



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 146

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 28, 2000

No. 36

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 28, 2000.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JUDY BIGGERT to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 1658. An act to provide a more just and uniform procedure for Federal civil forfeitures, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1730. An act to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide that certain environmental reports shall continue to be required to be submitted.

S. 1731. An act to amend the Clean Air Act to provide that certain environmental reports shall continue to be required to be submitted.

S. 1744. An act to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to provide that certain species conservation reports shall continue to be required to be submitted.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 19, 1999, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by

the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) for 5 minutes.

FAILING U.S. SUGAR PROGRAM

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Madam Speaker, today, I would like to bring to the attention of the House the problems with the failing U.S. sugar program. The sugar daddy of corporate welfare is one of the most egregious programs that we have in the Federal Government, and it is now in the process of imploding.

It is a really bad, big government program that is hard to understand in our great government we have here that we continue to have a program that just does not fit in our free enterprise capitalistic economy that we have. It is a program that is bad for the consumer. It is bad for jobs in this country. It is bad for the environment. It is bad trade policy. It just makes zero economic sense.

The way the program works is, the Federal Government kind of acts like OPEC, they want to manage supply to keep the prices high. Now, we are required to allow some sugar to be imported into the United States. The Government has a loan program that they say we will guarantee the price will not drop below this amount or else we will buy the sugar. Well, all of a sudden for the first time in decades, they are on the verge of getting ready to buy a lot of sugar.

As reported in the newspaper this morning, the AP wire service story says "got a sweet tooth? Uncle Sam wants you." The Government is think-

ing about buying 250,000 tons of surplus sugar to pump up the domestic price, but then what will officials do with all the sugar? Enough to fill two-thirds of the Empire State Building. One idea is to donate it overseas; although, no country has indicated they are willing to even take it.

This is just the beginning, as the article goes on to say. We are talking about \$550 million worth of sugar that our agriculture department is going to have to buy this year, and it has no place to even give it away. Wow, do we have an embarrassing situation here in Washington.

The production of sugar has gone up by 25 percent in the past 3 years, because we have this high price. The price of sugar in the United States is three times what it is around the world. You can go across the border into Canada, and it is a third of the price of the United States; or go to Mexico, it is a third of the price of the United States.

What is happening to jobs in the United States? We take companies that use a lot of sugar. Hey, I cannot compete with the Canadian companies that use a lot of sugar. For example, Bobs Candies from Georgia makes candy canes. The candy canes use a lot of sugar, and it is a lot cheaper to produce them in Canada or Mexico or some other place that buys sugar for a third of the price. So we are losing jobs in the country because sugar is used in so many of our different products, whether it is cereal or baked goods.

It is a very costly thing. In fact, the General Accounting Office says it costs over a billion dollars a year extra per year on the consumer, because of the high price we pay for sugar. This is really a regressive program, because the poor pay a lot higher percentage of the total income for the sugar program.

It is bad for the environment. I am from Florida. We are considered to

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H1415

have a real national treasure, the Everglades; and one of the real contributing problems to the Everglades environmentally is the runoff from the sugar plantations in Florida.

Now, we have this high price of sugar. They are growing more sugar in Florida and causing more runoff, and now we are having to buy this sugar from the sugar programs. We are going to spend \$8 billion restoring the Everglades. We are encouraging even more production in the sugar. This is one program that is hard to comprehend how you justify it in our country.

Let us talk about trade issues. When we negotiate trade agreements, what we really want to do is encourage our products to be exported around the world, whether it is orange juice from Florida or airplanes from Boeing or computers or computer software. We want to open up markets so we can sell our products. The problem our negotiators have is that we will go around and say, country, you need to open up your markets for us, as we are talking about China, but do not sell us any sugar, we want to protect our sugar plantations, our sugar barrens in Florida and elsewhere around the country, because we have to protect them; but we want you to let us sell anything we want to your country.

Explain to a trade negotiator how you explain that one away. As Mr. MCCAIN has talked about in campaign finance, this is a poster child for campaign finance. Mr. MCCAIN actually led the effort over in the Senate side to get rid of this program. Mr. Gore came out with his plan.

Sugar is one of the biggest contributors, not only in Washington, it is in Tallahassee. They are claiming poverty, but they are the biggest donors of PAC contributions in the campaign. It is on both sides of the aisle, Republicans and Democrats.

Now, I used to study economics in graduate school. And I know some economics. There is zero way to explain the economics of this. You have let the marketplace happen. We are not a socialistic country. Socialism does not work where the government manages prices, tries to manage production. It does not work, so we have to get rid of a program like this.

I am encouraging my colleagues as this program starts costing us hundreds of millions of dollars, billions of dollars in the government, we cannot afford to continue to allow this. I urge my colleagues to join with me and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) in a bipartisan effort to get rid of the sugar program.

MISTREATMENT OF GAY, LESBIAN, AND BISEXUAL PATRIOTIC AMERICANS

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

JOIN BIPARTISAN EFFORT TO ELIMINATE SUGAR PROGRAM

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I want to begin by expressing my agreement with the comments of the gentleman from Florida. One of the things he called attention to is a very curious publishing phenomenon. I have listened to many of my colleagues who are great supporters of free enterprise and who attribute the virtues of the market of free enterprise to all manner of people, mostly poor and working-class people who look for help. But apparently there is in every free market text ever written, Milton Friedman, Ludwig von Mises, et cetera, a secret footnote that can only be read by people who represent certain agricultural interests, which says to them, this free market stuff is great for poor people and for people who try to work in factories, but it does not apply to agriculture, because by some strange literary feat, the strongest supporters of an unrestrained free market system consistently make an exception for some protected and politically favored parts of agriculture.

I will be voting for the amendment that the gentleman mentioned.

Madam Speaker, I want to talk today about the recent report that was issued by the Inspector General documenting a fact that many of us already knew, and that is that the mistreatment of gay, lesbian, and bisexual patriotic Americans who have tried to serve their country has been one of the most discouraging aspects of this administration's record.

Ordinarily, being able to say "I told you so" makes one feel pretty good. People pretend they do not like to say "I told you so," but most people do. But in this case I say it sadly. I and others have been telling the President and the Secretary of Defense and others that for years now that they were allowing patriotic, honorable young men and women who happen to be gay, lesbian, or bisexual and who were motivated by a desire to serve their country to be mistreated.

I do not fault President Clinton for the adoption of the "don't ask, don't tell" policy; I think he tried very hard to get a better policy. But he is culpable for the fact that once the policy was implemented, he did not effectively compel the military to live up even to the slight improvement it represented. Neither he nor Secretaries of Defense under him, particularly Secretary Perry and Secretary Cohen, have taken it seriously. I must say that I am particularly disappointed in Secretary Cohen from whom I expected more.

For years, we have been telling the Secretary the facts that he now has to acknowledge, because a young man was tragically murdered, a young man who made the mistake of wanting to serve his country in the military, who had a flawless record, and who was tragically murdered by anti-gay bigotry, fostered by the policy of the administration.

Only after that murder could we get the Secretary to say, okay, I will look into this, and he now has to acknowledge what we have been telling him along. But he must understand that part of his own actions have been part of a pattern all along.

When the Navy outrageously violated the privacy of a young man named Timothy McVeigh, a patriotic member of the Navy, and a Federal judge ruled that they had violated his rights, the Defense Department resisted that ruling, sought to appeal it, and had to be overruled by the President, one of the few times that the President did get involved. Even now, in the aftermath of the murder of Mr. Winchell, we have the people at that base where absolute harassment was proven to have happened going unpunished. We had an officer at 29 Palms issue a viciously bigoted e-mail about gay people, and he goes unpunished.

The fact is that the administration cannot pretend that it did not know this was happening, and it certainly has to give a more effective response, even now, with the Inspector General documenting what the Secretary should have known because people have told him this for years, his response is well, I am now appointing a commission and in July, at the end of July, I will consider implementing some corrective steps.

There are things he can do right away, from his own personal involvement to some very specific policies. He has made a few steps. They have paled in insignificance to the kind of bigotry that is still there. Secretary Cohen has been there for over 3 years. Does he want to leave office with only the last couple of months of his stewardship of the Defense Department being a time when he paid serious attention to this?

Let us be clear what we are talking about. Young Americans who happen to be gay, lesbian or bisexual who, in accordance with the policy that is now the law, want to serve their country, and they are treated brutally, unfairly; they are ridiculed, they are threatened, they are physically assaulted, and until now, they have not been able to get protection from the military they have sought to serve.

Secretary Cohen has already waited too long. We cannot undo the terrible mistakes that were made by the Secretary that the President allowed to be made, and the President has an excellent record in confronting prejudice based on sexual orientation. He will get history's good judgment for having helped lead the fight against that prejudice. There is this one flaw.

Madam Speaker, it is not too late in these remaining months of the administration to undo it, and I hope that they will.

MEN AND WOMEN IN THE MILITARY ON FOOD STAMPS IS UNACCEPTABLE

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

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, again, I am on the floor to talk about our men and women in the military on food stamps. I want to start my comments by reading from the ABC show "20/20," June 25, 1999. This was an interview. The title was "Frontlines Food Lines," and I want to read just a few comments. First, I will start with the reporter, Tom Jarriel; and he says, "Military families reelected a huge \$21 million worth of WIC coupons in Defense commissaries last year. Even with that government help, the Millers cannot afford the insurance copayment to have their son's cavities filled."

I further want to quote an interview with David Lewis. David Lewis is a retired warrant officer and his quote is, "I think the biggest problem is that they just don't have enough."

Going back to Tom Jarriel again, the reporter for ABC's "20/20," and he says, "Retired warrant officer David Lewis, a hardened combat veteran of 26 years in the Marine Corps, teaches financial planning to thousands of Marines a year at Camp Pendleton." David Lewis further states, "At first it really bothered me that they did not have enough pride in themselves and I said," quoting David Lewis, "Well, wait a minute. It doesn't have anything to do with pride. It probably took more courage for that kid to get food. It probably took a lot of courage for that kid to say, I cannot take care of my family; I need help."

Tom Jarriel further states, "Lewis calculated that by total hours junior enlisted troops do not even earn minimum wage."

Madam Speaker, I want to read that again.

□ 1245

"Lewis calculated that by total work hours, junior enlisted troops do not even earn minimum wage."

Madam Speaker, that is why I am on the floor today, and I have been once a week ever since we got back in February.

I introduced H.R. 1055, which would help our men and women in uniform on food stamps. I am pleased to say today that there is strong bipartisan support. We have approximately 90 people who have signed this bill. I am encouraging our leadership, as well as the Democratic leadership, to please, let us not leave here in September or October and not speak to those who are serving our Nation, those who are willing to die for this country, that are on food stamps.

To me that is unacceptable. That to me is what I think America stands for, is to help those in uniform who are

willing to give their lives for this country.

What I have before me today is a Marine. This Marine is getting ready to deploy to Bosnia. We seem to be able to find \$9 million to \$10 million for Bosnia. We have already spent \$10 billion to \$11 billion in Yugoslavia. Yet, this cost to pass H.R. 1055 to get a \$500 tax credit for those on food stamps would only cost this government \$59 million over 10 years, roughly \$5 million a year.

I will be the first to say this will not get them off food stamps, but what I will say is that it will say to those in the military who are on food stamps that we in the Congress are concerned about the fact that they are on food stamps and they are willing to die for this country.

I look at the other bills that we pass in the Senate and the House, and we can find billions of dollars in tax credits for Tysons Food to study chicken manure and how this might help with energy problems. I say, let us take care of those first who are willing to take care of America. They are our men and women in uniform who are on food stamps.

I look at this little girl, Megan is her name. She is standing on the feet of her daddy. Do you know what, that serious look that she has, she is looking at a camera. In his arms he has his daughter Brittany. I am thinking about Megan. She does not know this at her age, but her daddy might not come back. He might not come back. He is willing to give his life for this country.

This Marine represents all of our military in both Air Force, Navy, Army, and Coast Guard that are willing to serve this Nation.

Madam Speaker, I hope that our leadership, working together with the Democratic leadership, will see that we do something to help men and women in uniform on food stamps. I want to close my comments by sharing with you and the other Members here on the floor today a simple poem but I think a very powerful poem that was written by a Marine, Father Dennis O'Bryan, United States Marine Corps.

His poem goes like this:

It is the soldier, not the reporter,
Who has given us freedom of the press.
It is the soldier, not the poet,
Who has given us freedom of speech.
It is the soldier, not the campus organizer,
Who has given us the freedom to demonstrate.
It is the soldier who salutes the flag,
It is the soldier who serves beneath the flag.

Madam Speaker, it is the soldier whose coffin is draped by the flag who allows the protester to burn the flag.

Madam Speaker, I close by saying to the leadership in the House, please, let us pass this legislation to help those men and women in uniform on food stamps.

LIVABLE COMMUNITIES IN VIRGINIA

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, this week there is a meeting in Norfolk, Virginia, of the unsung heroes of the efforts to promote Virginia's livability, the town planners and the citizen volunteers who are on the front lines doing one of the hardest jobs in terms of coping with the problems of growth and development and sprawl in Virginia, but sadly, they have fewer tools than almost any State in the country.

They know what to do, but despite those efforts, the State of Virginia has had unbalanced growth over the course of the last 15 years. The 1990s were a disaster. There was a failure in 1990 to adopt minimal State planning goals that would have helped provide form and direction.

In 1995, the legislature in Virginia overwhelmingly defeated Virginia's Strategic Planning Act. Today we have a State administration that is asleep at the switch, and a legislature that is not helping the people of Virginia. There is no tie-in between their transportation investments and land use. There is certainly a head-in-the-sand attitude regarding paying the bill.

Even if you are one of those people who still feel that we can pave our way out of traffic congestion, and that number is a smaller and smaller number across the country, because community after community has proven that we do not have enough concrete to pave our way out of congestion, but even if one believes that, in the State of Virginia there is no plan to deal with over \$50 billion of transportation investments that are conservatively required over the course of the next 20 years.

The Virginia Department of Transportation, VDOT, which is behind the curve as it relates to many of the transportation agencies around the country, was seriously damaged in the 1990s. There were ill-conceived programs of downsizing which ended up having a number of people who were terminated as retired, only to be hired back at higher salaries afterwards to try and move transportation projects along.

But I am pleased to say that there are some signs that things are happening in Virginia on the right side of the equation. First and foremost is that the citizens at the grass roots level are pushing back. There is increasing concern about unplanned growth.

In Loudon County we saw a sweep of eight smart growth candidates into county office, four Democrats, two Republicans, two Independents. It was a broad bipartisan effort to try and get back in control of their community.

There were other electoral wins in Fairfax, Prince William, in Stafford, in towns and cities across Virginia.

In the city of Suffolk there is an integrated comprehensive plan and zoning to direct growth towards designated areas that can handle it. The highly respected Mason-Dixon poll in March showed that growth is the number one issue in the Shenandoah Valley. Even the conservative newspaper, the Richmond Times Dispatch, has had a 180-degree change recently, and recently editorialized on behalf of planning smarter.

Madam Speaker, Virginia has given much to this country, the home of Thomas Jefferson, of George Washington. It was a leader in the democratic institutions for the entire world.

