 3 is celebrating both its 75th anniversary and its years of community service on this date. It is only fitting that we gather here for this honor, for this group epitomizes caring and generosity of spirit.

This Troop was formed not long after the founding of Boy Scouts of America. The national organization was Incorporated on February 8, 1910, and chartered by Congress on June 15, 1916. Troop 3 was organized in1923, and received its Charter from the Boy Scouts of America in January 1924 for the purpose of ''Character Building, Americanization and Citizenship Training.''

Since its inception, Troop 3 has always been involved in serving the community. The first Scoutmaster of this community organization was William Topp. The time spent under Scoutmaster Topp's leadership instilled in the Troop the attributes necessary for it to become the stellar force in the community it has now become. It was the small steps in the beginning of its development that gave it the fundamentals that would make its members role models to the people that they now serve.

Known for a questioning mind and an ability to get things done, William Topp, the Troop's first Scoutmaster, also organized its first committee. The members of this initial Committee were Adrion Wentink, Frank G. McIntosh and A.W. Moore. These visionary leaders fostered and aided the group during its nascent years, and helped it to become what it is today. Boy Scout Troop 3 is forever indebted to these men.

The early days of Troop 3 saw the Scouts participating in much of the same activities as today. These include basic Scouting activities such as hiking and camping. This Troop has shaped the lives of many generations of Americans, and this is a valuable and noble contribution to society.

This active and involved group from Clifton has many records of its 75-year history. The Troop's archives contain a picture dated July 25, 1926, which shows the Scouts preparing for a weekend trip. The Scouts were the guests of Clifton's then Mayor Thornburn. In addition, minutes of early meetings show that not much has changed in the order of Scout business. Then, as now, the meeting began with the recitation of the Scout Oath and Laws, followed by games and skill building.

Boy Scouts of America Troop 3 continually touches the lives of the people of Clifton. The troop is known throughout the community for its tradition of service. Whether the Scouts are aiding seniors or their fellow students, they have made an important and lasting impact on the citizens of Clifton over the last 75 years.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join me, our colleagues, Boy Scouts of America, the residents of Clifton, and the family and friends of past and present members of this organization in recognizing the outstanding and invaluable service to the community of Boy Scouts of America Scout Troop 3.

TRIBUTE TO PAUL KOENIG

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 2000

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Paul Koenig, an outstanding employee of San Mateo County, CA, who is retiring after 22 years of exceptional service to his community, his county and his country. He has served as Director of Environmental Services, Planning Director, Chief Building Official and Executive Director of the San Mateo Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCo).

Paul Koenig's long and devoted career in public service began in September, 1965, when he joined Broward County, FL, as a Planner in the Research Division. In September 1966, he moved to California to work for the San Diego County Planning Department, where he became the Chief of Planning in 1976. In April 1978, Mr. Koenig relocated to the Bay Area and was hired by San Mateo County as Planning Director. He was soon appointed to other demanding leadership positions, all of which he carried out with equal diligence, commitment and expertise.

Paul Koenig's accomplishments in San Mateo County are numerous. His most outstanding accomplishments include the adoption of the first county Local Coastal Program (LCP) that was adopted and certified pursuant to the California Coastal Act of 1976; The Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) for San Bruno Mountain, which was the first of its kind in the country to succeed in balancing the interests of private property owners with the need to preserve habitat for endangered species; the Coastside farm labor housing project in Half Moon Bay; the Devil's Slide tunnel project; the establishment of Edgewood County Park and Sawyer Camp Trail; and the establishment of a Joint Powers Authority to operate the County library system.

Paul Koenig's distinguished and successful career can be attributed to his professional skills, his work ethic and his personal characteristics. His flexibility and negotiating skills, along with his helpful nature and sense of humor earned him the respect of all those who worked with him. In addition, Mr. Koenig never neglected the day-to-day problems while keeping his focus on achieving larger goals.

We are all very grateful to Paul for his long commitment to public service. His vision, knowledge and commitment have helped immeasurably to improve the quality of life for our community.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today in paying tribute to a wonderful and distinguished man, my friend, and wish him all the best in his retirement.

THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ANN M. KILEY CENTER

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 2000

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, on the north end of my district lies a haven of hope called the Ann M. Kiley Center, where people with development disabilities can turn for training, guidance and a place to call home.

On April 4, 2000, the center will celebrate its 25th anniversary. Built in 1975 on 37 acres in Waukegan, IL, the facility consists of 48 single-story, four-bedroom homes. Residents range in age from 20 to 85, with an average age of 39.

Most individuals living at the Kiley Center function below the moderate level of retardation. The primary purpose of Kiley Center is to provide residential services, training and health services. Services focus on addressing basic needs, which enable an individual to function more independently in activities of daily living and in more advanced behaviors and skills needed to succeed in social, work, and leisure pursuits.

The mission of Kiley Center is to enable individuals to develop and achieve their personal goals. Is ultimate goal, whenever feasible, is to prepare for and return individuals to live in the community.

Mr. Speaker, how fortunate my district is to have a place where people with developmental disabilities can live in dignity as they strive to develop to their fullest potential. I congratulate the Ann M. Kiley Center for all the victories it has achieved in the past quarter century and invite my colleagues to join me as I wish this institution great success in providing many more years of quality service to the community.

TRAFFICKING BABIES' BODIES AND ORGANS

HON. BOB SCHAFFER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 2000

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, the selling of aborted baby body parts for monetary consideration of any kind is evil. Unfortunately, this kind of commerce is one to which the Federal Government is enabler, facilitator, and partner. Although the current law hints against profiteering in the horrific destruction and dissection of babies for their tissue and organs, the weakly worded prohibition allows unscrupulous merchants to proceed without pause.

Equally egregious and unconscionable is the Federal Government's involvement in the exploitation of mothers and destruction of babies in the name of research. Bill Clinton, AL GORE, and their researchers at the NIH are major buyers and users in this fundamentally immoral trade in aborted baby body parts.

President George Bush banned Federal involvement in such merchandising in 1988. Currently, 10 States outlaw embryo harvesting. Clinton can attempt to mitigate the moral, ethical, and constitutional damage he and his administration have wrought upon the fiber and foundation of our great country by reinstating the Federal ban, eliminating Federal support for experimentation with aborted baby body parts, and closing the for-profit loophole.

Mr. Speaker, I hereby submit for the RECORD the following letter I posted to Bill Clinton urging him to respect the fundamental right of all human beings, namely, the Right to Life, and completely stop the destruction of any human being for ''research.''

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 6, 2000.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON,
President of the United States, The White House, Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC.

DEAR PRESIDENT CLINTON: In the waning days of your last term in office, you can still correct your unfortunate decision to allow the grossly immoral business of selling baby body parts for so-called ''fetal tissue'' research. Congress will soon hold hearings, and I ask you to join me in this effort to end the ongoing destruction of babies for the purpose of harvesting their tissue and organs.

As you know, President George Bush demonstrated great moral courage by banning federal funding of ''fetal tissue'' research. Unfortunately, in 1993 you signed the National Institutes of Health (NIH) Revitalization Act (P.L. 103–43) into law, effectively lifting the previous ban and allowing the egregious and inhumane trafficking of baby body parts in the name of ''research.''

Distressingly, a number of private companies have sought to meet the demand of public and private research facilities for baby body parts. As outrageous as that practice is, many companies have exploited the vague language within the NIH Revitalization Act to sell these gruesome remnants of abhorrent abortive procedures for profit.

Although the NIH Revitalization Act made it a federal felony for any person to knowingly purchase or sell baby body parts for ''valuable consideration,'' it did not define the term to include ''reasonable payments associated with the transportation, implantation, processing, preservation, quality control, or storage'' of baby body parts. (P.L. 103–43, Sec. 112) Clearly, such loose language has given private merchants the incentive and means to evade federal law and felony charges while prospering through the harvesting and selling of tissue and organs from aborted babies.

Modern America has apparently not learned the lessons of World War II. Then, the possessions of massacred Jewish people, including the gold fillings in their teeth, were sold, often for profit, by unscrupulous and evil perpetrators. Barbaric experiments were performed on innocent, living human beings by their Nazi captors.

As a Representative to the United States Congress for Colorado's Fourth Congressional District, I am doing everything I can to end this malignant practice, whether it is for profit or for any ''reasonable payments.'' That is why I have repeatedly spoken against this horrendous commerce and called on Congress to hold hearings to investigate the full scope of the situation.

The question remains, are you willing to end this unconscionable research and commerce by closing the loophole and stopping all activity involving the use of baby body parts or tissue for research? To kill the innocent and defenseless in the name of science contradicts and corrupts the very essence and foundation of our great country.

Please join me in calling for a complete ban on the destruction of any baby's body for research.

Very truly yours,

BOB SCHAFFER,
Member of Congress.

SECRETARY ALBRIGHT'S ADDRESS ON U.S. RELATIONS WITH SOUTH ASIA IN PREPARATION FOR THE PRESIDENT'S VISIT

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 2000

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, at a meeting of the Asia Society yesterday, our outstanding Secretary of State, Madeleine K. Albright, delivered a thoughtful speech in anticipation of the Presidential visit to India and Bangladesh, with a brief stop in Pakistan. This visit is the first to India by an American president in 22 years and it is the longest presidential visit ever. This will also be the first visit by a U.S. President to Bangladesh.

Secretary Albright's speech was a brilliant background analysis of United States relations and strategic interests in South Asia. With regard to India, she emphasized the good relations our nation has with India, and she said that our relations can and should be strengthened. At the same time, however, Secretary Albright stressed that nuclear proliferation is a critical issue for the United States, and in order for our relationship to achieve its rich possibilities India must take steps to curb the proliferation of nuclear weapons and missile delivery systems.

With regard to the brief visit to Pakistan, Secretary Albright emphasized: ''I want to leave no room for doubt. In no way is this decision [to stop in Pakistan] to embrace the military coup or government led by General Musharraf. And no one should interpret it as such.'' She said that the United States has important interests with Pakistan, particularly in controlling the spread of nuclear and missile technology and in dealing with international terrorism.

In only one area do I find reason to disagree with our distinguished Secretary of State, Mr. Speaker. In discussing Kashmir, she noted that her father served as a member of a United Nations mission dealing with that troubled territory. She said: ''He [my father] is now dead, and I am old, and yet still this tragic story goes on.'' Our Secretary of State is not old, Mr. Speaker, she has pursued with great vigor and energy her critical role as our nation's chief diplomat. We are fortunate to have as our Secretary of State a woman of such distinction and such vibrancy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that Secretary Albright's address to the Asia Society be placed in the RECORD, and I urge my colleagues to give it the thoughtful and careful study that it deserves.

REMARKS TO THE ASIA SOCIETY—
WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 14, 2000

Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright

SECRETARY ALBRIGHT: I am indeed delighted to be here. Thank you very, very much, Ambassador Wisner, and to you as well to Marshall Bouton and the entire Asia Society. It's a great pleasure to be here. Ambassador Lodhi and Ambassador Gautam, it is a pleasure to have you here and other excellencies of the diplomatic corps; colleagues and friends from the worlds of scholarship and public policy, Capitol Hill and the press.

I have to warn you: This is a long speech. It's a ''wonky'' speech, and it basically—this, I think, is a perfect audience for it, because I think that you all have spent a great deal of time on the subject. I also, as I look around the audience, I see today people who signed an open letter to the President on the trip, and I think that you will find that many of your very thoughtful comments are reflected in the framework that I'm going to put forward here. At least, I hope you do.

I appreciate the chance to discuss the President's upcoming visit to South Asia. Our trip provides a rich opportunity to promote American interests in an area where a fifth of the world's people live, security risks are high, economic opportunities abound, and there is a potential for wide-ranging cooperation on global issues.

As befits the diversity of the region, our goals are many. In Bangladesh, we will both affirm and advance our friendship with a young democracy that was born in strife, and is surmounting huge obstacles.

During an extended visit to India, the President will seek to begin a new chapter in our relations with one of the world's leading countries and oldest civilizations. India is projected to pass China in size in the early decades of this century, and I can think of few greater gifts to the future than a strong and cooperative strategic relationship between India and the United States.

Finally, in Pakistan, the President will make clear our support for an early return to democratic rule, as well as our ongoing friendship for the Pakistani people.

In these areas and others, we are fortunate to have the support of America's South Asian communities. They are an amazing success story—and a remarkable resource. For the fruits of their hard work, generosity and genius are manifest here and on the subcontinent. And every day they help bind America and the region closer together.

As the new century begins, our foreign policy priorities include building a healthy and growing world economy, halting the spread of weapons of mass destruction, supporting democracy, and working with other nations to combat international terror, pollution, drug trafficking and disease.

We cannot succeed in meeting these priorities without South Asia. The President's trip offers us the opportunity to make progress towards each, and to forge ties that will benefit America for many years to come.

The first official stop on our schedule will be the first visit ever by an American president to Bangladesh. Although Bangladesh has a short history as an independent nation, it has already taken long strides to emerge from poverty and build an inclusive democracy. In the Muslim world and beyond, Bangladeshi democracy deserves recognition as a source of hope for its people and of inspiration to others.

We also want to support the constructive role Bangladesh plays in the international community. For example, it is a top contributor of troops to United Nations peacekeeping missions, and it has embarked with energy and distinction on a two-year term on the UN Security Council.

Bangladesh is also a valued partner on global issues. Last week it became the first South Asian country to ratify the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. And it is working to stamp out child labor in its garment export industry; preserve its tropical forests, and lift the lives of women and disadvantaged with a remarkable microlending program that has been emulated around the world.

There is also a very practical economic dimension to this visit. As Bangladesh has moved to join the global economy, American investment there has risen thirty-fold in three years. And with the right policies in place, Bangladesh could make a quantum

leap forward by exploiting its vast energy resources, particularly in natural gas.

Regional corruption in this area—I'm sorry. Regional cooperation in this area—Not good. We'll get to corruption. Regional cooperation in this area would benefit Bangladesh and all of South Asia. American companies can be the perfect partners to help seize such opportunities.

America can be a strong partner for India, as well. And the President's visit to India will be the centerpiece of his trip. In fact, Bill Clinton's five-day visit to five cities will be the most extensive trip to that country ever by an American president.

At the time of the last such visit, I was about to join the National Security Council in the Carter Administration. And let me state one truth at the outset. Twenty-two years is far too long an interval between presidential trips to India.

For decades, the enormous potential of Indo-US relations went largely untapped. The main reason was an all-encompassing Cold War. As the world became bipolar, India chose its own path of non-alignment.

The result, in the words of a former Indian Ambassador to Washington, was that Indo-US ties exhibited ''a pattern of misunderstanding, miscalculations, and missed opportunities.''

That legacy left a burden of history on both our nations that is only now lifting. Even after the Cold War's end, the United States and India were slow to explore in depth the many areas where our interests increasingly converge. We also failed to lay a fresh foundation for managing our differences.

The hesitation was on both sides. In some quarters in India, there was a lingering suspicion of US intentions in world affairs. And on the American side, some could not or would not understand India's compulsions and aspirations.

Today, however, this mindset of mutual distrust is beginning to change. And, in fact, I believe that both the United States and India are coming to realize that there was always something unnatural and regrettable about the estrangement of our two democracies. Nor is the democratic bond between us merely an ''intangible.'' To the contrary, the values and heritage we share are the bedrock for all our steps forward.

And we have been a rich source of ideas and inspiration for one another. Mahatma Gandhi studied Thoreau and the New England Transcendentalists—who in turn were deeply indebted to ancient Indian philosophy. Martin Luther King, Jr. then looked to Gandhi's towering example of nonviolence. And the framers of India's Constitution looked to our own in developing their framework for a free society.

We both understand that true democracy is never achieved; it is always a pursuit. Human rights concerns in India are still being addressed—particularly in the areas of trafficking in women and children, communal violence, and child labor. But for all our imperfections, the United States and India are the world's most visible messengers of the truth that secular, pluralist democracy not only can work, it does work.

By almost any measure of diversity, India is a world unto itself: seventeen officially recognized languages and 22,000 dialects; every major world religion—including one of the largest Muslim populations on earth; an incredible collection of communities, creeds and cultures; and 600 million eligible voters in some 600,000 polling places—exercising the miracle of self-government.

Considering the vast problems it inherited at independence, Indians have good reason to take pride in their country's survival as a democracy. And India has done more than survive—it has made remarkable progress.

In half a century, the average life span in India has roughly doubled. In place of famine, a ''Green Revolution'' has brought surplus grain to export. And a social revolution is finally unlocking doors of economic and political opportunity for women and lower castes.

Huge challenges remain, however. Illiteracy is high. HIV/AIDS must be attacked with the same energy that has brought India to the verge of eradicating polio. And millions still cannot obtain clean water, make a telephone call, or afford even a bicycle for transportation.

But for all that, it is clear that—particularly in recent years—India has been on a rising road toward a better life for its people. It is in this context that next week, the leaders of the world's largest and oldest democracies will meet. And we have a great deal of long-awaited business to discuss.

One such area of business is business. The Indian economy was one of the great under-reported success stories of the 1990s. By decade's end, the turn toward the free market that began in 1991 was yielding sustained growth rates of 6.5 percent per year.

And the greatest growth has come in areas that bode well for India's future. In recent years, software exports have jumped 50 percent annually—with no end in sight. American companies from Apple and Texas Instruments to Oracle and Microsoft have come to India for its high ''tech'' and high skills.

And while other countries beat a path to India's door, it continues to enrich the globe with talent. Indians make up 30 percent of software workers worldwide.

This should come as no surprise, in light of the subcontinent's history and culture. The Indian civilization gave the world several key building blocks of modern mathematics. And today, India's pool of trained scientists and engineers is second in size only to our own. In terms of purchasing power parity, India already has the world's fourth largest economy. By any yardstick, its middle class is one of the largest on the planet. And its massive economic takeoff is widely projected to continue.

In January, Treasury Secretary Summers told an Indian audience that a 10 percent annual growth rate is ''well within your grasp.'' At that rate, India's standard of living would quintuple in just 20 years—even accounting for population growth.

Toward that end, Indian governments have undertaken new economic reforms. Late last year, India took steps to open up its insurance sector to foreign investors. We hope it will follow suit in telecommunications and other new sectors.

India's economic reforms are a work in progress. The remaining hurdles include growth-choking deficiencies in transportation and infrastructure; remnants of the old license Raj; too much public borrowing; and poorly targeted subsidies. Changing all this will not be easy. But the overall trends are plainly in the right direction.

This, of course, is good news for India. And as India's largest trade and investment partner, it is also good news for us.

Our two-way trade and investment in India is projected to grow vastly over the next decade. Whatever its exact magnitude, the economic potential of enhanced Indo-American ties is clearly enormous. And we are determined to realize much more of this potential.

Strengthening democracy is another goal we share with India. So I am delighted that Minister of External Affairs Jaswant Singh will join me and five other foreign ministers as co-sponsors of the Community of Democracies initiative in Warsaw this June. This is a splendid example of the kind of ambitious and yet practical cooperation that India and the United States are in a unique position to pursue.

We also look forward to working, at both government and NGO levels, with a very active Indian presence at the 56th Session of the UN Commission on Human Rights in Geneva.

And during the upcoming visit, we will launch an Asian Center for Democratic Governance in Delhi. This independent forum will be jointly sponsored by the US National Endowment for Democracy and the Confederation of Indian Industries.

We are also working with India to expand our cooperation in a broad range of other important areas, including science and technology, social development, and exchanges such as the Fulbright program.

Clean energy is an area in which we are striving to strengthen our partnership and benefit our shared environment. Unless we act, India will suffer greatly from global climate change, and by acting together, we and India can also contribute greatly to solving this problem. And President Clinton's trip will underscore that in this high-tech era, India can both prosper in the global economy and protect the global environment.

That brings me, at last, to security issues.

The United States continues to seek universal adherence to the NPT. We believe the South Asian nuclear tests of May 1998 were a historic mistake. And UN Security Council Resolution 1172 makes it plain that the international community agrees with us.

We recognize fully: Only the Indian government has the sovereign right to make decisions about what is necessary for the defense of India and its interests. The United States does not regard India's missiles or nuclear weapons as a direct threat to us. But we do regard proliferation—anywhere—as our Number One security concern.

And for this reason, we must accept that significant progress in this area is necessary, before India and the United States can realize fully the vast potential of our relationship.

Deputy Secretary Talbott and Minister Singh have gone to unprecedented lengths to put our dialogue on these topics on a more productive footing. And the Cold War's end opened up new opportunities to work toward a world in which the risks and roles of nuclear weapons can be reduced, and ultimately eliminated. We and India agree that it would be tragic if actions now being taken led the world not toward seizing these opportunities, but instead toward new risks of nuclear war.

We have not yet found a way to create sufficient common ground on these issues. But I am convinced that our relationship today has the strength and breadth to keep working through our differences and find a way forward.

So we will continue to discuss how to pursue security requirements without contributing to a costly and destabilizing nuclear and missile arms race. Our goal is to ensure that people everywhere will be freed of such devastating dangers and economic burdens.

We believe that the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty would advance India's security interests—as, by the way, it would advance our own. And that is why, yesterday, I appeared yesterday with General Shalikashvili to highlight the important role in the Administration's continuing efforts with the US Senate on the CTBT that General Shalikashvili will play.

We likewise believe that steps to strengthen India's already-effective system of export controls would be in our common interests. So would a global treaty to ban the production of fissile material for weapons—and pending that, a multilateral moratorium.

India has emphasized that its decisions are not taken with a narrow regional focus, and

we accept that point. But India's decisions also have consequences beyond South Asia. Here, prudence and clarity in India's plans and doctrines could yield great benefits. For a pattern of steeply rising defense budgets in Asia would serve neither the continent's security interests nor its development needs. Such principles of restraint are consistent with statements India's own leaders have made.

How India addresses all these issues will, of course, influence the decisions we make. But our goal is a qualitatively different and better relationship with India—not a simple return to the status quo before the tests.

Our ability to attain this goal will depend largely on what India does. And the limits on our ability to cooperate with India are a matter of US law, as well as our international obligations. And our approach to nonproliferation is global. We cannot abandon it simply because we desire an improved relationship. Any other stance would break faith with all the nations—from South Africa to South America to the former Soviet republics—who decisions to strengthen their own security and the cause of nonproliferation by joining the NPT. And it would give cover to states which, unlike India, might threaten us directly.

We will persist in our efforts to reconcile, to the greatest extent possible, our nonproliferation concerns with India's appreciation of its security requirements. Our dialogue on these subjects will be continued during the President's trip, and beyond.

One topic we will discuss in both India and Pakistan is the relationship between these two countries. Let me say a word about the President's decision to stop in Pakistan at the end of our trip. And on one key issue, I want to leave no room for doubt. In no way is this a decision to endorse the military coup or government led by General Musharraf. And no one should interpret it as such.

We are going to Pakistan because the United States has interests there which are important—and urgent. Our interests include avoiding the threat of conflict in South Asia; fostering democracy in Pakistan; fighting terrorism; preventing proliferation; and doing what we can to help create an environment of regional peace and security; and reaching out to a people whose history is one of friendship with the United States.

The President is not going to Pakistan to mediate the Kashmir dispute. We have made it clear he will not do that unless both sides ask.

Last 4th of July, the President's ability to engage directly with the Pakistani Government played a key role in defusing a tense conflict in Kargil. For the President to maintain such lines of communication may be very important in any future crisis.

Some of you know that, when I was a young girl, my father worked as a diplomat at the UN on the problem of Kashmir. He wrote a book whose first chapter contains the simple but eloquent statement, ''The history of Kashmir is a sad story.'' He is now dead, and I am old, and yet still this tragic story goes on.