It is my hope that their Governor and that their legislature will stop denying the problem, will work with us in Congress, will work more importantly, with people at the grass roots level, all working as partners for livable communities. If they are willing to do so, to deal with those planners, with those citizen volunteers, with simple, commonsense steps and structure to make the planning process work better, Virginia communities will in fact be more livable and all our families can be safer, healthier, and economically secure.

MANY CENSUS QUESTIONS TOO INTRUSIVE

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Madam Speaker, there are too many curiosity questions on the Census long form. Right now, on the average, one out of every six citizens of the United States that are sent the census long form are asked questions that take almost 25 minutes to fill out, very personal questions, very intrusive questions.

What we have been investigating and looking at is should there really be a \$100 fine if you refuse to answer all of those personal, intimate questions. It asks all sorts of information that the government does not need to know, such as the number of rooms in your house, when it was built, where your water and utilities come from, how much they cost, how much you paid for your house, the number of cars, telephones, bathrooms you have, how much insurance you carry on the contents of your home.

It asks about your education, the time you leave for work, how you get there, your health, your job. This is simply excessive, and I am suggesting a couple of things.

Number one, I suggest that there should not be a \$100 fine if you fill out the pertinent information. This was put in our United States Constitution so every 10 years we could have a new

count of the number of individuals in the United States so we could reapportion congressional districts for the 435 Members of Congress.

It was not the intent that we expand this to allow an administration, a bureaucracy, a Washington group to pursue all kinds of personal information that they might want to know sometime about you.

We are suggesting that if you fill out the forms and that if you fill out the number of people and their names, in essence, the questions on the short form, there should not be any fine, or any fine that would exceed \$5 or \$10.

I think with our new technology in this country, with the ability of government to know so much about us, knowing what doctors we go to, when we go to the doctor, for what reason we are going to the doctor, where we buy, what kinds of goods, where we travel, the danger is a government that, out of curiosity, would like to know more than they really need to know about our individual lives.

I am saying that we need to totally review the Census form. I hope the information that came out yesterday, that a Federal judge in Texas has said that there should be no prosecution for any individual that does not fill out the rest of the long form and those intrusive questions, is correct.

In the meantime, I think it is time that this body and the United States Senate, along with the administration, re-evaluate its intrusiveness. It is bad enough that we are taking 41 cents out of every dollar the average American makes in local, State, and Federal taxes. It is worse when we start getting into their lives, their bedrooms, to try to have the kind of information that we think we need to know to make that kind of policy decision.

It is time we slowed down the intrusiveness of the Federal government. It is time that Americans started asking their Representatives in Congress, in the United States Senate, I include in that, and their potential next President their position on this issue.

AMERICA'S HEALTH INSURANCE INDUSTRY FAILS INDIVIDUALS 55 TO 64

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, I would just like to mention, in response to the comments of my friend, the gentleman from Michigan, that we could take care of these problems of what he calls intrusive government in the Census by allowing sampling, which is what many people on this side of the aisle have suggested, Census sampling, where we find out by taking some 10,000 or 20,000 or 50,000 or whatever number of people and find this information out and extrapolate it to the rest of the country, which every com-

pany and every government agency and every political candidate has done for years in terms of polling and all of that.

Madam Speaker, our health insurance system fails many Americans, no group more so than individuals age 55 to 64. There are 3.4 million Americans in this age range who are uninsured, the fastest growing segment of the uninsured population. Some of them were blind-sided when their employer terminated retiree health coverage. Others are self-employed or work for firms that do not offer health insurance.

Regardless of the reason behind their situation, the prospects of buying individual insurance in the individual market are grim. Only individuals enrolling directly from an employer-sponsored health plan are guaranteed access to private coverage. Companies can and do deny access to self-employed individuals and those whose employer does not offer coverage.

Even if an individual is lucky enough to be guaranteed access to a health plan, she is not guaranteed an affordable rate. As a matter of fact, she can bank on being quoted a rate so high it takes her breath away.

The purpose of health insurance is to pool risk, not to avoid it. The fact that individuals nearing retirement are priced out of the insurance market underscores how far our system has strayed from that basic tenet. Individuals 55 to 64 have entered a period in their lives when health insurance is particularly important, yet 3 million of them cannot secure coverage in the private health insurance market.

If this problem sounds familiar, there is a reason. Before Medicare, 60 percent of Americans 65 and older were uninsured. The public demanded that the Federal government step in when it became clear that insurers would not willingly cover these individuals.

Our challenge now is to help individuals 55 to 64. As long as health insurers can pick and choose those whom to enroll and whom to exclude, as long as they are permitted to use medical underwriting, rate increases, and skillful marketing to cream-skim, to weed out those they do not want to insure, as long as insurers can avoid those most in need of health care protection, there will always be significant gaps in our health insurance system.

□ 1300

It is one of realities this Nation faces in the absence of universal coverage. Eventually, the public will get tired of weak-kneed politicians and incremental strategies and the U.S. will implement that universal medical coverage. Until then, it makes sense to expand programs that work and to help those in most need of coverage.

That is where the Medicare Early Access program comes in. This week the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK), the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. THURMAN) and I will introduce revised legislation based on last year's

Early Access bill. The new version provides tax credits to help more individuals 55 to 64 to buy into Medicare or to purchase COBRA continuation coverage.

The mechanisms for providing more individuals age 55 to 64 coverage has not changed. Our bill would enable people 62 to 64 and displaced workers 55 to 64 to pay premiums to buy into Medicare. It would require employers who drop previously promised retiree coverage to allow early retirees with limited alternatives to have access to COBRA continuation coverage until they reach age 65 and, thereby, qualify for Medicare.

To make these initiatives more affordable, this legislation would establish tax credits equal to 25 percent of the premium for participants in the Medicare buy-in and individuals eligible for COBRA coverage. Our legislation provides uninsured individuals between 55 and 64 an opportunity to buy into Medicare since the private market surely has failed them. And it restores some measure of fairness to individuals who have paid for employer-sponsored retiree coverage paycheck after paycheck only to have it terminated when they actually need it.

Some individuals perceive of Medicare expansion as a backdoor means of establishing universal coverage. Expanding Medicare is not a backdoor means of moving towards universal coverage. I would say we are using the front door. Medicare works. We need universal coverage, and if expanding Medicare will help us put an end to the inefficient, gap-ridden patchwork of private and public health plans we are living in now, then I am all for it.

The United States needs universal health coverage. Nothing short of that can assure security, fairness, or economic efficiency. We need a system that does not discriminate against the very individuals that it is supposed to protect. Until we get there, it makes sense to take this step.

CINCINNATI'S SAINT XAVIER BRINGS HOME ANOTHER STATE CHAMPIONSHIP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) is recognized during morning hour debates for 3 minutes.

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, Cincinnati's Saint Xavier High School went to Columbus over the weekend and returned home with the Ohio State Division 1 basketball championship.

Our hardest congratulations go out to Coach Scott Martin and all the players whose hard work and dedication made it possible. Their families, their fans, and their community are very proud of them.

Saint X's victory marked the school's second State title this year. Just last month, the Bomber swim team also notched the State champion-

ship. It has been quite a year for one of Cincinnati's top schools and a stalwart in the GCL.

Madam Speaker, as a graduate of rival LaSalle High School, I must admit I am slightly envious. Hopefully, next year my Lancers will be back on top. But in the meantime, I tip my hat to the scholar athletes from Saint X.

On a sad note, players and students learned Sunday that assistant principal and teacher of some 30 years, Tom Meyer, who was known as Saint Xavier's number one basketball fan, had succumbed to cancer just a few hours after his favorite team won the title. Knowing he was near death, the players had specially made warm-up suits designed to honor their friend, Mr. Meyer, as they made their final run at the State championship. The back of the shirts had the following message, each of them: "May his pain be comforting knowing that he has touched the lives of so many. Thank you, Mr. Meyer, for carrying your cross for us." A very touching message for a man loved by many.

To all the Bomber players and coaches and families and friends, our hardy congratulations. And to the family of Saint X's number one fan, Tom Meyer, our most sincere condolences.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

O God our help in ages past, our hope for years to come, to You we commend ourselves as Your servants and fit instruments to accomplish Your holy will on this day You have given us. Without You, we can do nothing. With Your guidance and grace, we can accomplish great things, because You alone are holy and good. In You, we find wisdom and power. To You alone belongs the glory.

Bless this assembly today. On this new day, bless Your servant whom You have called to minister to the Members of this House. Fill all of us with Your Spirit of love, forgiveness and peace.

May our prayers be broad and deep. May our words spring forth from hearts purified by Your spirit and our actions manifest Your power taking root in us. In all we say and do, may we grow in awareness that You alone live and reign forever and ever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. 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. Will the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

THE EDUCATION SAVINGS AND SCHOOL EXCELLENCE ACT OF 2000

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, this week the House is considering H.R. 7, the Education Savings and School Excellence Act of 2000.

For years, we have watched as our education quality has gone way below the standards set by other nations. For example, the U.S. 12th graders currently test among the lowest among the industrialized nations in math and science.

If our Nation is to continue setting the standard for the rest of the world in science, research, and technology, then we must take steps now to help ensure that each child learns to their maximum ability.

Mr. Speaker, this education savings account will allow a Roth-type IRA for investment to help assure the best possible education for academic tutoring, for books, for fees, computers, special education services and other education need.

I understand Vice President GORE has now supported tax credits, tax deductions for contributions that will go into political campaigns, but he has denied support for this bill that allows families to have some kind of tax incentive for savings to help assure the best possible education.

CENSUS BUREAU 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 Census Bureau is literally out of control. Check this out: Reports now say that the Census Bureau is, quote/unquote, willing to sacrifice a true head count of American citizens for more personal detailed information. Unbelievable. Forms with questions about your bank account, your cars, how many bathrooms you have, your job. What is next, Congress, your sex life?

The Constitution mandates a simple head count by a Census taker, not an audit by some bureaucratic intrusive nincompoop. I yield back the manipulations of both American citizens and our great Constitution by the Census Bureau.

COMMEMORATING THE LIFE OF
LON FOLGER, JR.

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

Mr. BURR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the memory of a great man, Mr. Alonzo Folger, Jr., of Rockingham County, North Carolina, who passed away this morning. Lon was the son of one of my predecessors and the nephew of another.

His father, Alonzo Folger, Sr., represented the 5th District of North Carolina from 1939 to 1941, and his uncle, John Folger, represented the district from 1941 to 1949.

Lon Folger was a family man, an attorney, a community leader, a political activist, and a friend to many. I will never forget the support he, a leading Democratic figure in North Carolina, gave me, a Republican, when I ran for Congress in 1994. Lon not only supported me in that election but, from that time until his death, he was always willing to serve as an adviser to me on many issues we dealt with here in Congress.

Lon Folger was the type of person whose word was his bond. A handshake could be counted on to be a valid written contract. Lon was honest and forthright. He was fair in his dealings with people, even those who he disagreed with.

Lon was a leader in his community and, over the years, involved himself in numerous efforts to make his hometown, Madison, North Carolina, a better place to live. He could always be counted on to answer the call when there was a need, and he consistently devoted his time and energy to helping others.

If we are fortunate enough in our lifetimes, we have the occasion to cross paths with a handful of very special people who teach us and are willing to help us understand where they have been before us. Lon Folger was that type of special friend for me, and I will always be grateful for the opportunity to have sought his counsel, knowing that I could trust his judgment.

I extend my sympathy to his wife Elizabeth and to the rest of the family on their loss. Lon Folger's death is a loss not only for his family but for the community and the State he loved so much, and he will certainly be missed by all who knew him.

INTERNATIONAL ABDUCTION

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

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to tell the story of Robert Marquette and his children, Ben and Rhea. Their story is the ninth in a series of 1-minutes on more than 10,000 children who have been taken, abducted, to foreign countries.

In 1997, Robert Marquette's ex-wife, Rose Marie Marquette, abducted Ben and Rhea from Irving, Texas, and took them to Germany. Although Robert's home was named as the primary residence, Robert subsequently filed a Hague Convention petition through the State Department. His petition was heard by a German judge who violated the Hague Convention by refusing to return Ben and Rhea. He has filed numerous appeals, but they have all been denied.

On June 15 this year, it will be 3 years since Robert has seen his children or spoken with them. The German authorities refuse to tell him where they are.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to help me reunite parents with their children and to support the resolution that I introduced, along with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), which urges signatories to uphold the Hague Convention on the civil aspects of international child abduction. We must bring our children home.

MISGUIDED LEGISLATION ON
ILLEGAL GAMBLING

(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, legislation has been introduced in this Congress that calls for preempting the State laws of Nevada and closing down legal sports wagering entities.

Certainly the problem of illegal gambling and the results of illegal gambling are serious and must be addressed by this Nation. However, banning the highly regulated and closely supervised legal sports betting located in Nevada is not the solution.

According to FBI experts, the strict regulations on sports betting in Nevada have helped law enforcement officials in their efforts to stop illegal sports betting. Mr. Speaker, legislation banning legal sports' wagering is simply not the solution to stopping illegal betting.

I have introduced H.R. 3800, which calls for the U.S. Justice Department to analyze illegal sports gaming and make recommendations in combating it. Enforcement of our current laws is the solution, outlawing a law that enforces these laws is not a solution.

SUCCESS IN AMERICA BEGINS IN
THE CLASSROOM

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, every American child has a right to a quality education. Yet our education system, as a whole, has been failing to deliver, particularly to minorities.

For example, 63 percent of nonurban fourth graders can read at a basic level, while only 43 percent of urban fourth graders can meet the same standards. And the dropout rate for African American students is about 15 percent, while the Hispanic student dropout rate is between 30 and 35 percent.

Republicans believe educational opportunities should be the same for all children regardless of race, religion, or economic background. That is why I support H.R. 7, the Education Savings and Excellence Act. This legislation helps parents put aside money tax free for their children's education. This money may be spent on tuition, a computer, or even a tutor. Best of all, 76 percent of all the children who will benefit from the ESAs currently attend public schools.

Success in America begins in the classroom. Let us give all children an opportunity to achieve the American Dream. Let us pass H.R. 7.

EDUCATION SAVINGS ACCOUNTS

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

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago we approved legislation which allows parents to put aside \$500 each year in education savings accounts, where the money can be invested in order to grow tax free and where it can be added to each year so that it can grow enough to help pay for college tuition.

Ever since we managed to get education savings accounts enacted into law, we have been trying to raise the amounts parents are allowed to put into their children's accounts each year. We have been trying to extend education savings accounts so that parents, grandparents, or other interested parties will be able to use them to prepare for private or parochial, elementary or high school expenses.

If a family were able to put \$2,000 in an education savings accounts every year, from the time a child was born, and if the account averaged 7½ percent interest annually, it would hold \$14,500 by the time the child got to 1st grade. If nothing were withdrawn and annual savings continued, that amount would rise to \$46,500 when it was time for high school.

President Clinton vetoed an extension of education savings accounts last September, but I am confident that most of us in the House think parents should be encouraged to save for their kids' futures and that is why we are going to try again.

U.S. MINT'S DENIGRATION OF FOUNDING FATHER IN ADVERTISEMENT PROGRAM SHOULD BE STOPPED

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

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to take issue with the United States Mint's misguided decision to denigrate our Founding Father in their current advertisements promoting their new \$1 coin.