But today, the conflict over Kashmir has been fundamentally transformed. For nations must not attempt to change borders or zones of occupation through armed force. And now that they have exploded nuclear devices, India and Pakistan have all the more reason to avoid an armed conflict, and all the more reason to restart a discussion on ways to build confidence and prevent escalation.

India and Pakistan today must find some way to move forward. The process is not one that the international community can prescribe for them. We only know that it will take courage—but not the courage of soldiers.

And we can be sure of one more practical reality: Tangible steps must be taken to respect the Line of Control. For so long as this simple principle is violated, the people of Kashmir have no real hope of peace.

Another vital US interest in Pakistan is countering terrorism. The terrorist camps next door in Afghanistan directly threaten American lives. Because of Pakistan's influence with its neighbor, this matter will be high on the President's agenda.

General Musharraf has offered to go to Afghanistan himself to discuss concerns about terrorism. We hope to hear more from him about this. And we want to see steps to address the effects of terror on Pakistan's neighbors, notably India.

Nothing would do more to bolster the entire world's confidence in Pakistan's government than to learn that its people will regain their ability to choose their leaders sooner rather than later. And few things did more to undermine the confidence than the recent order that judges take an oath of loyalty to the military, rather than to the constitution.

In all these areas and others, we see opportunities not for mere gestures, but for real steps forward. For example, Pakistan's foreign minister has recently argued the advantages, from Pakistan's own standpoint, of early signature of the CTBT. Now, that would be the kind of coup for Pakistan—and I guarantee, the international community would rally around it.

President Clinton will go to India, and also to Bangladesh and Pakistan, to strengthen America's bonds with a region that is growing in importance with each passing year. And in so doing, he will affirm on an official level what many in this room can testify to in their own lives.

For the connections between America and South Asia are manifest. They may come in the form of a physician from Mumbai who spends part of her time each year in Los Angeles; or a businessman in Boston who is developing a new technology with a firm in Dhaka; or a teacher from Tennessee who is working with young people in Islamabad.

In today's world, geography is no longer destiny. America and South Asia are distant, but we are linked in the opportunities we have, the threats we face, and the changes to which we must respond.

President Clinton's historic visit offers the prospect of a welcome new chapter in our relations with India and her neighbors. But although that chapter may begin with a visit from the White House, it will be written by the people of all our countries.

For the President's visit, I ask your support next week. For the larger task, I urge your active participation in the months and years to come.

Thank you all very much for your attention.

TRIBUTE TO DORIS COLEY KENNER-JACKSON

HON. BILL PASCRELL, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 2000

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to your attention the deeds of a distinguished singer, Doris Coley Kenner-Jackson of Passaic, New Jersey, whose memorial today celebrates her remarkable talents and legacy. She epitomizes a strong spirit and never forgot from where she came.

Doris Coley Kenner-Jackson was born August 2, 1941 in Wayne County, North Carolina to the late Zeno and Ruth Best Coley. She was the oldest of five children born to this family. One brother, Leodie, preceded her in death. The world lost a truly remarkable woman on February 4, 2000 when Doris passed away at the Kaiser P. Memorial Hospital of Sacramento, California.

Her educational growth began in the two Goldsboro City Schools, Greenleaf and East End, and continued in Passaic where her family moved during the late Nineteen Fifties. Once in New Jersey she continued her education, and attended Passaic High School. During high school, Doris' main pursuit was music. It was at this time that she proved herself to be a remarkable singer.

Always an active and involved vocalist, Doris learned much of her skill in the church. Music was her passion and her gift to the world. Her love for music was deeply rooted in gospel. The early years spent singing in the church choir instilled in Doris the attributes necessary for her to become a stellar force in the music industry. It was the small steps in the beginning of her life that taught her the fundamentals that would make her a role model to scores upon scores of people worldwide.

Doris has had a remarkable career, which has taken her to the top of the charts. While she was a student at Passaic High School, she and three classmates, Shirley Alston Reeves, Beverly Lee and Addie Mickie Harris formed a pop ensemble that became the Shirelles.

The singing group eventually revolutionized the ''girl group'' sound of the Fifties and Sixties. This success was punctuated by ten hit singles including, ''Tonight's the Night,'' ''Will You Still Love Me Tomorrow?,'' ''Soldier Boy,'' ''Mama Said'' and ''Dedicated to the one I Love.'' The latter, an American classic, featured Doris as the lead vocalist. It is interesting to note that this sound is experiencing a current renaissance heralded by Britain's Spice Girls who debuted in the United States in 1996.

This native of North Carolina, who later moved to New Jersey, found fame and fortune around the world. As a member of the Shirelles, she received numerous awards in many countries. One highlight of her life and career came on January 17, 1996 in New York City, New York when the Shirelles were inducted into the Rock 'n' Roll Hall of Fame of Cleveland, Ohio. To mark this achievement, the auditorium of Passaic High School was named in honor of the group. In addition, Doris was inducted into the Rhythm & Blues Foundation.

Doris was united in marriage to Alfonza Kenner, until his death. Together they had two sons, Antonio and Gary. Later, she married Wallace Jackson with whom she had twins, Tracy Jackson and Staci Jackson Richardson.

All who knew Doris felt her magic and unique ability to form a distinctive bond with each and every person she met. The magic transcended all boundaries and is a true testament to the loving kindness of her spirit. Despite being ill, she was performing concerts until the end. This includes a series of shows from January 8 through January 15, 2000 aboard a cruise ship.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join our colleagues, the City of Passaic, Doris' family,

friends and me, in recognizing the outstanding accomplishments in life and in music of Doris Coley Kenner-Jackson.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 2000

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, on March 8, 2000, I missed five votes because I was delayed in California because of a canceled flight.

Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye'' on rollcall No. 29, ''aye'' on rollcall No. 31, ''aye'' on rollcall No. 32, ''aye'' on rollcall No. 33 and ''aye'' on rollcall No. 34.

MEMORIAL TRIBUTE TO BETTY WILSON

HON. GRACE F. NAPOLITANO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 2000

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, my district lost a veteran community leader on Monday with the passing of Betty Wilson, the first woman to serve as mayor in Los Angeles County.

Born in Danville, Illinois on June 13, 1915, Betty Wilson and her husband Sterling Wilson moved to Santa Fe Springs in 1949. Working as a field deputy for Los Angeles City Council members for 25 years, Betty developed a keen understanding of public service. She was actively involved in efforts to make Santa Fe Springs a city, and when voters approved incorporation in 1957, they also elected her to the city council. The council then chose Betty to be the first mayor of Santa Fe Springs. As one of the founders of Santa Fe Springs, Betty played a key role in shaping the city's mission to be a business community. She served on the city council for four decades, retiring in 1997, and also served as mayor a total of 11 times.

Betty's dedication to public service is evident by the number of organizations she has been involved with and the awards she has won. Betty was Chapter President of the Santa Fe Springs Business and Professional Women's Club; a member of the Santa Fe Springs Women's Club; Honorary Member of the Soroptimist International of Santa Fe Springs; and the Los Angeles County Children's Services Task Force. She was President of the Los Angeles County Division of the League of California Cities, chaired the League's Human Resources Committee and served on the League's Revenue and Taxation Committee, Action Plan for Local Government Task Force, and Transportation Task Force. In addition to being the first woman mayor in Los Angeles County, Betty was the first woman to chair the National League of Cities.

Long active in the Sister City Program, Betty served three terms as President; became President Emeritus of the Town Affiliation Association of the U.S., Inc. (Sister Cities International); and was the Council Liaison to the Santa Fe Springs Sister City Committee, Community Program Committee and Beautification Committee.

Betty chaired the International Municipal Cooperation Committee; served as an Executive Committee member of the Southern California Joint Powers Insurance Authority; was co-Chair and Council Liaison for the Santa Fe Springs Emergency Preparedness Conference for Business and Industry; and sat on the Advisory Council for the Salvation Army Transitional Living Center in Whittier.

Betty Wilson's long list of community commitment has been recognized by her listing in ''Who's Who in American Women'' and in ''Outstanding Civic Leaders of America.'' She was awarded the ''Peace Dollar'' for her work in the Sister City Program, and the Dwight D. Eisenhower Award for distinguished service in furtherance of the goals of international understanding through participation in the U.S. Sister Cities Program. Betty also received the United States Air Force Award for the advancement of peace through air power; the California Business and Professional Women's Club Civic Award; the National Civic Committee's People-to-People award; and the annual Good Scout Award by the Boy Scouts of America. Betty and her husband Sterling, who passed away in 1990, were named the 1985 ''Residential Citizens of the Year'' by the Santa Fe Springs Chamber of Commerce.

Betty is survived by her son Robert, daughter Jacqueline, four grandchildren and three great-grandchildren. Her family and friends will miss her greatly and to them I extend my sincerest heartfelt sympathy and pray that they will receive God's comforting graces in abundance.

WACHUSETT REGIONAL HIGH SCHOOL

HON. JAMES P. McGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 2000

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise to recognize Wachusett Regional High School for being designated a GRAMMY Signature School by the GRAMMY Foundation. The GRAMMY Foundation is a non for profit arm of the recording Academy, dedicated to advancing the role of music and art based education across the country and ensuring access to America's righ cultural legacy.

Wachusett was one of only 100 schools to be selected out of over 18,000 schools. I believe that this national recognition is a credit to all the students, parents, and teachers that make the Wachusett's music program so special. After submitting their application to an independent data compiling firm for processing last September, Wachusett was asked to submit additional information including recordings of school concerts, sample concert programs, and music curriculum, which was reviewed by an independent screening committee. The committee then designated Wachusett Regional High School as a GRAMMY Signature School.

Congratulations to Dr. Pandiscio, students, families, and all my friends at Wachusett Regional High School on this wonderful recognition. I join the entire community in celebrating is this marvelous achievement.

TRIBUTE TO RABBI AND MRS. SUGARMAN

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 2000

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Rabbi Marvin and Rebbetzin Avis Sugarman who will be honored at the Shaarey Zedek Congregation's 46th Annual Banquet on March 19, 2000. The occasion will mark Rabbi Sugarman's retirement and will celebrate the thirty-two years of dedicated service that both Rabbi and Mrs. Sugarman have given the Shaarey Zedek community since 1967.

I have known Rabbi Sugarman for 26 of those years and for all that time, I have watched with great admiration the tireless and energetic work that he and his wife have given to Shaarey Zedek. Their efforts have made it the largest Orthodox congregation in the San Fernando Valley and the second largest in Los Angeles. The depth of their concern for their congregants and their love for humanity made the temple community into a warm and welcoming family. No matter how busy he was, Rabbi Sugarman's first priority was to provide help and spiritual guidance to the members of his synagogue. He is a much respected and much beloved figure in Los Angeles.

Throughout Rabbi Sugarman's distinguished 44-year rabbinical career, he has been a dedicated student of Judaism. He has delivered thousands of learned sermons on a plethora of topics and issues, but his discourses on morality, responsibility, and duty have been especially enlightening and instructive. His focus has been not only upon his synagogue or even his religion, but against the moral decline and decay in our society. He has spoken out forcefully and effectively on this important subject.

Rebbetzin Sugarman will be honored for her understanding, devotion, intellectual integrity, and spiritual sensitivity. Her unwavering support has added immeasurably to the strength of this remarkable couple. By her active involvement in the synagogue Sisterhood and the Shaarey Zedek community at large, she provided both inspiration and example to its members. In addition, she has distinguished herself in her chosen career as a clinical dietitian in the health-care field and as the Administrative Dietitian in the Kosher Kitchen of Cedars-Sinai Medical Center.

Among the greatest achievements of Rabbi and Rebbetzin Sugarman are the five outstanding children they raised in their 44 years of marriage and among the great pleasures they look forward to in retirement is time to spend with the many grandchildren who bring them enormous pride.