□ 1415

A current television advertisement campaign has an image of George Washington dancing in a night club. And here is an ad from last Sunday's Washington Post which shows George Washington with two drinking women. Here is one from last Thursday in the same newspaper, the Washington Post, which shows George Washington with the phrase, "Change Happens."

Now, we all know the origin of this phrase, blank happens, and it is disgusting. I can say with complete certainty that our first President would not approve of this portrayal of himself.

And it gets worse. The Mint has initiated a \$45 million advertising campaign of which this is a part. That is the taxpayers' money. These funds come directly out of the Treasury Department's budget. I am quite sure this money could be spent on more productive activities.

Mr. Speaker, it is no wonder many of today's youth have little or no knowledge of our Founding Father and first President, George Washington. This type of treatment by our own Government agencies only goes to further denigrate the image of one of our greatest citizens, and this advertising campaign should be halted immediately.

SOCIAL SECURITY EARNINGS LIMIT

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues have heard of eliminating the Social Security earnings penalty. Well, we are finally doing it today.

It has been a long fight for our seniors, but today we are going to vote to end the Social Security earnings penalty.

The gentleman from Texas (Chairman ARCHER) has been working on that issue since 1973, and I have been working on it since I got in the Congress in 1991.

Our seniors deserve the right to work without being penalized by the Federal Government. Senior Americans are diligent, experienced, productive; and they want to work without the fear of losing their Social Security benefits.

This country was built by Americans of all ages who labored to realize their dreams. We have always rewarded work in America; and it is high time we rewarded, not penalized, our seniors for their hard work.

CONGRATULATING UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN MEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to extend my congratulations to the University of Wisconsin's men's basketball team on their first Final Four appearance in 59 years. The Badgers got to the Final Four by winning the Western Regional in the NCAA Tournament over the past 2 weeks.

Led by head coach Dick Bennett, the Badgers pulled off three upsets in a row to make it to the Final Four. The Badgers' style of play proves that defense wins basketball games.

Wisconsin may not be known for having the best athletes in the tournament, but they advanced with a patient and disciplined offense, a tenacious man-to-man defense, and a great deal of heart and perseverance.

The Wisconsin Badgers have exceeded many people's expectations in getting to the Final Four this year. In fact, along with the North Carolina Tar Heels, they are the lowest seed to reach the Final Four since 1986.

Wisconsin's tournament wins can be credited in part to the defensive pressure of Mike Kelley, the three-point sharp shooting of Jon Bryant, and the great front court offensive play of Andy Kowske.

Wisconsin faces a tough assignment on Saturday when we go up against the Michigan State Spartans. I wish the Wisconsin Badgers the best of luck in Indianapolis this weekend in their quest to bring Wisconsin its first championship since 1941.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PETRI) laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, which was read and, without objection, referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC, March 21, 2000.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed are copies of resolutions adopted on March 16, 2000 by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. Copies of the resolutions are being transmitted to the Department of the Army.

With kind personal regards, I am,
Sincerely,

BUD SHUSTER,
Chairman.

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 27, 2000.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on March 27, 2000 at 4:30 p.m. and said to contain a message from the President whereby he transmits a semiannual report on payments to Cuba related to telecommunications services.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

JEFF TRANDAHLL,
Clerk of the House.

PERIODIC REPORT ON NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO UNITA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

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

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), I transmit herewith a 6-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the National Union for the Total Independence of Angola (UNITA) that was declared in Executive Order 12865 of September 26, 1993.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON,
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 27, 2000.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 27, 2000.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on March 27, 2000 at 4:29 p.m. and said to contain a message from the President whereby he transmits a 6-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to UNITA/Angola.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely,

JEFF TRANDAHL,
Clerk of the House.

PERIODIC REPORT ON TELECOMMUNICATIONS PAYMENTS MADE TO CUBA PURSUANT TO TREASURY DEPARTMENT SPECIFIC LICENSES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

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

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 1705(e)(6) of the Cuban Democracy Act of 1992, 22 U.S.C. 6004(e)(6), as amended by section 102(g) of the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity (LIBERTAD) Act of 1996, Public Law 104-114, 110 Stat. 785, I transmit herewith a semiannual report "detailing payments made to Cuba . . . as a result of the provision of telecommunications services" pursuant to Department of the Treasury specific licenses.

WILLIAMS J. CLINTON,
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 27, 2000.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Any record votes on postponed questions may be taken after debate is concluded on all motions to suspend the rules but not before 6 p.m. today.

SAN GABRIEL BASIN WATER QUALITY INITIATIVE

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 910) to authorize the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers and in coordination with other Federal agency heads, to participate in the funding and implementation of a balanced, long-term solution to the problems of groundwater contamination, water supply, and reliability affecting the San Gabriel groundwater basin in California, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 910

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 "San Gabriel Basin Water Quality Initiative".

SEC. 2. SAN GABRIEL BASIN RESTORATION.

(a) SAN GABRIEL BASIN RESTORATION.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF FUND.—There shall be established within the Treasury of the United States an interest bearing account to be known as the San Gabriel Basin Restoration Fund (in this section referred to as the "Restoration Fund").

(2) ADMINISTRATION OF FUND.—The Restoration Fund shall be administered by the Secretary of the Army, acting through the Chief of Engineers (in this Act referred to as the "Secretary"). The Secretary shall administer the Fund in cooperation with the San Gabriel Basin Water Quality Authority, or its successor agency.

(3) PURPOSES OF FUND.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the amounts in the Restoration Fund, including interest accrued, shall be utilized by the Secretary—

(i) to design and construct water quality projects to be administered by the San Gabriel Basin Water Quality Authority and the Central Basin Water Quality Project to be administered by the Central Basin Municipal Water District; and

(ii) to operate and maintain any project constructed under this section for such period as the Secretary determines, but not to exceed 10 years, following the initial date of operation of the project.

(B) COST-SHARING LIMITATION.—The Secretary may not obligate any funds appropriated to the Restoration Fund in a fiscal year until the Secretary has deposited in the Fund an amount provided by non-Federal interests sufficient to ensure that at least 35 percent of any funds obligated by the Secretary are from funds provided to the Secretary by the non-Federal interests. The San Gabriel Basin Water Quality Authority shall be responsible for providing the non-Federal amount required by the preceding sentence. The State of California, local government agencies, and private entities may provide all or any portion of such amount.

(b) COMPLIANCE WITH APPLICABLE LAW.—In carrying out the activities described in this section, the Secretary shall comply with any applicable Federal and State laws.

(c) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER ACTIVITIES.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect other Federal or State authorities that are being used or may be used to facilitate the cleanup and protection of the San Gabriel and Central groundwater basins. In carrying out the activities described in this section, the Secretary shall integrate such activities with ongoing Federal and State projects and activities. None of the funds made available for such activities pursuant to this section shall be counted against any Federal authorization ceiling established for any previously authorized Federal projects or activities.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Restoration Fund established under subsection (a) \$85,000,000. Such funds shall remain available until expended.

(2) SET-ASIDE.—Of the amounts appropriated under paragraph (1), no more than \$10,000,000 shall be available to carry out the Central Basin Water Quality Project.

SEC. 3. PERCHLORATE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in cooperation with Federal, State, and local government agencies, is authorized to participate in studies and other investigative activities and in the planning and design of projects determined by the Secretary to offer a long-term solution to the problem of groundwater contamination caused by perchlorates.

(b) INVESTIGATIONS AND PROJECTS.—

(1) BOSQUE AND LEON RIVERS.—The Secretary, in coordination with other Federal agencies and the Brazos River Authority, shall participate under subsection (a) in investigations and projects in the Bosque and Leon River watersheds in Texas to assess the impact of the per-

chlorate associated with the former Naval "Weapons Industrial Reserve Plant" at McGregor, Texas.

(2) CADDO LAKE.—The Secretary, in coordination with other Federal agencies and the Northeast Texas Municipal Water District, shall participate under subsection (a) in investigations and projects relating to perchlorate contamination in Caddo Lake, Texas.

(3) EASTERN SANTA CLARA BASIN.—The Secretary, in coordination with other Federal, State, and local government agencies, shall participate under subsection (a) in investigations and projects related to sites that are sources of perchlorates and that are located in the city of Santa Clarita, California.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the purposes of carrying out the activities authorized in this section, there is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary \$25,000,000, of which not to exceed \$8,000,000 shall be available to carry out subsection (b)(1), not to exceed \$3,000,000 shall be available to carry out subsection (b)(2), and not to exceed \$7,000,000 shall be available to carry out subsection (b)(3).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI) each will control 20 minutes.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, who is the principal author of this legislation and the driving force behind it.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by saying first, I serve on the Committee on Rules, and it is a great thrill to stand here suspending the rules for consideration of this very important legislation.

I want to congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, my very good friend, whom I supported in his quest for Whip 2 decades ago; and also the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), the very distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment; along with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI), the ranking minority member of the subcommittee.

Also, I would like to point to several of my colleagues from the San Gabriel Valley, the gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ), who is here and who, in fact, reminded me of an event out in California that they came to him and talked to him about introducing this legislation, and I am very pleased that he has played a key role in helping to make this possible; our colleague, the gentleman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO), who joined in cosponsoring; and also a very important driving force behind this legislation has been my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROGAN), with whom I share representation of the City of Pasadena, which is in the San Gabriel Valley.

We are here for consideration of some legislation that is very, very important not just for Southern California; but, in fact, for the rest of the Nation.

I see the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), my colleague from the Committee on Rules, here on the floor. He is very concerned about the discovery of perchlorates in groundwater, and it poses a very serious threat to many parts of the country. So this legislation is not simply geared towards dealing with the problem that has developed in Southern California but for the entire Nation.

During the 1950s and 1960s, when we were in the midst of our buildup which allowed us to win the Cold War, there were many companies which legally, and I underscore the word "legally," dumped spent rocket fuel; and, in so doing, it has created problems which have just recently come to the forefront.

I will say that we found that the threat of contaminated water in Southern California could affect literally millions of people. Literally millions of people could be affected by this.

And so, a very strong consensus plan was put together among those in Southern California who deal with the water issue. I am pleased that, in looking at that consensus plan, that we were able to come up with legislation which is designed to provide \$75 million for the cleanup and then a very important \$25 million to deal with research into ways in which we can ensure that this problem will not expand in other parts of the country.

And so I will say that I know that this very important environmental legislation will enjoy strong bipartisan support, as has been evidenced by those who serve on the committee of jurisdiction and other members from around the country who I know are strongly committed to this.

I want to say that I believe we should move this as expeditiously as possible. This is, in fact, a public-private partnership. I believe that those who are responsible for dumping this spent rocket fuel should be responsible. But unfortunately, many of those businesses which are responsible are no longer in operation. And so that is why we have had to step up to the plate and take on part of this responsibility.

Now, we could have embarked on a big load of litigation. But would those lawsuits do anything to clean up the groundwater contamination, the threat that those perchlorates have? No.

And so that is why the responsible thing for us to do is to say to those businesses which are still in existence, like Arrowjet and other companies, that they need to shoulder part of this responsibility. But at the same time, when we have businesses that are no longer there, to make sure that we have clean drinking water in Southern California and in the rest of the Nation, it is important for us to again step up to the plate and take on the responsibility of cleaning it up and making sure that we do not have a threat that is posed.

And so I am pleased with the very, very strong support that we have en-

joyed on this legislation. I hope very much that we will be able to move it through both bodies. And while there was early indication that the Army Corps of Engineers and the White House was less than supportive on this, I am convinced that President Clinton will want to join this strong bipartisan coalition and lend his support for this very important measure.

I again thank my very good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI), and the leadership of their committee and the subcommittee for the expeditious way in which they have moved this very responsible legislation.

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

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

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, the San Gabriel Basin is facing a serious water quality and public health problem. The groundwater aquifer underlying this basin has been contaminated with a variety of hazardous substances, threatening the primary water supply of over 1.5 million people in Southern California.

There is also evidence that this contamination may be spreading to the surrounding aquifers that supply drinking water for a majority of the residents of Los Angeles County.

I want to commend the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), our distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules; the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO); the gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ); and the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN), a valuable member of our committee; and the entire area delegation for bringing this matter to the attention of the committee and for their efforts to address the cleanup of contaminated groundwater in the San Gabriel Basin.

The bill we are considering today would authorize the creation of a restoration fund to approve water quality within the basin. Monies from this fund could be used by the Secretary of the Army in conjunction with local water quality authorities to construct, operate, and maintain projects within the San Gabriel Basin.

□ 1430

This legislation would authorize funding for the design, planning, and construction of water quality projects in the Central Basin region of California. It is envisioned that these projects would be helpful in halting the spread of perchlorate contamination into the neighboring aquifers.

Mr. Speaker, portions of the San Gabriel Basin have been designated as a Superfund site. That program assigns liability for cleanup costs to responsible parties. Nothing in this bill affects the application of Superfund's liability provisions to the recovery of

the Secretary's costs under this bill. As the committee report clearly states, nothing limits the authority of the United States to pursue remedial action and to recover its costs from responsible parties, including the costs of work performed under this bill. I fully expect the Secretary of the Army to exercise his fiduciary responsibilities and recover expenditures made under this bill from responsible parties where such costs are recoverable under Federal or State law.

Finally, this bill would include within the existing studies, investigations and projects on perchlorate contamination an authorization that certain amounts be used to address contamination at designated sites in Texas and California. These projects are authorized to develop new and innovative solutions to the problem of groundwater contamination caused by perchlorates. I want to commend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. EDWARDS) and our committee colleagues the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SANDLIN) for their work on behalf of this provision.

I urge an "aye" vote on this bill.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), the distinguished chairman of our Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding me this time.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 910, a bill to clean up groundwater contamination and protect water supply in the San Gabriel and Central Basins in California.

Let me start out by first acknowledging the super efforts of the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), chairman of the Committee on Rules, who brought this matter to our attention. He has been a leader in this effort. I also wish to acknowledge the area's bipartisan delegation, including the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD), both of whom serve on the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. There are a whole lot of people responsible for the success we are going to enjoy today, none more important than the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) the chairman of the full committee and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) the ranking Democrat as well as my partner, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI).

Contamination of the groundwater in the San Gabriel Basin was first detected back in 1979. EPA placed the valley on the Superfund's national priorities list in 1984. Here we are 16 years later with very little progress.

At its hearing on this legislation last fall, the Subcommittee on Water Resources and Environment learned that

contamination from the San Gabriel Basin has already spread into the adjacent Central Basin aquifer. This groundwater contamination now threatens the drinking water for half of Los Angeles County. That is totally unacceptable.

Under H.R. 910, the Federal Government would assist the San Gabriel Water Quality Authority in conducting groundwater cleanup projects, and we provide \$75 million for that purpose. We also authorize \$25 million for investigation into solutions to groundwater contamination caused by perchlorate, a component of rocket fuel. As has been said so eloquently by previous speakers, this is a must-do bill; and we should put it on a fast track.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ), a Member representing the San Gabriel area and one who worked very hard on this bill.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle today in support of H.R. 910, the San Gabriel Basin Water Quality Initiative introduced by my good friend and San Gabriel Valley neighbor, the chairman of the Committee on Rules the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER).

It is refreshing to sponsor and cosponsor legislation which not only crosses party lines but is also strongly supported by environmentalists, local government, and business. It is a bill that came together because of the people who were concerned in that area in an effort to try to avoid costly lawsuits and long litigation.

Since contaminants were discovered in the San Gabriel Valley water supply some 20 years ago, there has been a concentrated effort to find a solution that equitably distributes the responsibility for the pollution while removing the contaminants from our water supply as quickly as possible.

The rocket fuel contamination is a by-product of Federal contract work. For years the Federal Government contracted with local firms to produce greatly needed aircraft and rocket parts. Unknown to any at the time, this production led to the leakage of rocket fuel and other substances into the aquifer, polluting the area's groundwater supplies. There is no question that the groundwater in the San Gabriel Valley is contaminated. Over one-quarter of the 366 water supply wells in the San Gabriel Valley have been contaminated, affecting approximately 1.4 million residents of the greater part of Los Angeles County. Much of the water pollution is a product of Federal contract work. These pollutants are rapidly making their way underground into the Central Basin of Los Angeles County.

I strongly support H.R. 910, the San Gabriel Basin Water Quality Initiative. H.R. 910 addresses the importance of researching rocket fuel contamination and aims to stop the spread of contami-

nation in an economical and time sensitive manner. It is time for the Federal Government to catch up with the others in the San Gabriel Basin in assuming responsibility for its actions. Eleven potentially responsible parties have voluntarily agreed to contribute over \$200 million in cleanup expenses. While this funding will cover a large portion of the cleanup, Federal funds are necessary to ensure cooperation by the potentially responsible parties and act as an immediate solution to an ever growing problem.

Although there are still many hurdles to overcome in saving our water supply, the time for Federal action is now. The primary responsible parties in the San Gabriel Basin have demonstrated their commitment to saving the region's groundwater with their checkbooks. They are doing it with their checkbooks. It is time for the Federal Government to use this broadly supported bill as an opportunity to do the same.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. HORN), a member of our committee.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) for this. The gentleman from Pennsylvania chairs the most bipartisan committee in this House and Members can tell how both sides, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI), and the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) have come together and moved this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation we consider today is absolutely essential. H.R. 910, the San Gabriel Basin Water Quality Initiative, will help restore vital groundwater resources in California where up to 3 million have lost or are in danger of losing access to critical groundwater reserves in our area. H.R. 910 is the key to fixing this problem.

The bill is a product of local cooperation that should be also an example to other areas of the country. Faced with a difficult and expensive problem, the local stakeholders have come together to restore and maintain groundwater for millions of people. H.R. 910 authorizes the closure of a small but critical gap in funding needed to accomplish this goal.

Here in Congress, this bill is also a product of cooperation as I noted earlier. The gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, has forged a bipartisan coalition to support this bill. If a real cleanup is going to occur in California or elsewhere, it requires the level of cooperation demonstrated in H.R. 910.

Let us pass this model pilot program. If this program is successful, many parts of our Nation will soon follow. Vote for H.R. 910.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO), a prime sponsor of the bill.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I am so happy that I am hearing the support, the bipartisan support for this measure, and I am also here to join as an original cosponsor of this measure. I would like to also thank my good friend and respected colleague the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) for offering this legislation and helping it move quickly through the House.

I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI) and others from the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for understanding the importance of this particular area of contamination in California that has affected a lot of us that live and work in those areas.

The San Gabriel Basin Water Quality Initiative is of critical importance to the people of my district. Those water aquifers, the underground streams running through the San Gabriel Valley which supply drinking water to 1.4 million people, have been known to be contaminated with volatile organic compounds for over two decades.

I have been working on this issue and trying to bring it to some kind of closure since I served on the local city council and managed to get a water coalition and been following its non-progress. Then in the past 3 years, perchlorate and other dangerous chemicals related to rocket fuels have also been found in that water. The contamination is seeping below the spreading grounds at Whittier Narrows and into my district. Volatile organic compounds have seeped from the San Gabriel Basin into the Central Basin and it comes down into my area, a large underground water system that provides water for an additional 1.5 million people in Montebello, Pico Rivera, Whittier, Santa Fe Springs, Norwalk, Long Beach, and other communities.

H.R. 910, the San Gabriel Basin Water Quality Initiative, provides the way and the means by which Federal, State and local government agencies and private business can collectively work towards a timely cleanup of the important San Gabriel and Central water basins, and will also serve as my colleagues have heard as an example of how aquifer contaminants can be addressed and effectively implemented to clean up.

Since it was a Federal Government defense contract that led to the introduction of the perchlorate and other rocket fuel related chemicals into our groundwater, I believe that the Federal Government has its share of responsibility and should take a role in helping clean up the contaminated area that threatens our communities.

This legislation will help more than 3 million people in our county that trust the water that flows from their tap.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS).

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to work with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) today.

I rise in support of H.R. 910, the San Gabriel Basin Water Quality Initiative. I commend not only the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT) but also the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) for bringing this legislation to the floor in such a quick and expedited manner.

H.R. 910 is sponsored by my colleague the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER). I believe it provides a national model for protection of our Nation's water supply from perchlorate. Perchlorate is an inorganic chemical used to manufacture solid rocket fuel and other explosives. I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER) for his assistance in addressing this important conservation issue in a part of my district which also impacts the entire Brazos River Corridor in Central Texas by adding funding to the study of perchlorate contamination originating from the former Naval Weapons Industrial Reserve Plant in McGregor, Texas.

With this funding, the Brazos River Authority and the Corps of Engineers will be able to carefully assess the extent of perchlorate contamination in this very critical watershed. By doing so, they will not only protect the drinking water of Central Texas but will also protect the Brazos Basin from Waco to the Gulf of Mexico.

I am grateful to my colleagues in the Brazos Basin including the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the majority whip; the gentleman from Texas (Mr. COMBEST); the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY); and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), all of whom have united in requesting this provision. Texans are proud to join with our colleagues from not only California but also other areas of the country in creating a national model for addressing this threat of perchlorate.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. ROGAN).

Mr. ROGAN. Mr. Speaker, first I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for yielding me this time.

I rise today in strong support of H.R. 910, the San Gabriel Basin Water Quality Initiative. In the Southern California area, like much of the West, water is possibly the most precious commodity for local cities. However, in parts of my district and in water tables throughout the Los Angeles Basin, contamination as a result of industrial runoff has become a serious threat to public safety.

In 1984, this water basin was designated a Superfund site. The problem continues.

□ 1445

Today, cleanup is vital, and it is imperative that government act at all levels.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 910 is supported by a bipartisan coalition interested in protecting the environmental resources in and around the Los Angeles area. This legislation will establish the San Gabriel Basin Restoration Fund that will be comprised of a unique partnership of State, local and Federal funding sources.

Our measure will authorize \$75 million over 5 years and set aside \$25 million for research and development of treatment programs to ensure that the mistakes of the past are not the mistakes of the future. This bill will improve the quality of the environment in the San Gabriel Basin region and will put the resources of the Federal Government behind local environmental experts.

Even more significant is the opportunity to make the San Gabriel Valley Water Quality Initiative a test case for similar programs around the country. The Los Angeles area faces unique challenges, but by uniting these officials, we are confident that these challenges can be met and the environment protected. What is more, the San Gabriel Water Quality Initiative can serve as a model for similar areas when they confront cleanup of underground contamination.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the chairman of the Committee on Rules, for his incredible leadership on this bill and in bringing it before the committee.

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

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, this is a powerful piece of environmental legislation, and I strongly urge its support.

Mr. Speaker, I commend our esteemed colleague from California, Congressman DAVID DREIER, for his leadership on this important environmental legislation.

Ground water contamination was discovered in the San Gabriel Basin in 1979. EPA placed this area on the Superfund national priorities list in 1984. Although this basin provides drinking water to 1.4 million people, EPA is only now getting around to addressing the contamination at this site.

To make matters worse, in 1997, perchlorate was discovered in the groundwater. Perchlorate is a component of rocket fuel and is very difficult to treat.

And just this past year, the local community received even more devastating news: The contamination from the San Gabriel Basin has spread into the Central Basin aquifer that provides drinking water for half of Los Angeles County.

On a bipartisan basis, the representatives of the San Gabriel Valley and the Central Basin, led by Representative DREIER, worked with the local community to develop a solution to this problem. I commend their efforts and congratulate them on this legislation.

I also would like to thank the committee's ranking Democratic member, Congressman JIM OBERSTAR, as well as Subcommittee Chairman BOEHLERT and Congressman BOB BORSKI for their help in moving this important legislation forward.

Under the solution advanced by the local community and their congressional delegation, the Army Corps of Engineers will help the local community work with the State and the business community to build water treatment projects that will stop the spread of contamination and protect their water supplies.

These treatment plants will accelerate the cleanup of the San Gabriel Basin in advance of EPA's cleanup schedule. This effort also should reduce the overall cost of the cleanup because it is a lot cheaper to keep groundwater from getting contaminated than it is to clean it up.

This assistance should lead to a true public-private partnership for addressing an historic contamination problem of enormous magnitude.

As we looked at this matter, we also discovered that perchlorate contamination is a national problem, particularly at facilities that have manufactured or tested solid rocket fuels for the Department of Defense or NASA.

To address this, H.R. 910 authorizes \$25 million for research into solutions to groundwater contamination caused by perchlorate.

Again, I congratulate the sponsor of this legislation and urge all Members to support H.R. 910.

Mr. GARY MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 910, the "San Gabriel Basin Water Quality Initiative." The San Gabriel Basin supplies drinking water for almost one and a half million people in Southern California. It is a valuable natural asset whose management is vital for all who depend on it.

H.R. 910 encourages the input of local industry and businesses, community and environmental leaders and government officials from the local, state and federal levels. Instead of costly litigation to punish or shield from liability, H.R. 910 provides incentives for these groups to participate in clean up and management efforts for ground water and water sources affecting the San Gabriel Water Basin.

One of the greatest obstacles to ground water clean up is the economic cost incurred by private industry and the controlling government authorities. This bill addresses this problem by authorizing funding for technology research that will allow for more cost-effective clean up. Beyond this effort, it also provides for technology development that will help maintain cleaner groundwater systems.

As our population continues to grow, it is important that we protect our groundwater resources against pollution. H.R. 910 provides \$25 million dollars in research funding to study ways to prevent future groundwater contamination in areas, like the San Gabriel Basin, which supply drinking water. Through this research private industry and government agencies will have better resources to devise water management plans for future development.

I believe that this bill provides us with a model for future clean up efforts around the country. It maintains the groups already involved in the clean up while empowering those who have vested interests in this clean up effort. I would like to thank the Chairman of the Rules Committee for his efforts in constructing this legislation, and urge Members of this House to support H.R. 910.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PETRI). The question is on the motion

offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 910, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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. 910.

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

There was no objection.

E. ROSS ADAIR FEDERAL BUILDING AND UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (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".

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2412

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

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The Federal building and United States courthouse located at 1300 South Harrison Street in Fort Wayne, Indiana, shall be known and designated as the "E. Ross Adair Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Federal building and United States courthouse referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "E. Ross Adair Federal Building and United States Courthouse".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) and the gentleman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE).

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2412 designates the Federal building and United States courthouse in Fort Wayne, Indiana as the "E. Ross Adair Federal Building and United States Courthouse."

Edwin Ross Adair was born in 1907, attended public schools and graduated from Hillsdale College and the George Washington University Law School. Adair volunteered as a lieutenant in World War II and was awarded battle stars for the Normandy, Northern France, Ardennes, Rhine and Central European campaigns. Congressman

Adair was first elected to the 82nd Congress and served for 20 years in the United States House of Representatives. He became the ranking member on the Committee on Foreign Affairs and was active on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and on the Committee on Committees.

After his service in the United States House of Representatives, President Nixon appointed Adair ambassador to Ethiopia, and he served as ambassador until 1974.

This is a fitting honor for this dedicated public servant. I fully support this bill, and I urge all of my colleagues to support it as well.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2412 is a bill to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse in Fort Wayne, Indiana, as the "E. Ross Adair Federal Building and United States Courthouse."

Congressman E. Ross Adair served his country and his State with bravery and distinction for almost his entire life. He was a dedicated teacher, decorated war hero, conscientious civil servant and diplomat. He served in the House of Representatives for 20 years, from 1951, the year that I was born, until 1971, representing the citizens of the 4th District of Indiana. In 1972, President Nixon appointed him as ambassador to Ethiopia, where he was posted until 1974. In 1976, Adair served on the Indiana State Privacy Commission, and in 1976 he was appointed to President Ford's reelection campaign. He was active in many civic organizations as well as in his church.

Mr. Speaker, it is fitting and proper to acknowledge the accomplishments of Congressman Adair with this designation. I support H.R. 2412 and urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

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

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER), the prime sponsor of the legislation.

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor for me today to be here with this bill to name the Federal building and U.S. courthouse in Fort Wayne, Indiana, my hometown, after northeast Indiana's longest serving Congressman, E. Ross Adair. He served 20 years in the district, getting elected the year I was born in 1950, and served until 1970, when he was appointed ambassador to Ethiopia.

It is also with great personal satisfaction that I have the honor of doing this, because as a young political activist, when I was still at Leo High School and moving to Indiana Purdue University at Fort Wayne, my first campaign

was in Ross Adair's 1968 reelection effort when redistricting had put two Congressmen into the same district. The group that we developed was at that time the second largest youth group ever put together in the country, and as my colleagues can see from this old poster, E. Ross Adair was not necessarily who one would think would attract a lot of young people. In fact, one of my friends, Lauren Smith, did a campaign for Winston Prouty, a Senator in Vermont, and Winston Prouty dressed up in all of these fancy clothes and it said, do we elect Winston Prouty because he is a swinger? You open it up and it says, no, it is because he does a good honest job of representing the people of his district.

That is what E. Ross Adair did, and that is why many, 2,000 young people got involved in that youth campaign to elect him and he won a very close and, quite frankly, unexpected victory in 1968. This particular poster, I collect a lot of Indiana memorabilia, and it is in the 1952 campaign when he still had hair. He lost his hair not too many campaigns after that, as politics is prone to do.

Let me give my colleagues a little bit of his bio. He was born in Albion, Indiana, a small town northwest of Fort Wayne in 1907 to parents Lue and Alice Adair. His mother and father were both educators. His father was a school superintendent and newspaper editor and his mother a school teacher. That newspaper, by the way, still exists in Albion. Ross's parents emphasized the importance of education and encouraged him to be an avid reader. In fact, the family home contained one room solely dedicated to books, which later became the first lending library in Albion. Albion now has one of the most beautiful small-town libraries in the country.

After attending public schools in Noble County, he attended Hillsdale College in Michigan, receiving an AB degree in history in 1928. He was an active member of the debate team, served as fraternity president, was selected to receive a Rhodes Scholarship. But, instead of going abroad, he chose to attend George Washington University School of Law here in Washington from which he received a law degree in 1933. When he was not studying, he actually served as a Capitol Hill police officer, a very honorable profession. In 1934 at age 28, he returned to Indiana to teach history in Noble County before devoting himself full-time to the practice of law in Fort Wayne.

In addition to practicing law, he was a lecturer, giving commencement and holiday addresses. His father was proud of his son, describing him as a country boy living a good and clean life in the city.