It is distinct pleasure to ask my colleagues to join with me in saluting Rabbi and Rebbetzin Sugarman for their dedicated service to the Jewish community of Southern California.

TRIBUTE TO JOSE AND MAGALY ROHAIDY

HON. BILL PASCRELL, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 2000

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to your attention the deeds of two distinguished members of the Hispanic community and the community-at-large, Jose and Magaly Rohaidy of West New York, New Jersey, who are being feted today because of their many years of service and leadership. It is only fitting that we gathered here in their honor, for they epitomize care, generosity and professionalism.

Both of these eminent community leaders are dedicated journalists, Jose has served his profession since he was a young man in Havana, Cuba. He was the director for ''Radio Nacional'' of Cuba. The time spent working with this organization instilled in Jose the attributes necessary for him to become a stellar force in the journalism community. Jose has been a reporter for El Diario-La Prensa for more than 30 years. In addition he has worked with Radio WADO for more than two decades.

Known for a questioning mind and an ability to get things done, Magaly Rohaidy has also had a distinguished career. She began in the textile industry in Cuba. In 1970 she founded Mini-Mundo Magazine and served as Director. She has also been a reporter for El Diario for more than 15 years.

Jose and Magaly Rohaidy both were born in Cuba, and have been blissfully married for more than 42 years. They have four children, Lourdes, Maria Magdelena, Gabriel and Jose Gabriel. They are blessed with six grandchildren.

This pair continually touches the lives of the people around them. Jose helped to organize the Puerto Rican Parades of Paterson and Trenton, the Hispanic American Parade of New Jersey, the Dominican Parade of New Jersey and the Peruvian Parade of New Jersey. In addition, he and his wife created the ''Toys Gift'' program for children at Saint Joseph's Hospital in Paterson, Barnert Hospital in Paterson, and the General Hospital of Passaic. As a public servant in New Jersey, Mr. Speaker, I can say that I can think of no people who work harder or care more about others than these two remarkable people. Perhaps the greatest tribute to Jose and Magaly are the numerous awards and accolades they have received.

Jose was the first Hispanic reporter to be given an honorary degree from Essex County College in Newark, New Jersey. The Martian Women Association of Union City proclaimed Magaly Rohaidy the Mother of the Year. This organization is named for Jose Marti, the National Hero of Cuba. Congress also honored her as ''the Woman of the Americas,'' and the New Jersey State Assembly named her as one of the 13 most notable women in the Garden State. Furthermore, Magaly was the Grand Marshal representing the Hispanic Community at the inaugural Hispanic-Italian-American Parade of New Jersey in Paterson. Mrs. Rohaidy is also the recipient of the Key to the City of Paterson.

On a personal note, Mr. Speaker, as a Mayor, Assemblyman, and now as Congressman, I have been privileged to work with numerous outstanding individuals. Jose and Magaly Rohaidy fall into this category, as exhibited by the many achievements and awards detailed on this page. The best thing I can say about Jose and Magaly Rohaidy, however, is that I am proud to call them my good friends.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join our colleagues, Jose and Magaly's family, friends, the State of New Jersey and me in recognizing the outstanding and invaluable service to the community of Jose and Magaly Rohaidy.

HONORING DNA CHAPTER 13 DURING NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION WEEK

HON. BART GORDON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 2000

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the members of the Nashville Chapter of Delta Nu Alpha Transportation Fraternity during National Transportation Week, May 14–20, 2000.

Congress and President John F. Kennedy first proclaimed National Transportation Week in 1962. Since then, National Transportation Week has been observed every year during the week in which the third Friday falls in May. It is important to recognize the men and women who deliver the goods from our farms and factories to suppliers and buyers all across this great nation, not only during a given week in the year, but throughout the year as well.

While transportation affords us the opportunity for leisure travel, it has become an increasingly important issue for those of us who commute to and from work. While I have been supportive of efforts to widen and expand our interstates to minimize traffic congestion, I also believe we need to consider alternatives like bus service and commuter rail.

In keeping with the objectives of its international organization, Volunteer Chapter 135 has done an excellent job in creating awareness of transportation issues, promoting safety in the industry and enabling young people to continue their education through numerous scholarship programs. During National Transportation Week, the Volunteer Chapter includes public schools in their awareness program with poster and essay contests and equipment demonstrations.

I ask the House to join me in recognizing the transportation industry and its workers. To Nashville Chapter 135, I say, ''Roll on!''

TRIBUTE TO JOHN D. MURPHY

HON. CARRIE P. MEEK

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 2000

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to a kind and decent man who lived his life helping others, and lost his life helping others.

John D. Murphy coached youth basketball and volunteered in his community. He attended the Million Man March, as well as the protest in Tallahassee against Gov. Jeb Bush's One Florida Plan to dismantle our state's affirmative action program. He was always thinking of others.

On the way home from the One Florida march, he came upon a chain-reaction auto accident that killed two people and injured 24. Despite the pleadings of his sisters, John Murphy left his van and went to help the injured. He was kill when a tractor-trailer filled with lumber overturned and buried him on the highway.

Mr. Speaker, John Murphy's sudden and tragic death is a source of great grief in his family and throughout our community. I join with his loved ones and those whose lives he touched in extending my deepest sympathy for their loss.

I would like to submit an article about John Murphy that appeared in the Miami Herald:

[From the Miami Herald, Mar. 10, 2000]

LOVED ONES FEEL LOSS OF I–10 PILEUP VICTIM

(By Adam Ramirez)

His sisters begged him not to leave the van and venture into the smoke-filled highway, but John D. Murphy insisted on trying to help motorists injured in Wednesday's horrific 23-vehicle crash on Interstate 10 near Wellborn, Fla.

Murphy, 36, who attended the Million Man March and coached youth sports for 12 years, was coming home from the protest of Gov. Jeb Bush's One Florida plan in Tallahassee. The Plantation man was killed when a tractor-trailer filled with lumber overturned and buried him on the highway.

''That's the kind of guy John was—he was always trying to help people, no matter who they were,'' longtime friend Calvin Joy said outside Murphy's Plantation home in Park Estates. ''He devoted his life to helping people—and that's how he died.''

Two other people were killed and at least 24 injured in the chain-reaction accident caused in part by heavy smoke on the highway about 90 miles east of Tallahassee in northern Florida, officials said. Also killed were truck driver Ben L. Helmuth III of Claxton, Ga., and Sheila Lindeck, 43, of Jacksonville, the Florida Highway Patrol said.

VERY SCARY SCENE

''It was a very scary scene when Mr. Murphy ran in there—smoke and flames everywhere,'' said Scott Pate, Suwannee County deputy emergency management director who arrived first on the scene. ''He was a true Good Samaritan.''

Twenty-three cars and trucks slammed into one another about 8 a.m. after some of them slowed and stopped when they suddenly came upon a cloud of smoke.

Seventeen miles of highway near Wellborn were closed after the accident but were reopened Thursday morning.

Murphy's sisters, Lydia and Jeryle Murphy, watched helplessly as he walked into the smoke and flames. A manager at BellSouth for six years, Murphy was driving a rental van with his sister and two of their children when they hit a thick patch of smoke and pulled over.

MISSING HALF HOUR

''John told them he saw people in the fire and smoke, and he had to go help them,'' Joy said. Murphy had been the best man in Joy's wedding. ''About 30 minutes later, his sisters were asking police to find him.'' They didn't realize he was only a few feet away.

Erik Gebauer, of Melbourne, said he was driving a Mustang that slid under a tractor-trailer.

''I don't understand how I lived through that,'' Gebauer said Wednesday, his voice

shaking. ''All I can remember was pushing that freaking door. I felt death right behind me. I can't believe I made it.''

Murphy drove the family to the state capital Monday night to participate in Tuesday's march against One Florida and was driving home Wednesday morning.

A longtime volunteer, Murphy served as a basketball and football coach for children ages 8 to 12 at nearby YMCA and Police Athletic League teams. A graduate of Tampa Technical College, he prided himself on being notoriously frugal, Joy said.

''He would drive five miles out of his way if he found gas two pennies cheaper,'' Joy said with a chuckle. ''John was very active, on the MLK committee and active on city boards in Plantation. But more than anything, he loved his little daughter with all his heart—nothing came before her.''

INTRODUCTION OF LAW ENFORCEMENT TRUST AND INTEGRITY ACT OF 2000

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 2000

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce the Law Enforcement Trust and Integrity Act of 2000, along with additional cosponsors. This legislation is supported by both police and civil rights organizations around the country and is aimed at curbing outrages like the Los Angeles Rampart Division perjury scandal and tragedies such as the Amadou Diallo shooting. Unlike past measures, the Law Enforcement Trust and Integrity Act of 2000 takes a comprehensive approach at addressing the issue of police accountability and building trust between police departments and their communities.

The purpose of the legislation is to build trust between law enforcement entities, officials and the people they serve. Specifically, the legislation provides incentives for local police organizations to voluntarily adopt performance-based standards to ensure that incidents of misconduct will be minimized through appropriate management, training and oversight protocols and that if such incidents occur, that they will be properly investigated. The bill also provides police officers—the vast majority of whom are decent people who are concerned about their communities—with the tools necessary to work with their communities and to enhance their professional growth and education.

Specifically, our bill makes 12 concrete steps toward improving law enforcement management and misconduct prosecution tools and has the support of a broad range of legal, community-based and law enforcement groups, including: the NAACP; Urban League; LULAC; NCLR; National Asian Pacific Legal Consortium; National Lawyer's Guild; ACLU; NOBLE; National Black Police Association; and the United Methodist Church.

1. Accreditation of Local Law Enforcement Agencies—Authorizes the Department of Justice to work cooperatively with independent accreditation, law enforcement and community-based organizations to further develop and refine accreditation standards that can serve as models for police departments around the country in trying to balance proper law enforcement with respect for liberties. This section also authorizes the Attorney General to make grants to law enforcement agencies for the purpose of developing such standards and obtaining appropriate certification.

2. Law Enforcement Agency Development Programs—Authorizes the Attorney General to make grants to States and local governments to develop pilot programs such as civilian review boards, early warning and detection programs which have been proven effective in many jurisdictions.

3. Administrative Due Process Procedures—Requires the Attorney General to study the prevalence and impact of any law, rule or procedure which interferes with prompt and thorough investigations of abuse.

4. Enhanced Funding of Civil Rights Division—Authorizes appropriations for expenses for ongoing investigations of pattern-and-practice-of-abuse investigations pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 14141, and authorizes appropriations for expenses related to programs managed by the Community Relations Service.

5. Enhanced Authority in Pattern and Practice Investigations—Amends 42 U.S.C. 14141 to provide private cause of actions, but limits the provision only to declaratory and injunctive relief when there is a pattern and practice of discrimination.

6. Deprivation of Rights Under Color of Law—Amends section 242 of Title 18 of the United States Code to provide the needed statutory clarification requested by the Department of Justice to expressly define excessive use of force and non-consensual sexual conduct as deprivations of rights under color of law.

7. Study of Deaths in Custody—Amends section 20101(b) of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C.A. 13701) to require assurances that States will follow guidelines established by the Attorney General for reporting deaths in custody.

8. National Task Force on Law Enforcement Oversight—Requires the Department of Justice to establish a task force to coordinate the investigation, prosecution and enforcement efforts of federal, state and local governments in cases related to law enforcement misconduct.

9. Immigration Enforcement Review Commission—Creates a commission to investigate civil rights complaints against the INS and Customs Services, with authority to make policy and disciplinary recommendations.

10. Federal Data Collection on Racial Profiling—Requires the Justice, Treasury and Interior Departments to collect data concerning the personal characteristics (race, ethnicity and gender) of individuals targeted for investigation (e.g., detention, traffic stop or warrantless search) by federal law enforcement agencies and requires the Justice Department to prepare a ''master report'' analyzing the findings and recommending improved policies and procedures.

11. Whistleblower Protection—The bill establishes civil and criminal penalties for retaliation against law enforcement officers who in good faith disclose, initiate or advocate on behalf of a civilian complainant in actions alleging police misconduct and creates private cause of action for retaliation.