Adair later serving as probate commissioner in Albion County until he volunteered on September 15, 1941, to serve in the Army as a second lieutenant in the U.S. Officers Reserve. As my

colleagues have heard, he received multiple medals, five battle stars for Normandy, Northern France, Ardennes, Rhine, and the Central European campaigns during World War II.

After the war, he returned to Indiana to first serve again as Allen County probate commissioner and the practice of private law and began political networking, starting his political campaign first as GOP city chairman in Fort Wayne and later as a precinct committee man. In 1950 at the age of 43 he announced his candidacy for the Republican 4th District Congressman. The Adair campaign became a family affair, run by the Adair Family Enterprise, Incorporated. The partnership included Ross's wife, Marian; the two Adair children, Carol, age 11, and Stephen, age 7. The children were common fixtures at political events, passing out campaign literature and urging folks to vote for their dad.

Marian, who is 92 years old and who is watching us on television today, was a dynamo, not only in that campaign and all the campaigns afterwards, but later in Washington; and she is still quite the organizer even at 92. His granddaughter, Amy Adair Horton, is my legislative director, continuing the Adair tradition here in Washington.

His early campaign themes focused on honesty, decency, economy in government, and a definitive foreign policy to not unduly jeopardize American servicemen and that would promote just and lasting peace; and he won that election over incumbent Congressman Ed Kruse.

In 1951 he began serving 20 years, and nobody else in our district has ever served more than 10. Ross' first office was in 433 Cannon, then called the "Old House Building." Back then, Members received \$12,500 annually and had a total of only three to six staff members. Even in 1968, when I was helping his campaign, he had one part-time staff person, Rosemary Hillis, in the district office and added a full-time staff person in 1969, Al Harvey, for field work. That shows my colleagues how much it has changed.

He was elected president of the 82nd Club, which consisted of the 45 Republicans who were elected in 1950. He also wrote to the student newspaper at Indiana Purdue in Fort Wayne in 1953 about his daily professional responsibilities:

"The average Congressman works diligently. We maintain unusual office hours and many times are called upon to attend business or social affairs in the evening. It is not infrequent for us to take material home with us at night to study in preparation for the next day's work. It is a very active and varied life. This is a matter of handling the correspondence and dealing with problems of the people in our district as representatives, in addition to studying legislation and attending meetings of committees. The latter occupies an important place in the life of a Congressman, as legislation is stud-

ied and many times redrafted by the committees of the House and Senate."

In 1959 he sent a postcard: "When you elect a man to Congress, actually you send a family to represent you. This is my family at our home in Washington. Please let us know if we can be of service in any way, either at home or in Washington."

Despite being from the Midwest, the home of isolationism, he began building a professional expertise in foreign affairs and began his assignment to the House Committee on Foreign Relations.

At the same time, his wife, Marian, was honing her diplomatic skills socially. In 1959 Mrs. Adair organized and founded a program designed to give hospitality and special interest activities to wives of foreign diplomats. Her earlier organization of six international clubs between 1953 and 1957 grew to 170 members who were spouses of Congressmen, diplomats and government and business officials. These clubs were described in Congressional Quarterly as places where "first names and small talk made for pretty good foreign relations."

In 1962 he toured Asia, meeting with high-ranking officials in Taiwan, Pakistan, and Turkey to gauge their loyalty to the West and opposition to the Communist menace in Asia. South Vietnam, he thought, was in trouble because Communist infiltration could not be stopped.

He was also selected as a delegate to the annual sessions of the Interparliamentary Union in 1959, 1963, 1964, and 1965.

During his congressional service, he rose to ranking Republican member on House Veterans by 1966 in the Committee on Foreign Affairs and was also in the Committee on Committees.

Some of his legislative victories, including ushering President Nixon's major proposals on pollution control, introducing legislation to provide tax incentives for voluntary efforts to curb pollution, and assisting the city of Fort Wayne in obtaining funds for storm sewers. He also introduced and helped pass the Peace With Justice resolution, a resolution condemning the treatment of American prisoners of war by the North Vietnamese Communists and a bill to implement President Nixon's plan to curb plane hijacking. He also led efforts which he bragged about in every campaign to slash millions of dollars of wasteful foreign-aid spending.

He lost his final campaign in 1970, but Senator Hruska paid a final tribute to him by saying, "Ross Adair made his mark as a Congressman's Congressman, quiet, hard-working and effective. One of the great things about Adair was his ability to conciliate differences and effect agreements between bitter political enemies."

After his departure from Congress, President Nixon appointed Adair as U.S. ambassador to Ethiopia, a post he held until 1974, just before the Ethio-

pian revolution erupted, deposing American ally, His Majesty, Haile Selassie.

□ 1500

Thereafter, he returned to Indiana, where he continued his practice as a senior partner in the law firm of Adair, Perry, Beers, McAlister, and Mallers.

He was also tapped in 1976 by former Governor Otis R. Bowen to serve on the Governor's Privacy Commission, and he also served on an advisory committee for President Ford's re-election campaign.

Ros Adair received honorary Doctor of Laws degrees from Indiana University of Technology in 1964 and from Indiana University in 1982. He was a member of the Southgate Masonic Lodge, Forest Park Methodist Church, Mizpah Temple, and Scottish Rite Cathedral. In 1966, he received the 33rd Degree, the highest honor in Scottish Rite. He died in Fort Wayne in October of 1983.

I have also received a few letters from some of his long-time friends I want to read.

"Ross Adair spent most of his adult life in service to his country and its citizens. He was a lawyer, soldier, Representative, ambassador. It seems fitting that a Federal building be named to honor his service and his loyalty."

That was from Susan Prickett, the wife of his longtime chief of staff. She edited the Albion paper after her husband died, and she passed away just a few months ago. I was hoping she would be able to see us name this building. I am glad we got to put her tribute in the RECORD.

Orvas Beers, his longtime law partner, cousin, and close friend, wrote "I am writing in support of this legislation to designate the Federal building after E. Ross Adair. I think this is a great idea.

"National recognition of our former congressman and United States Ambassador to Ethiopia is long overdue. He dedicated well over 20 years of his life to public service in both Congress and as ambassador. His accomplishments . . . were outstanding. His integrity and statesmanship are unmatched. Ross was among the finest Congressmen ever to represent Northeast Indiana. As a former law partner of Ross, and former chairman of the Republican party of Allen County, I am proud to have known him and worked for his elections.

Ross Adair's word was as good as his name. He meant what he said, and said what he meant. A handshake and his word closed many solid agreements. He served our country during a time when political machines were a big part of how this Nation functioned. Yet, Ross's honesty and integrity were never questioned. He was a fine man. Republicans and Democrats alike were well represented by Ross Adair."

Ken Meyers writes that E. Ross Adair will finally get the recognition he deserved. He tells a story. He was a Republican County Chairman of Steuben

County, a county to the north of Fort Wayne, in 1950.

He said, at the time Ross was nominated he was not familiar “outside Allen and Noble Counties—but not for long. His sincere friendly campaigning won him the nomination and election in November.

“E. Ross Adair represented all the people in the district; Republican, Democrat, or Independent received the same attention and consideration. On important legislative matters he was in constant contact with his constituents. He read and studied the legislation before the House.

“One personal incident proved to me that he did his ‘homework.’ A popular piece of legislation was before the House that would be beneficial to his district. Ross voted against it. As county chairman, I questioned his vote. His reply was, ‘Ken, a last-minute amendment was attached to it that made it unacceptable.’ When he explained what the amendment was and what it would do, I was proud he was our Congressman.

“The election in 1958 was an indication of his popularity in Steuben County. Statewide, the 1958 election was a disaster for Republicans in Indiana. Ross was roughly 1,100 votes behind until little Steuben County’s 1,400 plurality sent him back to Washington, where he remained for 12 more years.

“E. Ross Adair’s morals and integrity were of the highest. I have often wondered what our country would be like if all 535 Members of Congress and yes, the President, too, had the same level of morals, integrity, and dedication as E. Ross Adair.”

Walter Helmke, a longtime State Senator, father of the immediate past mayor of Fort Wayne and son of the former district chairman and congressional candidate, wrote, “Congressman Adair served the Fourth Congressional District with high distinction . . . having been elected 10 times to the office of Fourth District Representative. I knew him well during the entire 20-year period that he served. He was always responsive to his constituents, and, I believe, represented the sentiments and beliefs of his constituents to an extraordinary degree.

“During 8 of the 20 years that Ross served as Congressman, I served as Prosecuting Attorney of Allen County, and had occasion to call on him for assistance and information a number of times. He always provided me with assistance and support without hesitation.

“After his distinguished career in the United States Congress, he ably served the United States government as the U.S. ambassador to Ethiopia until the emperor of Ethiopia was deposed.”

The last letter I would like to read is from Marta Gabre-Tsadick. She is the only female senator to have ever served when Haile Selassie was head of Ethiopia. She writes, “We at Project Mercy,” a project that continues today based and working out of Fort Wayne

to help those impoverished people who need health care and other things in Ethiopia, “wholeheartedly support this initiative to commemorate a man who not only gave 20 years of his life to serving his country as Congressman, but reached international boundaries as a great Ambassador to Ethiopia. His service there impacted all African countries through his interaction with the Organization of African Unity, headquartered at Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. We are grateful for his service.

“In retrospect, I can think of no one who has contributed more to this area, or anyone who could possibly deserve this honor more than our mutual friend and mentor, E. Ross Adair.”

When Haile Selassie fell, roughly one-third of the senate in Ethiopia came to Fort Wayne, Indiana, because Ross Adair meant to them America, and where freedom was. I and many others heard the stories of peoples’ heads being chopped off and watching their kids die. Ross Adair represented the values, as do so many of our ambassadors, of America abroad, not only here in this Chamber.

It is a tremendous honor and distinction for me today to be the United States Congressman from the Fourth District to sponsor this bill to have our Federal building and courthouse named after E. Ross Adair.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PETRI). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2412.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

AARON E. HENRY FEDERAL BUILDING AND UNITED STATES POST OFFICE

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1279) to designate the Federal building and the United States post office located at 223 Sharkey Street in Clarksdale, Mississippi, as the “Aaron E. Henry Federal Building and United States Post Office,” as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1279

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

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The Federal building and United States courthouse located at 236 Sharkey Street in Clarksdale, Mississippi, shall be known and designated as the “Aaron E. Henry Federal Building and United States Courthouse”.

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United

States to the Federal building and United States courthouse referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the “Aaron E. Henry Federal Building and United States Courthouse”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) and the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE).

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

Mr. Speaker, this bill, H.R. 1279, as amended, designates the Federal Building and United States Courthouse located in Clarksdale, Mississippi, as the Aaron E. Henry Federal Building and United States Courthouse.

Dr. Henry was born in Clarksdale, Mississippi, in 1921, and attended local schools. He served in the United States Army, after which he returned to school and earned a degree in pharmacy from the Xavier University in 1950.

In 1953, Dr. Henry organized the local branch of the NAACP, and served as the State NAACP president from 1960 until 1993. He was instrumental in creating an integrated political system in Mississippi. He also participated in the Freedom Rider Movement, which led to the passage of the public accommodations sections of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

In 1979, Dr. Henry was elected to the Mississippi House of Representatives, and held this office for 2 additional terms.

The naming of this Federal complex is a fitting tribute to a distinguished African-American. I support the bill. I urge the passage of this bill, and I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1279 is a bill to designate the Federal building in Clarksdale, Mississippi, as the Aaron Henry Federal Building and United States Courthouse.

Dr. Aaron Henry was a civil rights pioneer, a thoughtful mentor, scholar, and great humanitarian. He led an active, committed, exemplary life.

After attending local public schools, he joined the Army in 1942 and was a veteran of World War II. After the war, he attended and graduated from Xavier University in New Orleans. In 1953, Dr. Henry organized the Coahoma County Branch of the NAACP, and served as the State NAACP president from 1960 to 1993.

During the 1960s, he participated in the Freedom Rider Movement and in the Mississippi Freedom Summer’s nonviolent campaigns of public protest.

Dr. Henry served on numerous boards, such as the Executive Committee of the NAACP, the Federal Council on Aging, and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. Acknowledging his contributions as a

civil rights leader in 1979, the citizens of Coahoma County elected him to the Mississippi House of Representatives, where he was reelected in 1983 and 1987.

Dr. Henry was instrumental in securing passage of legislation that created the Office of Economic Opportunity, and was a strong advocate and spokesman for the Job Corps and Head Start.

Dr. Henry was an active member of the Haven United Methodist Church, serving as its lay leader. He was committed to his community and educational and civic issues throughout his life.

It is most fitting and proper that we support the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) and honor the great contributions of Dr. Henry. I urge passage of this bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate our colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON), for bringing this important legislation to the floor of the House.

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

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON), the sponsor of this bill.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, today is a very special day for me. Today we will vote on the passage of H.R. 1279, a bill to rename the Federal Building and Post Office in Clarksdale, Mississippi, after one of Mississippi's most notable pioneers in the civil rights movement, Dr. Aaron E. Henry.

I might add that I have known Dr. Henry all of my adult life. Until his untimely death, Dr. Henry served as a role model for all of us in the State of Mississippi and the country as a whole for those who believed in fair play and justice.

Dr. Henry's role in the civil rights movement is well documented. His role in the political arena in the State of Mississippi is well documented. His legacy lives on.

Many of us could not, as early public officials, go on TV locally. Dr. Henry, through his efforts, challenged the license of local stations in order for African-Americans to buy time on TV. His legacy is one that we all are proud of.

Mr. Speaker, as the sponsor of this legislation and also the Representative of Clarksdale, Mississippi, I am happy to see this legislation move forward. I am happy to see the bipartisan support that it has received. I look forward to the passage of this bill.

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

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

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to be able to join the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) and all of the others who are supporting this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I first saw Aaron Henry in action in the 1960s, in the battle within the Democratic Party, and at the convention of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party for Equality and for Integration.

In the early 1970s, I had the opportunity to work with him in Mississippi as part of what we called the Mississippi-Michigan Alliance. It was an effort to spark registration within Mississippi, and to try to make sure that all voices there were heard.

During those joyful days that I spent with him at his home with his beloved family and at his drugstore on Fourth Street, I had the chance to come to know him firsthand.

Aaron Henry had a dream, a dream of an integrated America, a dream where everybody counted. He lived to achieve that dream. He lived a life of good works. He was instrumental in the founding of the NAACP in Mississippi. He also, as we know, as we have heard, ran for office in Mississippi and was elected to the House of Representatives, which was a proud day for Mississippi.

Aaron Henry came a good long way in his life, and America has come a considerable way on that path of an integrated America because of the likes of Aaron Henry. Today we take another step along that path. I am honored to join the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE).

Mr. Speaker, I close by just briefly referring back to what I had the chance to enter into the RECORD after the passing of Aaron Henry.

□ 1515

I said at that point, "Hopefully, his native State will mourn him across its cities and its farms. He was born in its rural land, toiled in one of its important towns, and journeyed it throughout from border to border. His legacy is his hopefulness. The task now of his beloved State, of his beloved Nation, and of all of us who loved him is to keep his faith and continue his battle."

Today, with the naming of the building in Clarksdale in his honor, it is another small step in the battle that involved and really enmeshed the life of Aaron Henry.

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY) for yielding me this time, and I thank and congratulate the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) for sponsoring this bill.

Mr. Speaker, there are many ways to mark a Nation's milestones. Naming a public building for Dr. Aaron Henry is one such way for me.

I first met Aaron Henry in 1963 when, as a law student and member of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Com-

mittee, I went into the delta in Mississippi to work in the civil rights movement one summer. The civil rights movement had circled the South, but had not penetrated the "Black Belt" deep in the Mississippi Delta.

I met the President of the NAACP at the time, Aaron Henry. To be President of the NAACP in Mississippi was itself an act of conspicuous courage. It marked a man, both as a marked man and a brave man.

The next year I graduated from law school and became one of the lawyers that summer for the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party, of which Aaron Henry was the chairman. I went to my files and discovered the brief I filed before the Credentials Committee on behalf of Aaron Henry and the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party to be admitted into my party, the Democratic Party, on behalf of these Mississippi citizens.

What Aaron Henry and the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party did is itself a milestone in the Nation's history, because it assured that both parties would now be open to delegates of all races.

Aaron Henry lived such a life to go from the very outside as the head of the NAACP, all the while a working pharmacist in his own drugstore in Clarksdale, to becoming a member of the Mississippi House of Representatives. From the NAACP and civil rights leader, fighting words, in Mississippi, to representative of the people of Clarksdale, Mississippi.

When I went back to Mississippi a number of years later as Chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Aaron Henry had become a true insider. Aaron Henry arranged for a reception for me sponsored by the Governor in the Governor's mansion. Mr. Speaker, when I first met Aaron Henry, the closest he and I could get to the Governor's mansion was to picket it.

Aaron Henry had gone from challenger to change-maker and had himself created much of the change in the State of Mississippi.

He lived to see a peaceful revolution occur in his State, including his own election to the State legislature. All of this was simply unthinkable in the Mississippi in which Aaron Henry was born in 1922. So was naming a building for Aaron Henry.

But naming a Federal building by this body is normally an estimate of the man. However, the Aaron E. Henry Federal Building and Post Office is likely to be regarded as far more than that. The naming of a building for Dr. Henry evokes a milestone in the history of Mississippi and of our country. The triumph of racial struggle and harmony over racial segregation and division. There is no better way, no better person to symbolize this progress than Aaron Henry.

Ms. BERKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PETRI). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1279, as amended.

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

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 236 Sharkey Street in Clarksdale, Mississippi, as the 'Aaron E. Henry Federal Building and United States Courthouse'."

A Motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LATOURETTE. 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 materials on H.R. 2412 and H.R. 1279, as amended, the measures just considered.

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

There was no objection.

CONGRATULATING THE PEOPLE OF TAIWAN FOR SUCCESSFUL CONCLUSION OF PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS AND REAFFIRMING UNITED STATES POLICY TOWARD TAIWAN AND PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res 292) congratulating the people of Taiwan for the successful conclusion of presidential elections on March 18, 2000, and reaffirming United States policy toward Taiwan and the People's Republic of China, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 292

Whereas section 2(c) of the Taiwan Relations Act (Public Law 96-8) states "[t]he preservation and enhancement of the human rights of all the people on Taiwan" to be an objective of the United States;

Whereas Taiwan has become a multiparty democracy in which all citizens have the right to participate freely in the political process;

Whereas the people of Taiwan have, by their vigorous participation in electoral campaigns and public debate, strengthened the foundations of a free and democratic way of life;

Whereas Taiwan successfully conducted a presidential election on March 18, 2000;

Whereas President Lee Teng-hui of Taiwan has actively supported the consolidation of democratic institutions and processes in Taiwan since 1988 when he became head of state;

Whereas this election represents the first such transition of national office from one elected leader to another in the history of Chinese societies;

Whereas the continued democratic development of Taiwan is a matter of funda-

mental importance to the advancement of United States interests in East Asia and is supported by the United States Congress and the American people;

Whereas a stable and peaceful security environment in East Asia is essential to the furtherance of democratic developments in Taiwan and other countries, as well as to the protection of human rights throughout the region;

Whereas since 1972 United States policy toward the People's Republic of China has been predicated upon, as stated in section 2(b)(3) of the Taiwan Relations Act, "the expectation that the future of Taiwan will be determined by peaceful means";

Whereas section 2(b)(6) of the Taiwan Relations Act further pledges "to maintain the capacity of the United States to resist any resort to force or other forms of coercion that would jeopardize the security, or the social or economic system, of the people of Taiwan";

Whereas on June 9, 1998, the House of Representatives voted unanimously to adopt House Concurrent Resolution 270 that called upon the President of the United States to seek "a public renunciation by the People's Republic of China of any use of force, or threat to use force, against democratic Taiwan";

Whereas the People's Republic of China has consistently refused to renounce the use of force against Taiwan;

Whereas the State Council, an official organ at the highest level of the Government of the People's Republic of China, issued a "white paper" on February 21, 2000, which threatened "to adopt all drastic measures possible, including the use of force," if Taiwan indefinitely delays entering into negotiations with the People's Republic of China on the issue of reunification; and

Whereas the February 21, 2000, statement by the State Council significantly escalates tensions across the Taiwan Straits and sets forth a new condition that has not heretofore been stated regarding the conditions that would prompt the People's Republic of China to use force against Taiwan: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That—

(1) the people of Taiwan are to be congratulated for the successful conclusion of presidential elections on March 18, 2000, and for their continuing efforts in developing and sustaining a free, democratic society which respects human rights and embraces free markets;

(2) President Lee Teng-hui of Taiwan is to be congratulated for his significant contributions to freedom and democracy on Taiwan;

(3) President-elect Chen Shui-bian and Vice President-elect Annette Hsiu-lien Lu of Taiwan are to be congratulated for their victory, and they have the strong support and best wishes of the House of Representatives and the American people for a successful administration;

(4) it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the People's Republic of China should abandon its provocative threats against Taiwan and undertake steps that would lead to a substantive dialogue, including a renunciation of the use of force against Taiwan and progress toward democracy, the rule of law, and protection of human and religious rights in the People's Republic of China; and

(5) the provisions of the Taiwan Relations Act (Public Law 96-8) are hereby affirmed as the legal standard by which United States policy toward Taiwan shall be determined.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and the gen-

tleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the distinguished majority leader who has taken a great deal of time in focusing attention on the Taiwan problem.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, the House today is commemorating a very, very special event: The first democratic election leading to a transfer of power in the 5,000-year history of the Chinese people.

This is, indeed, a momentous event not only for the Chinese, not only for Taiwan, but for the cause of democracy itself. It was not that long ago, Mr. Speaker, that many people believed that democracy may be a dying creed. I remember as recently as 1984, one French philosopher respected by some friends of mine wrote that the era of democracy may be, and I quote, "a brief parenthesis that is even now closing before our eyes."

There was a popular view, shared by conservative pessimists as well as left-wing revolutionaries, that some form of dictatorship was the only alternative to even worse forms of government.

At best, these people believed that democracy was only appropriate for some cultures, but not for most. Though they rarely said so, what they really meant was that it was only suited for some kinds of people and not for others. Certainly, not for Asians who, it was said, had unique "Asian values." That made democracy unsuited for them and they unsuited for democracy.

Well, Mr. Speaker, how wrong they were. The Taiwan elections vindicate once again the great wisdom of the American founding fathers when they wrote these wonderful words that "All men are created equal" and all men "are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights."

Mr. Speaker, freedom and democracy are not more precious for our culture than they are for the people of other cultures. There are no alien values that lead some people to prefer dictatorship over self-government. Freedom and democracy are, in fact, the shared aspirations of all human beings everywhere, from Athens to England to America indeed to all of Asia.

Taiwan can now serve as a shining example to the unfree people in its part of the world. It shows that democracy works in a Chinese culture. It shows that democracy can resist threats and bullying from abroad. It shows that democracy is the only way that a Nation can be both rich and free.

Mr. Speaker, let me add that even as we rejoice in Taiwan's democratic success, we also wish to aid all the Chinese people as they seek greater freedom, and that includes those in the People's Republic of China. It is for this reason

we are doing everything possible to pass Permanent Normal Trade Relations for China. We know that free and open trade will help make China an open and free society. We will pass PNTR, and we will do it this year.

Mr. Speaker, the House today is pleased to offer our heartfelt congratulations to the people of Taiwan and to their new president and vice president-elect. All the world should know that the people of Taiwan and their democratic government enjoy the friendship, admiration, and support of the government of the United States.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) the distinguished majority leader, for his supportive remarks with regard to this resolution.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the election of the Democratic Progressive Party's Chen Shui-bian and Annette Lu is truly an historic event with profound and moving implications for Taiwan's people. The race was more than a race between and among candidates. It was a race between the people of Taiwan and the Beijing leadership.

Despite Beijing's protests, despite even its threats, this election signified the long-standing commitment of Taiwan to democratic ideals. I would like to extend my congratulations to the people of Taiwan in their success in conducting a free and a fair election.

On March 15, only three days before the election, the premier of the People's Republic of China, Zhu Rongji, held a news conference which intensified China's threats of violence if Taiwan were to elect a pro-independence candidate and move away from the People's Republic of China "one China" policy. This act was only the latest demonstration of China's attempts to corrupt the Taiwanese democratic process. But as a sign of desire for political change and faith in democracy, the voters of Taiwan overcame any fears of foreign threats and elected a candidate they felt would best lead Taiwan into the 21st century.

I applaud President-elect Chen's immediate overtures to improve the situation with China. Already he has invited President Jiang Zemin to visit Taiwan, and he has suggested abolishing Taiwan's ban on direct trade with China.

Beijing must now also exercise restraint and start accepting the reality that there are two sovereign countries facing the Taiwan Strait.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. should support the strides Taiwan's new leadership is making toward establishing a peaceful Taiwan and toward making it absolutely clear that the issues between China and Taiwan must be resolved peacefully and must be resolved with the assent of the people of Taiwan.

I had the pleasure last April in my office of meeting now President-elect

Chen. He is a man of great ability and representative in many ways of modern Taiwan. I am confident his administration will provide the necessary leadership in these difficult and sensitive times for his country.

I look forward to working with him, as I am sure all of us in this body do, in improving relations between the United States and the Republic of Taiwan.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from San Dimas, California (Mr. DREIER), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) on this resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 292, and thank him for his leadership on this important issue and his vigorous pursuit of freedom over the many years he has been serving in the Congress. I also thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) for his support of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, it is all designed to congratulate the people of Taiwan for the very successful election that they realized a week ago last Saturday. What is important to note, Mr. Speaker, is that this ground-breaking election marks the first transition from one political party to another in the 5,000-year history of the Chinese civilization. Let me say that again. This election that we have just observed marks the first transition from one political party to another in the 5,000-year history of Chinese civilization. That is an extraordinary accomplishment.

In fact, it is important to note that this largely peaceful transition that we have observed over the last decade and a half from an authoritarian regime, to what we have now witnessed as full democracy and a transition from one political party to another, is one of the greatest victories of the 20th century when it comes to our vigorous pursuit of political pluralism worldwide. One which I think it is important to note goes hand in hand with the very important economic reforms and ties that the United States of America has had with Taiwan.

□ 1530

It does go hand-in-hand. And I think that we all know that the very vigorous public debate that was spawned by competitive elections has played a role in strengthening the foundations for a free and democratic way of life. And we are witnessing that right now on Taiwan.

The recent election of President-elect Chen sends, I believe, a very strong and positive message that democracy works in China. It works in Asia. It works in a Chinese society. We all hope very much that it will be able to expand on to the mainland.

Mr. Speaker, without a doubt, there are many very, very tough domestic

challenges that President-elect Chen will be facing as he takes over the reins in Taiwan. However, it is key to recognize that one of his very first public statements came in an interview that he did with my hometown newspaper, the Los Angeles Times, I do not call it the Chicago Tribune yet; but it is the Los Angeles Times, where he did a very, very important interview stating that he strongly supports mainland China's accession to the World Trade Organization, which, obviously, as we all know, is the global, rules-based trading system, which would allow for the elimination of tariff barriers so that the rest of the world can gain access to the 1.3 billion consumers in China.

We know that following China's accession to the World Trade Organization, we will see Taiwan immediately join the WTO. And the People's Republic of China has supported that.

It is important to note that immediately following his election, President-elect Chen said that he strongly supported the idea of China acceding to the WTO. He recognizes that the economic fates of both Taiwan and mainland China are inextricably tied. In fact, not many people are aware of the fact there are nearly 46,000 businesses on mainland China that are owned by Taiwanese.

In fact, the single largest supplier of foreign direct investment to mainland China happens to be the island of 22 million people of Taiwan. The commercial relations with its cross-strait neighbor are vital to the continued prosperity of mainland China and of Taiwan.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I am certain that this House is united behind the principle that the future of Taiwan be determined in a manner that is both peaceful and mutually agreeable to the people on both sides of the Taiwan Strait.

We as a Nation stand firmly behind the 1979 Taiwan Relations Act. Military action, threatened or actual, is clearly the wrong way to proceed. And I believe that this election sends a strong signal that we can and, in fact, see improved relations there.

I congratulate President Chen for the strong steps that he has taken to bring the temperature down and to work towards what we hope will be peaceful association there.

I thank my friend for yielding me the time. Again, I appreciate his strong leadership on this very important issue.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California (Chairman DREIER) for his strong supportive remarks with regard to the People's Republic of China.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me

the time. I rise in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 292, the resolution introduced by the distinguished majority leader, Mr. ARMEY, which congratulates the people of Taiwan and Taiwan's leaders for the successful conclusion of their presidential election on March 18.

Indeed, this election represents, as the majority leader and the Committee on Rules chairman just indicated, the first such democratic transition to high national office, one elected leader to another, in the very long history of Chinese society. That fact bears repeating.

The people of Taiwan are to be congratulated for their continuing efforts in developing and sustaining a free democratic society which respects human rights and embraces free markets.

Contrary to the claims of those trying to defend Communism and other authoritarian forms of government, this election demonstrates that democracy clearly could work in the People's Republic of China, and it explains the reason why the Chinese people increasingly yearn for democracy and could flourish under it.

The success of democracy in Taiwan is, indeed, a powerful model for the mainland. This resolution, which was expeditiously considered last week without opposition in the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, which this Member chairs, and subsequently in the full Committee on International Relations, also acknowledges that a stable and peaceful security environment in East Asia is essential to the furtherance of democratic developments in the Taiwan area and in other countries. It reaffirms U.S. policy regarding Taiwan as set forth in the Taiwan Relations Act.

In this regard, the resolution appropriately, this Member believes, expresses the sense of Congress that the People's Republic of China should refrain from making provocative threats against Taiwan and should instead undertake steps that would lead to substantive dialogue, including a renunciation of the use of force against Taiwan, the encouragement of democracy, the rule of law, and the protection of human and religious rights in the People's Republic of China.

Mr. Speaker, this Member is encouraged that since the election in Taiwan, Beijing has curtailed, to a certain degree, its aggressive and unhelpful rhetoric and appears again, to a certain degree, to be extending the offer for a renewed dialogue.