12. Sexual Abuse in Correctional Facilities—Amends chapter 109A of title 18 to increase penalties and expand jurisdiction for sexual abuse offenses in correctional facilities.

The catalogue of high-profile incidents of police misconduct grows with each passing day. With the Rampart perjury scandal, Amadou Diallo shooting and Abner Louima assault, it should now be clear to all members, and the nation at-large, that police misconduct is an issue that we must address in a bipartisan manner. The energies of Congress should be focused on the adoption of legislative priorities that address the substance of law enforcement management and strengthen the current battery of tools available to sanction misconduct.

As a Congress we have been enthusiastic about supporting programs designed to get officers on the street. We must be just as willing to support programs designed to train and manage them after they get there. The current national climate requires decisive action to implement solutions. This legislation initiates the reforms necessary to restore public trust and accountability to law enforcement.

IMPORTANCE OF THE CENSUS TO RURAL AMERICA

HON. ROBERT W. NEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 2000

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, as you know, this week, 112 Members of Congress, along with members of Leadership from both sides of the aisle, officially kicked off the start of the Congressional Rural Caucus. Over the last days, a series of events was held to promote this renewed bipartisan effort that will help raise awareness of the concerns and issues facing rural America.

There are, of course, a number of issues that affect those who live in rural areas, but in reality, one event in particular can and will have long-lasting implications for rural America.

I'm talking about April 1, 2000, better known as Census Day.

Unfortunately, a number of Americans, whether they live in urban or rural communities, are still unaware of the importance of the decennial census. This is evident in the number of people, around 30 to 40 percent, who do not respond to a Census questionnaire.

But, I'd like to remind everyone that the outcome of the decennial census has the potential to change the face of rural America, both politically and socially.

Before I outline the potential outcomes let me first define what is rural America:

Rural and small town America is home to approximately one-third of the total US population, or about 82 million residents. This is equal to the percentage of Americans who live in urban centers.

Of the nation's 39,000 local governments, 86 percent serve populations under 10,000, and half have fewer than 1,000 residents. These communities cover at least 80 percent of the nation's land.

While farming remains a driving force in many rural communities, it no longer completely dominates the rural economy. The service and manufacturing sectors account for 22 percent and 17 percent respectively of rural employment, compared to 8 percent for agriculture.

And, many will be surprised to know that overall, Pennsylvania, Texas, North Carolina,

Ohio and New York have the largest rural populations, with Michigan, Georgia, California, Indiana and Florida close behind.

Now, why is the census important to rural America?

First, the Constitution requires the federal government to conduct a census evey ten years to help apportion the 435 seats of the House of Representatives among the states. So, states that have a large undercount are at risk of losing political representation in Congress.

Second, billions of dollars in federal aid to states and local governments are allocated using census data. In 2000, almost $200 billion in federal aid will be distributed through 20 federal programs that range from agriculture to community development to education to health.

According to the National Association of Development Organizations (NADO), rural communities are at risk of losing $2,500 each year in federal and state aid for each person that is undercounted. That adds up to a significant amount of lost revenue for rural communities over a ten year period, especially when you consider the numbers.

In 1990, the census missed 5.9 percent of rural renters, compared with 4.2 percent of urban renters. The Census Bureau also estimates it missed about 1.2 percent of all rural residents, which is about three-quarters of a million people.

Let me put this into perspective. There are six states, plus the District of Columbia, that have populations below 750,000. So, the rural undercount is equivalent to misplacing Alaska, Delaware, North Dakota, South Dakota, Vermont, or Wyoming.

Third, accurate census data is essential for local decision makers, whether economic development planners, school board members or business leaders. The more data rural communities have at their disposal, the better prepared they will be to serve their citizens in terms of municipal services and programs. It is also an essential ingredient in developing strategic plans aimed at attracting new businesses and industries.

With so much at risk, it is vital that we all work together to ensure that rural Americans are counted. This is not a partisan issue, but a rural issue. Stand up and be counted Rural America!

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CHARLES A. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 2000

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 46 and 47, I was away on official business. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye'' on each.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ADAM SMITH

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 2000

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, March 9, I had to fly home for my wife's ultrasound and missed several votes.

On House vote 42 on H.R. 3846 (Minimum Wage/Question of Continued Consideration) I would have voted ''yes.''

On House vote 43 on H.R. 3846 (Minimum Wage/Two-Year Increase) I would have voted ''yes.''

On House vote 44 on H.R. 3846 (Minimum Wage/Recommit) I would have voted ''yes.''

On House vote 45 (Minimum Wage/Passage) I would have voted ''yes.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LYNN N. RIVERS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 2000

Ms. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote 41—H.R. 3081, I inadvertently voted ''yes.'' It was my intention to vote ''no'' on rollcall vote 41—H.R. 3081.

HOPE FOR SYRIA

HON. BILL McCOLLUM

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 2000

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, since its establishment, Israel has been fighting and striving for genuine and lasting peace with its neighbors so that it can concentrate on making the desert bloom, and, more recently, on developing one of the world's leading centers of high-tech industries. Israel is the United States' closest ally in the region, and the bulwark of furthering U.S. interests in the region. Little wonder that virtually the entire political spectrum in Washington is committed to supporting Israel's quest for peace and security.

However, despite this American commitment, the Middle East is in the midst of a crisis emanating from the latest developments in the Peace Process advocated by the Clinton Administration. The flagrant absurdity of this latest turn of events is an accurate manifestation of the Administration's overall policy. For nearly twenty years, the Syrian-dominated Lebanese Government has been demanding an Israeli withdrawal from south Lebanon. Now, when the Israeli Government committed to just such a unilateral withdrawal by next July, Beirut and Damascus threaten war. ''An Israeli unilateral withdrawal [from south Lebanon] will not work. It will lead to another war,'' President Emile Lahoud warned, echoing Hafiz al-Assad's position. Why? The Israeli withdrawal from Lebanon will remove the primary Syrian point of pressure on Israel to accept the extremely disadvantageous ''package deal'' advocated by the Clinton Administration.

The Clinton Administration is pushing Israel and Syria to reach a peace agreement by next May. Both countries are under tremendous pressure to sign before the U.S. elections. The principles of the Israeli-Syrian agreement the Administration is pushing are: (1) a complete Israeli withdrawal from the Golan Heights and south Lebanon; (2) enduring and now legitimized Syrian occupation of Lebanon; (3) a U.S.-dominated international force in south Lebanon and the Golan Heights; and (4) a financial inducement package to both Israel and Syria that, by conservative estimates, will exceed $100 billion to be dispensed over a few years.

In its zeal to bring about this package deal, the Clinton Administration seems unperturbed by the widespread opposition in Israel to any withdrawal from the strategically crucial Golan Heights—particularly the kind of a total and speedy withdrawal the U.S. is trying to bring about. Moreover, the Administration ignores recent polls indicating that about two-thirds of the American public are against U.S. support for Syria and any form of deployment of troops in the Golan or Lebanon. Nor does the Clinton Administration take into consideration the significance of the pre-conditions introduced by Syria—a demand for an advance Israeli commitment to a full withdrawal with U.S. guarantees. This demand is intentionally phrased so as to bring about stalling of the peace process because, as Damascus knows well, Jerusalem cannot comply with the letter of the demand (even if Jerusalem is ready to commit to such a withdrawal) because Israeli law requires a referendum for any withdrawal from the Golan.

Most puzzling, however, is the White House's haste. The question it raises has nothing to do with the essence of the Israeli-Syrian ''package deal''. The Administration's sense of urgency does not make sense in the context of the internal dynamics in Syria.

Syria is in a major crisis. Hafiz al-Assad's health is in a bad shape. He is desperate to ensure that his son Bashar succeeds him and for the U.S. to provide for both averting the collapse of the Syrian economy and the payoffs to the Syrian elite Bashar must make in order not to be toppled. The U.S. is also expected to replace the virtually free oil Syria now gets from Iran. By careful analysis, these financial requirements amount to $35–50 billion a year. Hafiz al-Assad is willing to ''make peace'' in order to ensure this U.S. financial support. He also expects the U.S. to legitimize the Syrian occupation of Lebanon which will also clear the Syrian drug and counterfeit trade as well as the income they provide for the Syrian ruling elite.

However, the Syrian ruling establishment, which is predominantly Allawite (a Shiite people that is a minority in predominantly Sunni Syria), is afraid of Bashar. He is young, inexperienced and weak. The Syrian elite knows that once Hafiz al-Assad dies, the Syrian Islamists and Iran may well rise up, overthrow and slaughter the Allawite elite, and establish a Sunni Islamist government in Damascus. If so, Iran and an Islamist Syria will then export Islamist subversion and instability to all other Arab countries, including such U.S. allies as Egypt, Saudi Arabia, and Jordan. Islamist terrorism by such organizations as the HizbAllah, HAMAS and Islamic Jihad, all of whom are already sponsored by Syria and Iran, would also escalate. The only way to prevent the rise of an Iran-dominated Islamist regime in Damascus is by securing a strong Allawite-dominated regime—something that Bashar is incapable of achieving despite all of his father's desperate grooming. The ongoing purges in Syria and Lebanon, as well as the sudden change of the Syrian Government, only highlighted Bashar's weakness and insecurity, as well as his father's trepidations.

The Syrian elite is fully aware of the Islamist threat. Indeed, there is a major segment within the Syrian Allawite elite led by Dr. Rifat al-Assad (Hafiz al-Assad's estranged brother) that is very pragmatic in addressing the forthcoming crisis. They believe that the only

chance for the Allawite to remain in power (and thus survive slaughter by the Islamists) is by reversing the virtual collapse of the Syrian economy. Only an economic upsurge can avert the radicalization of the Sunni majority. And only improved relations with the U.S.-led West can save the Syrian economy from an impending collapse. Furthermore, Dr. Rifat al-Assad believes that a strong alliance between the peoples of the Eastern Mediterranean—the Allawites of Syria, the Christian Maronites of Lebanon, the Jews of Israel, and the Druze dwelling in all three countries—will transform the region into an economic power house as the bridge between East and West, as well as the bastion of regional stability as the source of prosperity and employment for all. Therefore, the Syrian elite led by Dr. Rifat al-Assad appears willing to reach agreement with the U.S. and Israel on all major issues in return for removing the sanctions and normalization of relations. Significantly, the Syrian Allawite elite believes that the alternative to such a deal is their slaughter—for them it is literally a life-saving deal.

Therefore, the U.S. should assist Dr. Rifat al-Assad and the responsible and pragmatic segments of the Syrian elite to come to power in a post-Hafiz al-Assad Damascus and begin the process of recovering and restoring the economy. Given Syria's crucial geo-strategic posture, it is imperative for the entire U.S.-led West to ensure that a pro-Western, Democratically oriented government—the kind of government Dr. Rifat al-Assad is striving for—is established in Damascus. Meanwhile, the U.S. and Israel should wait until the government of Dr. Rifat al-Assad redirects Syria's national policies and priorities, proves its commitment to policies of moderation and compromises, as well as economic reforms. Once stable, this Syrian government will be capable of making long-term commitments. Only then it would be possible for both Israel and Syria to reach enduring and genuine peace for the sake of peace. This kind of peace the U.S. should, and will, support.

TRIBUTE TO CHIEF JUSTICE ERNEST A. FINNEY, JR.

HON. JAMES E. CLYBURN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 2000

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Ernest A. Finney, Jr., who will retire on March 23, 2000, as Chief Justice of the South Carolina Supreme Court.

Ernest Finney moved to Orangeburg, SC, from Virginia as a teenager when his father became the Dean of Claflin College in Orangeburg. He received his undergraduate degree from Claflin, and later his law degree from South Carolina State College.

Although an attorney, Mr. Finney began his career as a teacher in Conway, SC, where he supplemented his teaching salary by waiting tables. He attended his first meeting of the South Carolina Bar as a waiter, because blacks were not allowed membership in the state bar association.

After practicing civil rights law in my hometown Sumter, of South Carolina for a number of years, Mr. Finney began his distinguished public service career in 1973 when he was elected to the South Carolina House of Representatives, where he served until his election as Judge of the Third Judicial Circuit in 1976. On April 3, 1985, Mr. Finney was elected Associate Justice of the South Carolina Supreme Court, becoming the first African American to hold that office since Reconstruction. On May 11, 1994, Justice Finney was elected Chief Justice of the South Carolina Supreme Court.

In addition to his duties on the court, Chief Justice Finney is devoted to his family and community. He is married to the former Frances Davenport and is the father of three fine children—Lynn C., a college professor, Ernest A. III, and Jerry Leo, both attorneys. He is the grandfather of two—Amanda and Felicia. Chief Justice Finney is a dedicated alumnus of Claflin College, where he serves on the Board of Trustees, and is a long time member of Emmanuel United Methodist Church. He has been a role model and mentor for legions of young attorneys.

Mr. Speaker, Chief Justice Ernest A. Finney, Jr. guided the Supreme Court of South Carolina and the state judiciary with a steady, balanced hand. I ask that you and my colleagues join me in saluting him on the occasion of his retirement for a job well done.

IN RECOGNITION OF VIVIANA RISCA

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 2000

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Viviana Risca in honor of her reception of the first-place prize in this year's prestigious Intel Science Talent Search, America's oldest and most highly regarded pre-college science contest.

Viviana is first in her senior class of 292 students at Paul D. Schreiber High School, in Port Washington, NY. Her award-winning computer science project was chosen from over 1,500 submitted entries, reviewed by a board of ten distinguished scientists who judged the entries for their research ability, scientific originality and creative thinking.

Using DNA as the medium, Viviana studied steganography, a data encryption technique that embeds secret computer messages within large amounts of seemingly innocent information. For her molecular computing project, Viviana encrypted the secret message ''JUNE 6__INVASION: NORMANDY,'' and then inserted it in the gene sequence of a DNA strand.

Over the years, more than 115,000 students from American high schools in all 50 states and overseas have completed independent research projects and submitted entries. More than 100 of the world's most coveted science and math honors have been won by alumni of this program. Five finalists of this contest have gone on to win the Nobel Prize, and thirty have been elected to the National Academy of Sciences.

I had the pleasure of meeting Viviana while she was in Washington, D.C. for the final phase of this year's competition. Viviana is a talented young woman and she is a fine example of the amazing potential of our nation's youth.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me today in congratulating Viviana Risca upon receiving the first place-prize for her outstanding scientific capabilities and tremendous innovation.

TRIBUTE TO ROLLIE ROTH

HON. ELTON GALLEGLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 2000

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in tribute to Rollie Roth, who will be honored this week by the Simi Valley Education Foundation at the Lew Roth Awards Dinner, to be held at the Ronald Reagan Presidential Library in my district.

Rollie Roth has been an active member of the Simi Valley, CA, community for about 35 years. She served for eight years as a commissioner on the city's Public Safety Committee, assisted the community's Incorporation Study Committee on research projects and volunteered for the March of Dimes and American Cancer Society.

But it is in the area of education that Rollie Roth has truly made her mark.

She served on the PTA of every school that her three children—Paul, Miriam and Barry—attended. At Vista Fundamental School, she was responsible for the newsletter for two years. She also served two years as PTA President at Sycamore School.

With Rollie's full support, her husband, the late Lew Roth, served for 25 years on the Simi Valley Unified School District Board of Education. It was his vision that led to the founding of the Simi Valley Education Foundation.

In 1993, Rollie was appointed to the Foundation board. An energetic board member, she has served as Board Secretary and provides leadership in staging the benefit dinner that bears her husband's name.

Mr. Speaker, Rollie Roth has been a stabilizing influence for both the community and her family. She cared enough about her community, and of teaching her children the importance of community, to remain active after Lew's death while raising her children. Rollie Roth's dedication and determination has also influenced many others to become involved.

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues will join the Simi Valley Education Foundation and me in paying special tribute to Rollie Roth's years of dedication to our community and its children.

HONORING KRISTINE THALMAN FROM ANAHEIM, CA

HON. CHRISTOPHER COX

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 15, 2000

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Kristine Thalman, a loyal staff member at the city of Anaheim, CA. Kris will be retiring from the city after a long and distinguished career.

In her career, especially for the last 13 years, Kris has served as the Governmental Relations Director for the city. She has ensured very smooth relations between the city

of California and many of us in Congress that we represent.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I ask my colleagues to join with me in honoring Kristine Thalman. It is fitting that all of us join with the family, friends, and the community of Anaheim, CA, in recognizing her service and dedication to the city and wish her well in her future endeavors.

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 Thursday, March 16, 2000 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

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 Alzheimers Disease.
SH–216

Small Business
Business meeting to consider certain legislation regarding the Small Business Administration and Small Business Innovation Research Program reauthorization.
SR–428A

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

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

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

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 Timbisha Shoshone Tribe a permanent 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

Foreign Relations
To hold hearings to examine nonproliferation threats and U.S. policy formulation.
SD–419

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe
To hold hearings on the state of democratization and human rights in Turkmenistan.
334–CHOB

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
Housing and Transportation Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on HUD's Public Housing Assesment System (PHAS).
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

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

Indian Affairs
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business; to be followed by hearings on the nomination of Thomas N. Slonaker, of Arizona, to be Special Trustee, Office of Special Trustee for American Indians, Department of the Interior.
SR–485

10 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs on the Legislative recommendation of the Vietnam Veterans of America, the Retired Officers Association, American Ex-Prisoners of War, AMVETS, and the National Association of State Directors of Veterans Affairs.
345 Cannon Building

Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings on Department of Energy's management of health and safety issues surrounding the DOE's gaseous diffusion plants at Oak Ridge, Tennessee, and Piketon, Ohio.
SD–342

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

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

Budget
Business meeting to discuss the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2001.
SD–608

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 District; H.R. 992, to convey the Sly Park Dam and Reservoir to the El Dorado Irrigation District; H.R. 1235, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into contracts with the Solano County Water Agency, California, to use Solano Project facilities for impounding, storage, and carriage of nonproject water for domestic, municipal, industrial, and other beneficial purposes; 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 hyroelectric 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

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

Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
Public Health Subcommittee
To hold hearings on safety net providers.
SD–430

10 a.m.
Appropriations
Commerce, Justice, State, and the Judiciary Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2001 for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration of the Department of Commerce, and the Securities and Exchange Commission.
S–146, Capitol

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on the Monetary Policy Report to Congress pursuant to the Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act of 1978.
SH–216

Environment and Public Works
Fisheries, Wildlife, and Drinking Water Subcommittee
To resume hearings to examine the Environmental Protection Agency's proposed rules regarding changes in the

total maximum daily load and NPDES permit programs pursuant to the Clean Water Act.
SD–406

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

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 markup the proposed Technical Assistance, Trade Promotion and Anti-Corruption Act.
SD–419

Armed Services
SeaPower Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 2001 for the Department of Defense and the Future Years Defense Program, focusing on Navy and Marine Corps' seapower operational capability requirements.
SR–222

Energy and Natural Resources
National Parks, Historic Preservation, and Recreation Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings to examine the status of monuments and memorials in and around Washinton, D.C.
SD–366

MARCH 28

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Communications Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the current state of deployment of hi-speed Internet technologies, focusing on rural areas.
SR–253

Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
Children and Families Subcommittee
To hold hearings on child safety on the Internet.
SD–430

Small Business
To hold hearings to examine the extent of office supply scams, including toner-phoner schemes.
SD–562

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine issues dealing with mind body and alternative medicines.
SD–192

10 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine the implementation of the Driver's Privacy Protection Act, focusing on the positive notification requirement.
SD–192

2:30 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
National Parks, Historic Preservation, and Recreation Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the incinerator component at the proposed Advanced Waste Treatment Facility at the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory and its potential impact on the adjacent Yellowstone and Grand Teton National Parks.
SD–366

MARCH 29

9:30 a.m.
Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.
SD–430

Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.
SD–366

Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2001 for the Department of the Interior.
SD–124

10 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings on how to structure government to meet the challenges of the millennium.
SD–342

Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings on meeting the challenges of the millennium, focusing on proposals to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the Federal Government.
SD–342

Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2001 for the Department of Defense, focusing on Air Force programs.
SD–192

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 certain land into trust for that Band.
SR–485

Energy and Natural Resources
Forests and Public Land Management Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1778, to provide for equal exchanges of land around the Cascade Reservoir, S. 1894, to provide for the conveyance of certain land to Park County, Wyoming, and S. 1969, to provide for improved management of, and increases accountability for, outfitted activities by which the public gains access to and occupancy and use of Federal land.
SD–366

MARCH 30

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2001 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development.
SD–138

Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings on S. 882, to strengthen provisions in the Energy Policy Act of 1992 and the Federal Nonnuclear Energy Research and Development Act of 1974 with respect to potential Climate Change; and S. 1776, to amend the Energy Policy Act of 1992 to revise the energy policies of the United States in order to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, advance global climate science, promote technology development, and increase citizen awareness.
SD–366

Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2001 for the National Institutes of Health, Department of Health and Human Services.
SD–124

10 a.m.
Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
To hold hearings on medical records privacy.
SD–430

2:30 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Forests and Public Land Management Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the President'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.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2001 for the Bureau of Indian Affairs and Office of the Special Trustee, Department of the Interior.
SD–138

APRIL 5

9:30 a.m.
Indian Affairs
To hold hearings on S. 612, to provide for periodic Indian needs assessments, to require Federal Indian program evaluations.
SR–485

10 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2001 for the Department of Defense, focusing on Army programs.
SD–192

APRIL 6

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2001 for the Department of Veterans Affairs.
SD–138

APRIL 8

10 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2001 for the Department of Defense, focusing on medical programs.
SD–192

APRIL 11

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2001 for the Department of Energy.
SD–138

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 capacity under section 210 of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978; S. 516, to benefit consumers by promoting competition in the electric power industry; S. 1047, to provide for a more competitive electric power industry; S. 1284, to amend the Federal Power Act to ensure that no State may establish, maintain, or enforce on behalf of any electric utility an exclusive right to sell electric energy or otherwise unduly discriminate against any consumer who seeks to purchase electric energy in interstate commerce from any supplier; S. 1273, to amend the Federal Power Act, to facilitate the transition to more competitive and efficient electric power markets; S. 1369, to enhance the benefits of the national electric system by encouraging and supporting State programs for renewable energy sources, universal electric service, affordable electric service, and energy conservation and efficiency; S. 2071, to benefit electricity consumers by promoting the reliability of the bulk-power system; and S. 2098, to facilitate the transition to more competitive and efficient electric power markets, and to ensure electric reliability.
SH–216

APRIL 12

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, and will be followed by a business 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

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 capacity under section 210 of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978; S. 516, to benefit consumers by promoting competition in the electric power industry; S. 1047, to provide for a more competitive electric power industry; S. 1284, to amend the Federal Power Act to ensure that no State may establish, maintain, or enforce on behalf of any electric utility an exclusive right to sell electric energy or otherwise unduly discriminate against any consumer who seeks to purchase electric energy in interstate commerce from any supplier; S. 1273, to amend the Federal Power Act, to facilitate the transition to more competitive and efficient electric power markets; S. 1369, to enhance the benefits of the national electric system by encouraging and supporting State programs for renewable energy sources, universal electric service, affordable electric service, and energy conservation and efficiency; S. 2071, to benefit electricity consumers by promoting the reliability of the bulk-power system; and S. 2098, to facilitate the transition to more competitive and efficient electric power markets, and to ensure electric reliability.
SH–216

2:30 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Forests and Public Land Management Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 2034, to establish the Canyons of the Ancients National Conservation Area.
SD–366

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

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

HIGHLIGHTS

The House agreed to the conference report on H.R. 1000, Wendell H. Ford Aviation Investment and Reform Act for the 21st Century—clearing the measure for the President.