It is hoped that this is an offer which is offered in, in fact, good faith. Across the Taiwan Strait, President-elect Chen and others in Taipei are also calling for renewed dialogue and are already proposing the kind of responsible statesman-like policies that could expand and accelerate this dialogue.

Mr. Speaker, this is a timely, necessary, and straightforwardly positive resolution that sends an important

message to both Beijing and Taipei. As a cosponsor of H. Con. Res. 292, this Member urges his colleagues to support the resolution.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BE-REUTER) for his supportive remarks.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PETRI). The gentleman from New York has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, but I reserve the balance of my time.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Con. Res. 292.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 292, introduced in the House by the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the majority leader, who has taken an active role in our international affairs.

I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the people of Taiwan on a successful election and for taking another step in consolidating their democratic evolution. They should be very proud of their achievement, registering a voter turnout of over 80 percent. They have clearly articulated their determination to build a society of freedom and of democracy.

On May 20 of this year, for the first time in Taiwan's history of over 400 years, the mantle of executive power will pass from one democratically elected president to another. This should serve as a source of pride for the Chinese people everywhere.

This peaceful transfer of power will take place despite the misguided attempts by the government of Beijing to intimidate Taiwan's voters and candidates and influence the outcome of their democratic election.

The new government of Chen Shui-Bian faces many challenges as it ascends to office. We look forward to learning more of his vision for his administration.

I want to commend the President-elect for his proposal of embarking on a journey of reconciliation with Beijing and his offer to meet with the Chinese leaders. Talks between Taipei and Beijing should only go forward at a pace and scope that is acceptable to both parties.

I want to encourage the PRC to exercise restraint, to avoid fanning the flames of nationalism over Taiwan in an effort to divert attention from their own internal problems, and to open

substantive dialogue with Taipei, and to end its history of military threats toward that island.

As has long been American policy, it is essential that the future of Taiwan be determined in a peaceful and non-coercive and mutually agreeable manner to the people on both sides of the strait.

We hope the world will take adequate notice of what has transpired in Taiwan; that being that another Asian nation has fully embraced democratic principles and practices. This further proves that democracy is not an Eastern or a Western value as some might contend, but it is a universal value of the right of people everywhere.

I especially hope that the 1.2 billion people of the PRC and their unelected government take particular notice of the prosperous, free, and open model Taiwan provides for China's future.

With the new government comes new opportunities. Accordingly, I call upon our administration to work productively with the new government and treat President-elect Chen as an equal partner in addressing the cross-strait issues.

I also urge our administration to adhere to the "Reagan Six Assurances." As my colleagues may recall, in July of 1982, the Reagan administration wisely promised Taipei that it would not: one, set a date for the ending of arms sales to Taiwan; two, consult with China on arms sales; three, play a mediation role between PRC and Taiwan; four, revise the Taiwan Relations Act; five, change its position regarding sovereignty over Taiwan; and, six, exert pressure on Taipei to enter into negotiations with Beijing.

Regrettably, those "Six Assurances" have been set aside in part, or completely ignored, by the present administration. These common sense guarantees are a solid basis for American Taiwan policy and should be reinstitutionalized as guideposts of the conduct of bilateral relations with Taipei and with Beijing.

I recommend strongly that our administration take no action to delay or undermine this year's arms sales talks with Taiwan. The talks should be concluded as scheduled on April 24, and Taiwan's legitimate defense needs should be met in light of China's continuing military build-up.

Despite protestations by some to the contrary, China is, in fact, precipitating an arms race in Asia and is working towards achieving military superiority over Taiwan and the ability to influence that island's future through coercion, an action in direct contravention to long-standing American policy and U.S.-Sino communiques.

We can be assured that Beijing will move at some point in the future to test the mettle of the new Taipei government. China is biding its time for the moment while a Permanent Normal Trade Relations hangs in the balance in the Congress.

But once that issue is addressed and a new Taiwanese administration is inaugurated, China may opt to act militarily in some fashion against Taiwan. Such a misguided policy of restricting arms sales by the Clinton administration to Taiwan now will only serve to increase the likelihood of Chinese adventurism, miscalculation, and military confrontation over Taiwan's future.

Any equivocating on this year's arms sales process will send the wrong signal at the wrong time to both China and to Taiwan. Instead of eclipsing a crisis through strength and deterrence, the administration may be in fact fomenting a crisis in the Taiwan Strait through weakness and through indecision.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a cosponsor of this legislation. I want to thank the majority leader for his good work in bringing it to the floor.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to strongly support this measure.

I congratulate the people of Taiwan once again on a free and fair election.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 292—Congratulating the people of Taiwan on their successful presidential elections on March 18. This election serves as a testament to their continuing efforts in sustaining a free society that respects democracy and human rights.

The people of Taiwan deserve our praise and support for conducting this election. They showed that true democracy can be successful even in the face of military threats by the Chinese government. This election is a reminder that the threat of a military attack will not be successful in a political system where the people can exercise the right to determine their own future. The people of Taiwan have taken great risks in sticking to their principles.

The second free election in Taiwan represents a coming of age for this maturing democracy. This is the first time in 50 years that the Nationalist Party (KMT) will have to give up its political power. The peaceful transfer of power is a key turning point for every successful democracy.

In particular, I would like to congratulate the new President of Taiwan, Mr. Chen Shui-bian. Mr. Chen was born in rural Taiwan about the time of the Chinese Communist Revolution. Since then, Mr. Chen has been an outspoken advocate for human rights and has served as a successful mayor of Taipei in recent years.

Over the course of his campaign, Mr. Chen has shown prudence in handling the China issue. In his victory speech, he promised to continue economic relations with mainland China and seek a "permanent peace." It is my hope that China and Taiwan will continue to negotiate their differences in a peaceful manner. I would also like to commend Vice-President elect Annette Liu who has advocated for democratic reform in Taiwan on her visits to Washington, D.C.

This election proves that the Chinese people, like people all over the world, will choose freedom and democracy when given the opportunity. By contrast, the Chinese government continues to escalate the repression and human rights of its own people—despite the thriving democracy across the strait. The Tai-

wan elections should serve as an example that the only real hope of eventual reunification rests in the possibility of true freedom and democracy in China.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, today with H. Con. Res. 292 Congress bestows well-deserved congratulations upon the people of Taiwan for the successful conclusion of presidential elections on March 18, 2000, and for their continuing efforts to develop and sustain a free republic that respects individual rights and embraces free markets. President Lee Teng-hui of Taiwan should also be praised for his significant contributions to freedom in Taiwan.

Unfortunately, because the bill pronounces the Taiwan Relations Act (P.L. 96-8) as the legal standard by which U.S. policy toward Taiwan is governed, I cannot support the measure. This Taiwan Relations Act, effectuated a United States policy which recognized an attack against Taiwan as inimical to an attack on the United States.

Just as it is wrong to force our preferences on other countries and cultures, it is wrong to dictate politics. The United States has absolutely no moral or constitutional right to do so. In fact, action of that sort could rightfully be considered an act of aggression on our part, and our founding fathers made it very, very clear that war should be contemplated only when national security is immediately threatened. To play the part of policemen of the world degrades all who seek to follow the Constitution. The Constitution does not allow our government to participate in actions against a foreign country when there is no immediate threat to the United States.

Sadly, the U.S. has in recent years played the role of world interventionist and global policeman. Thomas Jefferson stated in his first inaugural address: "Peace, commerce and honest friendship with all nations—entangling alliances with none, I deem [one of] the essential principles of our government, and consequently [one of] those which ought to shape its administration." Instead, the U.S. government has become the government force that unconstitutionally subsidizes one country and then pledges taxpayer dollars and lives to fight on behalf of that subsidized country's enemies. It's the same sort of wisdom that would subsidize tobacco farmers and pay the health care costs of those who then choose to smoke.

Each year the people of the United States write a check to subsidize China, one of the most brutal, anti-American regimes in the world. It has been in vogue of late for everyone in Washington, it seems, to eagerly denounce the egregious abuses of the Chinese people at the hands of the communist dictators. Yet no one in our federal government has been willing to take China on in any meaningful way. Very few people realize that China is one of the biggest beneficiaries of American subsidization. Thanks to the largesse of this Congress, China enjoys the flow of U.S. taxpayers cash into Beijing's coffers. Yet, today we are asked to pledge support for Taiwan when we could best demonstrate support for Taiwan by terminating subsidies to that country's enemies.

Again, my congratulations to the Taiwanese on their continuing efforts to develop and sustain a free republic that respects individual rights and embraces free markets and to President Lee Teng-hui for his contributions to that end.

Mr. LARSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Con. Res. 292 to congratulate the people of Taiwan on the successful presidential elections on March 18th and for their continuing efforts in developing and sustaining a democratic society which embraces free markets and respects human rights. I am a proud co-sponsor of this bill and encourage my colleagues to vote in favor of it.

I believe that the freedom of Taiwan's 22 million Chinese people to participate in the competitive election of their president is surely a reason for Congress to pass this resolution in celebration of democracy. The bill congratulates Taiwan's current President Lee Teng-hui, Taiwan's "Father of Democracy," who presided over Taiwan's twin miracles of economic development and political reform. It also congratulates Taiwan's President-elect, Chen Shui-bian, and Vice President-elect, Annette Hsiu-lien Lu, on their election, which ended a half-century of one-party rule there.

I have followed these historic events in Taiwan closely and with interest. I have also been assisted in understanding these issues by the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office here in Washington. This Office, and the very capable Benson Wang in particular, have provided me and my staff with straight-forward information on Taiwan and events there, which I appreciate greatly. I am hopeful that the companion measure we will vote on today, to authorize \$75 million to upgrade the American Institute in Taiwan's facilities in Taipei, will allow the U.S. to have the same high quality of representation in that country.

This peaceful transfer of power brings Taiwan to the forefront of democratic nations in Asia, and provides a shining example of freedom for mainland China and other nations in the region to follow. This free election took place despite Beijing's clumsy and counter-productive attempts to intimidate President-elect Chen and his supporters. Perhaps the government in Beijing is more concerned that this election will result in further democracy movements in China than they are about the possibility of Taiwan's independence. This is why I especially support this measure's provisions to encourage China to make progress toward democracy, the rule of law, and the protection of human and religious rights.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude by saying that I believe that it is important for the United States to salute and support Taiwan's democracy, and I therefore urge my colleagues to join me in voting for this resolution. Thank you.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 292 and to congratulate the people of Taiwan on their successful presidential elections on March 18, 2000.

The election results impressively demonstrate the strength and vitality of Taiwan's democracy. I strongly support the right of the people of Taiwan to decide their own political future.

The victory for president-elect Chen Shui-bian, the candidate of the Democratic Progressive Party, and vice-president-elect, Annette Lu, a pioneering feminist and former political prisoner, symbolize the beginning of a new era in Taiwanese politics after 51 years of rule by the Nationalist Party.

The development of Taiwan from authoritarian rule to a vibrant democracy during only two decades has been truly inspiring. The

pace of political reform accelerated in the middle and late 1980s. Martial law was ended in July 1987 and in 1992, for the first time in Taiwanese history, a new parliament was elected.

In its second direct presidential election almost 83 percent of Taiwanese voters cast their ballots—an impressive turn-out that underlines the great support among the population for the democratic process.

I commend the people of Taiwan for this peaceful transition and their commitment to democratic values and ideas. The consistent growth of the Taiwanese economy is closely related to the success of Taiwanese democracy.

I firmly believe that a democratic Taiwan is the best guarantee for prosperity, peace and security in the region.

Taiwan has been a valued and reliable partner to the United States during the previous decades and I am sure this constructive relationship will continue, after president-elect Chen Shui-bian takes office.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the resolution offered by the Majority Leader, Mr. ARMEY, and am proud to be an original cosponsor.

The people of Taiwan should be commended for their brave and inspiring show of courage in support of democratic values.

The people of Taiwan stood in the face of tremendous intimidation and constant threats from the tyrants in Communist China, and they refused to back down. About 80 percent of the people went to the polls to exercise the most sacred of democratic freedoms—the right of citizens to choose their own leaders. Mr. Speaker, that is the essence of democracy.

Undoubtedly, this new administration in Taiwan will face many challenges. For the first time, Taiwan will experience a peaceful transition of executive power. This transition will not be easy, but the peaceful passing of power is at the core of democracy. The United States must support this transition in every way possible.

This expression of freedom should not serve as a threat to Beijing, but as an inspiration. Hopefully, the day will soon come when the people of communist China, for so long fettered by the chains of communism and tyranny, will be able to determine their own destiny through free and fair elections.

Until that time, it should be clear that the United States is firm in its commitment to Taiwan, and I urge the Administration to use this occasion to signal to the world that we will stand by and support our democratic allies. In the meantime, Taiwan should meet future threats by Beijing with the same strength and determination that guided this most recent election.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this resolution. I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) for bringing this important resolution to the floor in such a timely manner.

I want to congratulate Taiwan on its recent free and fair elections. In a region of the world where democracy is not widely accepted, it is important that milestones like the elections of March 18th do not go unrecognized. Despite threats from Beijing, the Taiwanese set themselves apart from their neighbors by going to the polls and voting for the candidate who they wanted to be their leader. It is welcoming to see that there are peoples around the world who do not succumb to threats and pressure

and instead exercise their guaranteed rights. Also the record number of the eligible voters who went to the polls, 82.7 percent, is very encouraging.

Taiwan has proven itself to be one of the true democracies in a region surrounded by dictators, military regimes, and human rights abusers. The United States must do everything within its power to stand behind these defenders of democracy and human rights around the world.

President Lee Teng-hui is to be commended for leading his country during a tenuous time. When he took office in 1988 martial law in Taiwan had just ended. He successfully built a strong foundation on which democracy and freedom has flourished. On May 20th of this year, the first peaceful transfer of power to a popularly elected opposition leader by Chinese anywhere will take place. President Lee Teng-hui of the Nationalist Party will turn the presidency over to the recently elected Chen Shui-bian of the Democratic Progressive Party. For the first time in half a century, all of Taiwan's history, the governing party will change.

I wish to convey congratulations to President-elect Chen Shui-bian and Vice-President-elect Annette Hsiu-lien Lu. Leading Taiwan into the next century, and being at the helm during the first changing of a political party in Taiwan's history, will be a great challenge. However, I am confident that with the support of the Taiwanese people and the continued support of the international community, Taiwan will continue to be a pillar in the region for democracy and freedom.

Again, I congratulate Taiwan. I hope and believe that Taiwan can be a window into the future of Asia. A future where everyone is free—free from abuse, free to speak, free to practice the religion of choice and free to vote. A free, stable and prosperous Taiwan serves as a positive example in a region where none of these qualities are widely accepted.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to join my colleagues in congratulating President-elect Chen Shui-bian and Vice President-elect Annette Lu of Taiwan on their impressive victory. The election results are testament to the strength of Taiwan's democracy, which has witnessed the peaceful transition of power from the Nationalist Party that ruled China for 50 years.

The election results are also a testament to the courage and independence of the people of Taiwan, who refused to be intimidated by the increasingly bellicose threats from China on the eve of the election.

I commend President-elect Chen Shui-bian for his constructive and positive statements on relations with China since his election. His sensitivity and statesmanship will be critical to lowering the level of tension between China and Taiwan.