The House passed H.R. 3843, Small Business Reauthorization Act of 2000.

House Committees ordered reported 10 sundry measures, including the Concurrent Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 2001.

Senate

Chamber Action

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

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: 72 public bills, H.R. 3926–3997, and 4 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 283–285 and H. Res. 442, were introduced. **Pages H1075–77**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H. Res. 441, providing for consideration of H.R. 2372, the Private Property Rights Implementation Act of 2000 (H. Rept. 106–525); and

H.R. 21, to establish a Federal program to provide reinsurance for State disaster insurance programs, amended (H. Rept. 106–526). **Page H1075**

Speaker Pro Tempore: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he designated Representative Ose to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H999**

Guest Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the guest Chaplain, Rev. Dr. Richard Camp of Boston, Massachusetts. **Page H999**

Wendell H. Ford Aviation Investment and Reform Act for the 21st Century: The House agreed to the conference report on H.R. 1000, to amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize programs of the Federal Aviation Administration, by a yea and nay vote of 319 yeas to 101 nays, Roll No. 48—clearing the measure for the President. **Pages H1010–30**

The Clerk was authorized to make technical and conforming changes in the engrossment of H.R. 1000. **Page H1030**

Earlier, agreed to H. Res. 438, the rule that waived points of order against the conference report. **Pages H1002–10**

Small Business Reauthorization Act of 2000: The House passed H.R. 3843, to reauthorize programs to assist small business concerns by a yea and nay vote of 410 yeas to 11 nays, Roll No. 49. **Pages H1032–39**

Agreed to the Traficant amendment that requires a study to determine the average time required to process an application for each type of loan or loan guarantee. **Pages H1038–39**

Earlier, agreed to H. Res. 438, the rule that provided for consideration of the bill. **Pages H1030–32**

Pursuant to the rule, H. Res. 432, waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany S. 376, to amend the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 to promote competition and privatization in satellite communications, was laid on the table. The

conference report was agreed to by the House on March 9, 2000. **Page H1032**

Juvenile Justice Reform Act: By a yea and nay vote of 218 yeas to 205 nays, Roll No. 50, agreed to the Lofgren motion to instruct conferees on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to H.R. 1501, Juvenile Justice Reform Act, to have its first substantive meeting to offer amendments and motions within the next two weeks. **Pages H1040–49**

Amendments: Amendments ordered printed pursuant to the rule appear on page H1078.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Three yea and nay votes developed during the proceedings of the House today and appear on pages H1029–30, H1039, and H1049. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10:00 a.m. and adjourned at 7:37 p.m.

Committee Meetings

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FDA, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies held a hearing on Marketing and Regulatory Programs. Testimony was heard from Michael Dunn, Under Secretary, Marketing and Regulatory Programs, USDA.

COMMERCE, JUSTICE, STATE, AND JUDICIARY APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary held a hearing on the Supreme Court and on State and Local Law Enforcement. Testimony was heard from the following Justices of the Supreme Court: David Souter; and Clarence Thomas; the following officials of the Department of Justice: Mary Lou Leary, Acting Assistant Attorney General, Office of Justice Programs; John J. Wilson, Acting Administrator, Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention; and Thomas C. Frazier, Director, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services; and Alan Hantman, Architect of the Capitol.

DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Defense held a hearing on Fiscal Year 2001 Navy/Marine Corps Budget Overview. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Defense: Richard Danzig, Secretary of the Navy; Adm. Jay L. Johnson, USN, Chief of Naval Operations; and Gen. James L. Jones, USMC, Commandant of the Marine Corps.

The Subcommittee also met in executive session to continue hearings on this subject. Testimony was heard from departmental witnesses.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs held a hearing on the Secretary of State. Testimony was heard from Madeleine K. Albright, Secretary of State.

INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior held a hearing on the Woodrow Wilson Center, the Holocaust Museum, the Kennedy Center and on the Secretary of Energy. Testimony was heard from Bill Richardson, Secretary of Energy, Lee Hamilton, Director, Woodrow Wilson Center; Sara J. Bloomfield, Director, National Holocaust Museum; and Laurence Wilker, President, Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

LABOR-HHS-EDUCATION APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education held a hearing on Vocational and Adult Education and Educational Research and Improvement, and the Office of Higher Education/Office of Student Financial Aid. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Education: Patricia W. McNeil, Assistant Secretary, Vocational and Adult Education; and Cyril Kent McGuire, Assistant Secretary, Educational Research and Improvement.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Military Construction held a hearing on Family Housing Privatization. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Defense: Randall Yim, Deputy Under Secretary, Installations; Mahlon Apgar IV, Assistant Secretary, Army, Installations and Environment; Duncan Holaday, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Navy, Installations and Facilities; and Jim G. Dishner, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Air Force, Installations.

TRANSPORTATION APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Transportation held a hearing on the National Railroad Passenger Corporation. Testimony was heard from Kenneth M. Mead, Inspector General, Department of

Transportation; Phyllis F. Scheinberg, Associate Director, Transportation Issues, Resources, Community and Economic Development Division, GAO; and George D. Warrington, President and CEO, National Railroad Passenger Corporation.

TREASURY, POSTAL SERVICE, AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government held a hearing on the Secret Service and on the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of the Treasury: Brian L. Stafford, Director, Financial Crimes Enforcement Network; and Jim Sloan, Director, Financial Crimes Enforcement Network.

VA, HUD, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies held a hearing on NASA. Testimony was heard from Daniel S. Goldin, Administrator, NASA.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION

Committee on Armed Services: Continued hearings on the Fiscal Year 2001 National Defense authorization budget request, with emphasis on the regional commanders. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Defense: Gen. Anthony C. Zinni, USMC, Commander in Chief, U.S. Central Command; Adm. Dennis C. Blair, USN, Commander in Chief, U.S. Pacific Command; and Gen. Thomas A. Schwartz, USA, Commander in Chief, U.S. Forces Korea.

Hearings continue March 22.

MORALE, WELFARE AND RECREATION RESALE SYSTEMS AND PROGRAMS

Committee on Armed Services: Special Oversight Panel on Morale, Welfare and Recreation held a hearing on morale, welfare and recreation resale systems and programs. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Defense: Alphonso Maldon, Jr., Assistant Secretary (Force Management Policy); Maj. Gen. Robert L. Van Antwerp, USA, Assistant Chief of Staff (Installation Management), Department of the Army; Vice Adm. James F. Amerault, USN, Deputy Chief of Naval Operations, Department of the Navy; Lt. Gen. John W. Handy, USAF, Deputy Chief of Staff (Installations and Logistics), Department of the Air Force; Lt. Gen. Jack W. Klimp, USMC, Deputy Chief of Staff (Manpower and Reserve Affairs), Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps; Maj. Gen. Robert J. Courter, Jr., USAF, Director, Defense Commissary Agency; Maj. Gen. Barry D. Bates, USA, Commander, Army and Air Force Exchange Service; Rear Adm. Richard T. Ginman, USN, Commander, Navy Exchange Service Command; Phillip G. Short, USMC (Ret), Director, Personal and Family Readiness Division, Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps; Victor Vasquez, Jr., Deputy Assistant Secretary (Personnel Support, Families and Education); Brig. Gen. Craig B. Whelden, USA, Commander, U.S. Army Community and Family Support Center; Rear Adm. James B. Hinkle, USN, Commander, Naval Personnel Command, Department of the Navy; and Arthur J. Myers, Director, Air Force Services, Department of the Air Force.

TRICARE—REMOVING BARRIERS

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Military Personnel held a hearing on removing the barriers to TRICARE. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Defense: Rudy de Leon, Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness; Sue Bailey, Assistant Secretary, Health Affairs; H. James T. Sears, M.D., Executive Director, TRICARE Management Activity; and Adm. D.L. Pilling, USN, Vice Chief, Naval Operations; Stephen P. Backhus, Director, Veterans' Affairs and Military Health Care Issues, GAO; and public witnesses.

WORLD BANK AIDS PREVENTION TRUST FUND ACT

Committee on Banking and Financial Services: Ordered reported, as amended, H.R. 3519, World Bank AIDS Prevention Trust Fund Act.

REAGAN LEGACY

Committee on Banking and Financial Services: Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy held a hearing on H.R. 3591, to provide for the award of a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to former President Ronald Reagan and his wife Nancy Reagan in recognition of their service to the Nation. Testimony was heard from Representative Gibbons and former officials of the Reagan Administration.

CONCURRENT BUDGET RESOLUTION FISCAL YEAR 2001

Committee on the Budget: Ordered reported the Concurrent Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 2001.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES; CONTEMPT OF CONGRESS REPORT

Committee on Commerce: Ordered reported, as amended, the following bills: H.R. 1089, Mutual Fund Tax Awareness Act of 1999; and H.R. 1954, Rental Fairness Act of 1999.

The Committee also approved a motion adopting a report finding Miles Jones, M.D., in Contempt of

Congress, and directed the Chairman to file the report with the House and to take such action as may be necessary to bring the report before the House for its consideration.

HCFA'S FINANCIAL STATEMENT AUDIT RESULTS

Committee on Government Reform: Subcommittee on Government Management, Information, and Technology held a hearing on the Results of the Health Care Financing Administration's Fiscal Year 1999 Financial Statement Audit. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Health and Human Services: June Gibbs Brown, Inspector General; and Michael M. Hash, Deputy Administrator, Health Care Financing Administration; and Gloria L. Jarmon, Director, Health, Education and Human Services, Accounting and Financial Management Issues, Accounting and Information Management Division, GAO.

AGENT ORANGE

Committee on Government Reform: Subcommittee on National Security, Veterans' Affairs and International Relations held a hearing on Agent Orange: Status of the Air Force's Ranch Hand Study. Testimony was heard from the following officials of GAO: Kwai Chan, Director, Special Studies and Evaluations; and Weisueh Chiu, Project Manager, Agent Orange Study, National Security International Affairs Division; the following officials of the Department of Defense: Joel Michalek, Senior Principal Investigator, Ranch Hand Study; and Richard Albanese, Senior Medical Research Officer, USAF; Robert J. Epley, Director, Compensation and Pension Service Veterans' Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs; and the following officials of the Department of Health and Human Services: Ronald Coene, Executive Secretary, Ranch Hand Advisory Committee, FDA; and David Butler, Study Director, Veterans and Agent Orange Reports, Institute of Medicine; and public witnesses.

OIL PRICE REDUCTION ACT; ADMINISTRATION'S FOREIGN ASSISTANCE REQUEST

Committee on International Relations: Ordered reported, as amended, H.R. 3822, Oil Price Reduction Act of 2000.

The Committee also held a hearing on the Administration's Fiscal Year 2001 Foreign Assistance Request. Testimony was heard from J. Brady Anderson, Administrator, AID, Department of State.

NEW MILLENNIUM—U.S. AND LATIN AMERICA

Committee on International Relations: Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere held a hearing on the U.S. and Latin America in the New Millennium: Outlook and Priorities. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

FAIRNESS IN ASBESTOS COMPENSATION

Committee on the Judiciary: Continued markup of H.R. 1283, Fairness in Asbestos Compensation Act of 1999.

Will continue tomorrow.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Resources: Ordered reported the following measures: H. Con. Res. 89, recognizing the Hermann Monument and Hermann Heights Park in New Ulm, Minnesota, as a national symbol of the contributions of Americans of German heritage; H. Res. 182, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the National Park Service should take full advantage of support services offered by the Department of Defense; H.R. 2958, to provide for the continuation of higher education through the conveyance of certain public lands in the State of Alaska to the University of Alaska; H.R. 3417, amended, Pribilof Islands Transition Act, and H.R. 3671, amended, Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs Improvement Act of 2000.

PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS IMPLEMENTATION ACT

Committee on Rules: Granted, by voice vote, a structured rule providing 1 hour of debate on H.R. 2372, Private Property Rights Improvement Act of 1999. The rule makes in order the Committee on the Judiciary amendment in the nature of a substitute now printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment. The rule makes in order only those amendments printed in the Rules Committee report accompanying the resolution. The rule provides that the amendments made in order may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in the report. The rule permits the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone votes during consideration of the bill, and to reduce voting time to five minutes on a postponed question if the vote follows a fifteen minute vote. Finally, the rule provides

one motion to recommit with or without instructions. Testimony was heard from Representatives Canady, Boehlert, Watt of North Carolina, Jackson-Lee of Texas, Waters and Traficant.

NSF BUDGET AUTHORIZATION REQUEST

Committee on Science: Subcommittee on Basic Research concluded hearings on National Science Foundation Fiscal 2001 Budget Authorization Request, Part III: A View from Outside NSF. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

STANDARDS CONFORMITY

Committee on Science: Subcommittee on Technology held a hearing on Standards Conformity and the Federal Government: A Review of Section 12 of Public Law 104–113. Testimony was heard from Jim Wells, Director, Energy, Resources, and Science Issues, GAO; Belinda Collins, Director, Office of Standards Services, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Department of Commerce; Gregory E. Saunders, Director, Defense Standardization Program Office, Department of Defense; and Richard L. Black, Director, Office of Nuclear Safety Policy and Standards, Department of Energy.

HELPING AGRICULTURAL PRODUCERS

Committee on Small Business: Held a hearing on Helping Agricultural Producers "Re-Grow" Rural America": Providing the Tools. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

U.S. COAST GUARD BUDGET REQUEST

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation held a hearing on the United States Coast Guard Fiscal Year 2001 budget request. Testimony was heard from Representative Stupak; John H. Anderson, Jr., Director, Transportation Issues, GAO; Thomas J. Howard, Deputy Assistant Inspector General, Maritime and Departmental Programs, Department of Transportation; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, Hazardous Materials and Pipeline Transportation approved for full Committee action the following: H.R. 938, to designate the Federal building located at 290 Broadway in New York, New York, as the "Ronald H. Brown Federal Building"; H.R. 1279, amended, to designate the Federal building and United States post office located at 223 Sharkey Street in Clarksdale, Mississippi, as the "Aaron E. Henry Federal Building and United States Post Office"; H.R. 1605, amended, to designate the United States courthouse building located at 402 North Walnut Street and Prospect Avenue in Harrison, Arkansas, as the "J. Smith Henley Federal Building"; H.R. 2412, to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 1300 South Harrison Street in Fort Wayne, Indiana, as the "E. Ross Adair Federal Building and the United States Courthouse"; H. Con. Res. 279, authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the 200th birthday celebration of the Library of Congress; H. Con. Res. 280, authorizing the District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run to be run through the Capitol Grounds; H. Con. Res. 281, authorizing the use of the East Front of the Capitol Grounds for performances by the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts; H. Con. Res. 277, authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby; and H. Con. Res. 278, authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the 19th annual National Peace Officers' Memorial Service.

Joint Meetings

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs concluded joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs on the legislative recommendations of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, after receiving testimony from John W. Smart, Commander-In-Chief, Veteran of Foreign Wars of the United States, Washington, D.C.

NEW PUBLIC LAWS

(For last listing of Public Laws, see DAILY DIGEST, *p. D128)*

H.R. 3557, to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to John Cardinal O'Connor, Archbishop of New York, in recognition of his accomplishments as a priest, a chaplain, and a humanitarian. Signed March 5, 2000. (P.L. 106–175)

H.R. 149, to make technical corrections to the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996. Signed March 10, 2000. (P.L. 106–176)

H.R. 764, to reduce the incidence of child abuse and neglect. Signed March 10, 2000. (P.L. 106–177)

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, MARCH 16, 2000

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, on Chief Information Officer, 10 a.m., 2362–A Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary, on Small Business Administration, 10 a.m., and on FBI, 2 p.m., H–309 Capitol.

Subcommittee on Defense, executive, on Ballistic Missile Defense, 9:30 a.m., H–140 Capitol.

Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, on Department of Energy—Energy Resources and Science, 10 a.m., 2362–B Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Interior, on Geological Survey, 10 a.m., B–308 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, on Howard University and Gallaudet University, 10 a.m., and on Special Institutions for the Disabled; and Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, 2 p.m., 2358 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Military Construction, on Family Housing Privatization outside witnesses, 9:30 a.m., B–300 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government, on IRS, 9:30 a.m., and on Secretary of the Treasury, 2 p.m., 2358 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on VA, HUD and Independent Agencies, on EPA, 9:30 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Committee on Armed Services, Special Oversight Panel on Department of Energy Reorganization, hearing on the National Nuclear Security Administration and implementation of the provisions of Title XXXII, 10 a.m., 2216 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities, hearing on the implementation of the Military Housing Privatization Initiative, utilities infrastructure privatization, and asset management practices of the military departments, 10 a.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Military Procurement and the Subcommittee on Military Research and Development, joint hearing on Air Force programs, 1 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on Banking and Financial Services, Subcommittee on Capital Markets Securities and Government-Sponsored Enterprises, hearing and markup of H.R. 2924, Hedge Fund Disclosure Act, 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Commerce, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing on Assessing the Operation of the National Practitioner Data Bank, 10 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Telecommunications, Trade, and Consumer Protection, hearing on H.R. 3615, Rural Local Broadcast Signal Act, 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Education and the Workforce, Subcommittee on Employer-Employee Relations, hearing on H.R. 3462, Wealth Through the Workplace Act of 1999, 10:30 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Government Reform, Subcommittee on Government Management, Information, and Technology, hearing on "Federal Acquisition: Why are Billions Being Wasted?" 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on International Relations, hearing on North Korea: Leveraging Uncertainty? 10 a.m., 2200 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Africa, hearing on Africa's Energy Potential, 2 p.m., 2200 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, 10:30 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Crime, to mark up the following bills: H.R. 1349, Federal Prisoner Health Care Copayment Act of 1999; and H.R. 3048, Presidential Threat Protection Act of 1999, 2 p.m., 2226 Rayburn.

Committee on Resources, Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, oversight hearing on Fiscal Year 2001 Budget requests for the following Department of the Interior Agencies: Office of Surface Mining, Reclamation and Enforcement; Minerals Management Service; energy and minerals programs of the Bureau of Land Management, and the U.S. Geological Survey, except water resources programs, 1:30 p.m., 1334 Longworth.

Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands, hearing on the following bills: H.R. 2941, Las Cienegas National Conservation Area Establishment Act of 1999; H.R. 3676, Santa Rosa and San Jacinto Mountains National Mountains National Monument Act of 2000; and H.R. 3293, to amend the law that authorized the Vietnam Veterans Memorial to authorize the placement within the site of the memorial of a plaque to honor those Vietnam veterans who died after their service in the Vietnam war, but as a direct result of that service, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Rules, to continue hearings on Biennial Budgeting: A Tool for Improving Government Fiscal Management and Oversight, 9:30 a.m., H–313 Capitol.

Committee on Science, Subcommittee on Energy and Environment, to continue hearings on Fiscal Year 2001 Budget Authorization Request: Department of Energy—Offices of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy; Fossil Energy; and Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology, 2 p.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics, hearing on NASA Fiscal Year 2001 Budget Request for Human Spaceflight, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, to consider the following: H.R. 3903, to deem the vessel M/V Mist Cove to be less than 100 gross tons, as measured under chapter 145 of title 46, United States Code; H.R. 910, San Gabriel Basin Water Quality Initiative; H.R. 1775, Estuary Habitat Restoration Partnership Act of 1999; H.R. 2328, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize the Clean Lakes Program; H.R. 3039, Chesapeake Bay Restoration Act of 1999; Corps of Engineers Survey Resolutions; H.R. 938, to designate the Federal building located at 290 Broadway in New York, New York, as the "Ronald H. Brown Federal Building"; H.R. 1279, to designate the Federal building and United

States post office located at 223 Sharkey Street in Clarksdale, Mississippi, as the ''Aaron E. Henry Federal Building and United States Post Office''; H.R. 1605, to designate the United States courthouse building located at 402 North Walnut Street and Prospect Avenue in Harrison, Arkansas, as the ''J. Smith Henley Federal Building''; H.R. 2412, to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 1300 South Harrison Street in Fort Wayne, Indiana, as the ''E. Ross Adair Federal Building and United States Courthouse''; H. Con. Res. 279, authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the 200th birthday celebration of the Library of Congress; H. Con. Res. 280, authorizing the District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run to be run through the Capitol Grounds; H. Con. Res. 281, a concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the East Front of the Capitol Grounds for performances by the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts; H. Con. Res. 277, authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby; H. Con. Res. 278, authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the 19th annual National Peace Officers' Memorial Service; and other pending business, 2 p.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Aviation, hearing on Aviation Security, focusing on Training and Retention of Screeners, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing on the Department of Veterans Affairs, Loan Guaranty Service, 10 a.m., 334 Cannon.

Committee on Ways and Means, Subcommittee on Human Resources, hearing on H.R. 1488, Compassion for Children and Child Support Enforcement Act of 1999, 11 a.m., B–318 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Social Security, to continue hearings to examine Social Security's readiness for the impending wave of Baby Boomer beneficiaries, 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, executive, hearing on Fiscal Year 2001 Central Intelligence Program Budget, 1 p.m., H–405 Capitol.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

12 Noon, Monday, March 20

Senate Chamber

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

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Thursday, March 16

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Consideration of H.R. 2372, the Private Property Rights Implementation Act (structured rule, one hour of debate).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Ackerman, Gary L., N.Y., E323
Berman, Howard L., Calif., E319
Clyburn, James E., S.C., E323
Conyers, John, Jr., Mich., E321
Cox, Christopher, Calif., E323
Eshoo, Anna G., Calif., E313, E315, E319
Gallegly, Elton, Calif., E323
Gonzalez, Charles A., Tex., E322
Gordon, Bart, Tenn., E320
Graham, Lindsey O., S.C., E313
Lantos, Tom, Calif., E316
McCollum, Bill, Fla., E322
McGovern, James P., Mass., E319
Meek, Carrie P., Fla., E320
Napolitano, Grace F., Calif., E319
Ney, Robert W., Ohio, E321
Norton, Eleanor Holmes, D.C., E313
Pallone, Frank, Jr., N.J., E314
Pascrell, Bill, Jr., N.J., E313, E315, E318, E320
Porter, John Edward, Ill., E315
Rivers, Lynn N., Mich., E322
Schaffer, Bob, Colo., E315
Smith, Adam, Wash., E322

Congressional Record The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed at one time. ¶Public access to the Congressional Record is available online through *GPO Access,* a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. The online database is updated each day the Congressional Record is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d session (January 1994) forward. It is available on the Wide Area Information Server (WAIS) through the Internet and via asynchronous dial-in. Internet users can access the database by using the World Wide Web; the Superintendent of Documents home page address is http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs, by using local WAIS client software or by telnet to swais.access.gpo.gov, then login as guest (no password required). Dial-in users should use communications software and modem to call (202) 512–1661; type swais, then login as guest (no password required). For general information about *GPO Access,* contact the *GPO Access* User Support Team by sending Internet e-mail to gpoaccess@gpo.gov, or a fax to (202) 512–1262; or by calling Toll Free 1–888–293–6498 or (202) 512–1530 between 7 a.m. and 5:30 p.m. Eastern time, Monday through Friday, except for Federal holidays. ¶The Congressional Record paper and 24x microfiche will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, $179.00 for six months, $357.00 per year, or purchased for $3.00 per issue, payable in advance; microfiche edition, $141.00 per year, or purchased for $1.50 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly Congressional Record Index may be purchased for the same per issue prices. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250–7954, or phone orders to (202) 512–1800, or fax to (202) 512–2250. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily Congressional Record is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the Congressional Record.