I am especially delighted at Vice President-elect Annette Lu's election. She will be the highest-ranking female government official in Taiwan's history! Her new position and her impressive accomplishments as an advocate for women, human rights, and democracy make her an exciting leader to watch.

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank the House, particularly Chairman BEN GILMAN and Ranking Member SAM GEJDENSON, for bringing this important resolution to the floor.

I join all in this Congress in congratulating the Republic of China for the success of their

recent elections. A successful election is one which is fair to all and whose results are respected by everyone. In fact, in a democracy, the most important election is the second election, not the first. The second election is the truest test of commitment to democracy. If a nation can watch the peaceful transfer of power from one party to another, their journey as a democracy is indeed on solid ground.

President-elect Chen Shui-bian of the Democratic Progressive Party won the presidential election, replacing President Lee Teng-hui. The Far East is a favorite destination of mine when I lead trade delegations, and I have met and worked with President Lee. He has made immeasurable contributions to the solid foundation of democracy in Taiwan, and he will hold a prominent place in Taiwan's history as the first democratically elected president in Taiwan's history.

While the purpose of today's resolution is to congratulate President-elect Chen Shui-bian and Vice President-elect Annette Hsiu-lien Lu on their victory, I am pleased we are also remembering the most important element of this election: the people of the Republic of China. When a democracy freely votes, respects human rights and embraces free markets, they are a democracy among the established democracies of the world.

The United States is hopeful that Taiwan will make use of its new power as a growing democracy to lead a substantive dialogue in that part of the world about democracy, the rule of law, and the protection of human and religious rights.

Again, I thank the Majority Leader and the International Relations Committee for bringing this important resolution to the attention of the House of Representatives.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the Majority Leader (Mr. ARMEY) for the resolution we are considering today which congratulates President-elect Chen Shui-bian and Vice President-elect Annette Lu on their victory in a free and open and democratic election in Taiwan. I also want to commend my distinguished colleague and friend from Nebraska, the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Asia of our International Relations Committee, Mr. BEREUTER, for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, Taiwan is one of the great success stories of the post-World War II era. At the end of the war, Taiwan was a destitute, primitive, backward society. Today, it is one of the great economic triumphs of this century—a vibrant, innovative, creative economy, the 18th largest in the world. The strength of Taiwan's economy is reflected in the fact that it is our nation's 7th largest trading partner.

Taiwan is also one of the great political success stories of the twentieth century. During the last two decades, Taiwan had become a full-fledged democracy. From an American point of view, there is nothing more desirable than to see an economically under-developed autocracy become a full functioning, vibrant democracy as we have seen in Taiwan.

In this regard, Mr. Speaker, the recent election marks another important milestone in the consolidation of democracy in Taiwan. This election marks the first peaceful transfer of power from the KMT (Nationalist) party, which has played the dominant political role in Taiwan for the past half century, to Mr. Chen, the candidate of the Democratic Progressive Party. This peaceful change of political power

is reflection of the maturation of Taiwanese democracy.

I do want to pay tribute to President Lee Teng-hui, the first democratically elected President in the history of the Chinese people. He has ably and faithfully served the people of Taiwan during his tenure as president, and as he steps down now at the completion of his presidential term, we owe him our thanks for the friendship he has shown the United States.

I also want to pay tribute to President-elect Chen for the responsible and thoughtful way which he has approached the difficult issue of Taiwan's relationship with mainland China. We in the United States welcome his statesmanship and see it as a further reflection of the maturity of Taiwan's democracy.

Mr. Speaker, these important changes in Taiwan stand in sharp contrast with the continuing authoritarian and dictatorial government which rules the People's Republic of China. I think this resolution we are considering today needs to be viewed as one that congratulates the people of Taiwan on having attained a high degree of economic development and creating a functioning political democracy and starkly contrasts these positive developments with those in the People's Republic of China. There is a free press in Taiwan, unlike the PRC. There are political alternatives in Taiwan, but not in mainland China.

Taiwan also recognizes the desire of its people to function in a free and democratic fashion, unlike China. In particular Taiwan permits religious groups freedom of worship. In China, on the other hand, the practitioners of Falun Gong continue to be persecuted. Those who seek to practice their faith are prohibited or are limited to officially recognized and officially organized churches which have more to do with securing political support for the communist regime than they do with religious worship. The followers of all faiths—in China, as well as Taiwan—must have the freedom to practice their religion. The handful of incredibly courageous individuals in China who have expressed views contrary to the communist regime must be released.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution we are considering today acknowledges the outstanding contributions of the Chinese people. I personally have the highest regard for Chinese civilization and what it has contributed to the culture of all humankind. It is one of the great tragedies of history that these wonderful and cultured people are ruled by an autocratic and dictatorial regime.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution, which recognizes the enormous achievements of the people of Taiwan and holds out great hope for the people of China.

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the people of Taiwan on the successful March 18th, 2000 presidential election. Taiwan's decades-long political transformation and the recent election are indeed great examples of Taiwan's commitment to a government of the people, by the people and for the people.

As the first member of the United States Congress born in Taiwan, I observed with great interest Taiwan's extremely competitive presidential campaign. The open process is a tribute to the people of Taiwan, and to the island's real, working democratic process. Taiwan has indeed achieved democracy under adversity and joined the great democracies of the world.

Once again, I would like to congratulate the people of Taiwan on their courage and commitment to forming a more democratic and complete society. In addition, I would also like to congratulate all the candidates, especially President-elect Chen Shui-bian and Vice President-elect Annette Lu, for a very open and competitive campaign. I wish the Taiwanese people well and hope to work together with all people in the region for a peaceful and prosperous future.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PETRI). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 292, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 1545

AMERICAN INSTITUTE IN TAIWAN FACILITIES ENHANCEMENT ACT

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3707) to authorize funds for the site selection and construction of a facility in Taipei, Taiwan suitable for the mission of the American Institute in Taiwan, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3707

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 "American Institute in Taiwan Facilities Enhancement Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) in the Taiwan Relations Act of 1979 (22 U.S.C. 3301 et seq.), the Congress established the American Institute in Taiwan (hereafter in this Act referred to as "AIT"), a nonprofit corporation incorporated in the District of Columbia, to carry out on behalf of the United States Government any and all programs, transactions, and other relations with Taiwan;

(2) the Congress has recognized AIT for the successful role it has played in sustaining and enhancing United States relations with Taiwan;

(3) the Taipei office of AIT is housed in buildings which were not originally designed for the important functions that AIT performs, whose location does not provide adequate security for its employees, and which, because they are almost 50 years old, have become increasingly expensive to maintain;

(4) the aging state of the AIT office building in Taipei is neither conducive to the safety and welfare of AIT's American and local employees nor commensurate with the level of contact that exists between the United States and Taiwan;

(5) because of the unofficial character of United States relations with Taiwan, the Department of State is not responsible for funding the construction of a new office building for the Taipei office of AIT;

(6) AIT has made a good faith effort to set aside funds for the construction of a new office building, but these funds will be insufficient to construct a building that is large and secure enough to meet AIT's current and future needs; and

(7) because the Congress established AIT and has a strong interest in United States relations with Taiwan, the Congress has a special responsibility to ensure the AIT's requirements for safe and appropriate office quarters are met.

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$75,000,000 to AIT—

(1) for plans for a new facility and, if necessary, residences or other structures located in close physical proximity to such facility, in Taipei, Taiwan, for AIT to carry out its purposes under the Taiwan Relations Act; and

(2) for acquisition by purchase or construction of such facility, residences, or other structures.

(b) LIMITATIONS.—Funds appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) may only be used if the new facility described in that subsection meets all requirements applicable to the security of United States diplomatic facilities, including the requirements in the Omnibus Diplomatic Security and Anti-Terrorism Act of 1986 (22 U.S.C. 4801 et seq.) and the Secure Embassy Construction and Counterterrorism Act of 1999 (as enacted by section 1000(a)(7) of Public Law 106-113; 113 Stat 1501A-451), except for those requirements which the Director of AIT certifies to the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate are not applicable on account of the special statue of AIT.

(c) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Amounts appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) are authorized to remain available until expended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PETRI). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILMAN. 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. 3707.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 3707, a bill to authorize funds for the construction or acquisition of a new facility for the American Institute in Taiwan.

I would like to thank the distinguished sponsor of the bill, the vice chairman of our committee, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), for his efforts

in framing this bill and in amending it to improve it further for consideration by the full committee.

Mr. Speaker, the American Institute of Taiwan serves the important function of maintaining relations with Taiwan, and the mission should be appropriately supported by the Congress. There is no doubt that the current facility is inadequate and does not meet security standards. This bill authorizes \$75 million for a suitable location for a new facility and for necessary construction costs.

We are looking forward to a long future with Taiwan and it is time to make the long-range commitment and invest in a new facility to support this relationship. Accordingly, I am urging my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I provide for the RECORD information on a cost estimate done by the Congressional Budget Office on this matter:

H.R. 3707—AMERICAN INSTITUTE IN TAIWAN
FACILITIES ENHANCEMENT ACT

H.R. 3707 would authorize \$75 million for the design and construction of a new facility in Taipei to be used by the American Institute in Taiwan. The American Institute in Taiwan is a nonprofit corporation that facilitates programs and relations between the United States and Taiwan. CBO estimates that implementing H.R. 3707 would cost \$6 million in 2001 and \$63 million over the 2001–2005 period, assuming appropriation of the authorized amount. (We estimate that the remaining \$12 million would be spent after 2005.) Because the bill would not affect direct spending or receipts, pay-as-you-go procedures would not apply.

H.R. 3707 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act and would not affect the budgets of state, local, or tribal governments.

The CBO staff contact is Sunita D'Monte. This estimate was approved by Peter H. Fontaine, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER).

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and, as the author of H.R. 3707, the American Institute Enhancement Act, this Member rises in strong support of what he regards as timely and responsible legislation.

Before commenting on it, though, this Member would like to express his sincere appreciation to the Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights, the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), for his much appreciated assistance in moving this bill forward so quickly and for suggested refinements that were incorporated in the bill during the markup of the Committee on International Relations.

This Member would also like to thank the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON), for supporting this bill and moving it expeditiously.

Additionally, I express my appreciation to the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), for his cosponsorship and special cooperation in expediting the consideration of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this Member believes it is important to note that the United States' commitment to the security and well-being of the people of Taiwan is enshrined in the Taiwan Relations Act of 1979, the TRA, a congressional initiative of that year, responding to a controversial Carter administration initiative of that previous year.

The TRA, which continues to be the guide of our unofficial relations with Taiwan, is an important document for us to consider and to reaffirm from time to time and also to reexamine to make sure that we understand exactly what it is that controls our relationship with Taiwan and, in effect, the relationship between Taiwan and the People's Republic of China.

The TRA established the American Institute in Taiwan, AIT, as a nonprofit corporation to implement on behalf of the United States Government any and all programs, transactions and other relations with Taiwan. In other words, to function as our unofficial embassy in Taiwan. The current AIT facilities, which in some cases consists of aging quonset huts, are grossly inadequate and were not designed for the important functions of AIT. They were built or occupied as temporary facilities almost 50 years ago, and are increasingly difficult and expensive to maintain.

From the perspective of security, AIT fails miserably, surrounded by taller buildings and lacking adequate setbacks. Major, very cost-ineffective enhancements would be required to bring it into compliance with security requirements. In fact, it is an impossibility, and the site is entirely inappropriate for our new construction for the AIT.

Because of our unique relationship with Taiwan, characterized by the agreement itself, the State Department is not able, under routine authority, to proceed with the planning and the construction of a new facility for AIT. The Congress must specifically authorize and appropriate the necessary funds. While AIT has made a good faith effort to set aside funds for the construction of a new office building complex, these funds, while very significant, will never be sufficient for even a modest complex that is sufficient and secure enough to meet AIT's needs.

H.R. 3707, which this Member introduced, has bipartisan support. Although only recently introduced, the resolution is cosponsored by the distinguished ranking member of the committee, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON), as well as other distinguished members of the committee, including the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), the gen-

tleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), and the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER). The bill authorizes the appropriation of \$75 million for planning acquisition and construction of a new facility for AIT.

Over 20 years after the enactment of the Taiwan Relations Act, our unofficial relations with the people of Taiwan are stronger, more robust, and more important than ever. In order to reflect the importance of these relations, as well as for very practical reasons of efficient and secure operations, the Congress needs to act now to authorize the lengthy effort to upgrade our diplomatic facilities on Taiwan.

Mr. Speaker, recently, as is apparent to all, we have been seized with issues involving our relationship with Taiwan and China. Today, relatedly, we just considered another resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 292, that once again congratulates the people of Taiwan on the success of their historic democratic elections. We have also been concerned by the bellicose rhetoric from Beijing that once again preceded the Taiwanese presidential election. The House also recently passed a properly amended version of the Taiwan Security Enhancement Act, while at the same time we are preparing for the upcoming debate on granting permanent normal trade relations for China as a part of the country's accession to the WTO.

In view of all these developments, now is the appropriate time to send another signal of our unshakable, long-term commitment to our critically important relations with Taiwan. We are there in Taipei with the citizens of Taiwan for as long as it takes to assure that any reunification with the mainland is voluntary and as a result of peaceful means. In the judgment of this Member, the Congress should and will work with the administration to approve permanent normal trade relations with the People's Republic of China, the PRC, as part of our support for its accession to the World Trade Organization, just as we support and will lead in the near simultaneity of Taiwan's accession to the WTO, a long-justified accession to the WTO that has been too long delayed.

We will support the accession of the PRC to the WTO because it is in our clear national interest to do so. At the same time, it is very important that we make it crystal clear to the PRC and the world that we are calmly but resolutely standing at the side of Taiwan, providing for the sale of necessary defensive weapons to it for its defense against any hostile or coercive action to force its reunification with the PRC through any process that is not a peaceful noncoercive one.

We are, by our recent actions regarding Taiwan making our continued positive, supportive, TRA-driven relationship with Taiwan unambiguous. We are proceeding in a two-track Taiwan-PRC policy; resolutely, unflinchingly, and

unabashedly standing by Taiwan's side while demonstrating our willingness to engage with the PRC in a variety of ways when it is in our national interest to do so and when it is consistent with our region-stabilizing role to do so. We have benign motives for our great and many interests in Asia, but as a superpower, we will act like one and defend our national interest in the region and support all of our loyal allies.

Mr. Speaker, this Member urges his colleagues to join him in supporting the American Institute in Taiwan Facilities Enhancement Act.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3707. I thank my friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) for their good work on this legislation.

The recent election of President Chen was a monumental event in Taiwan's history. The peaceful transfer of power will stand as a model for all other nations struggling for the Democratic ideals that our Nation holds so dear. Under threats of violence from the People's Republic of China, the people of Taiwan demonstrated their desire to elect the candidate with the ability and the vision to lead them into the 21st century.

The United States must recognize its responsibility to assist the Taiwanese leadership in establishing a peaceful Taiwan. Any resolution to the dispute between China and Taiwan will be through peaceful negotiation with the ascent of the Taiwanese people.

Assisting Taiwan in their pursuit of a Democratic future, we must provide the American Institute in Taiwan with the necessary resources to perform all of their functions properly. The allocation of funds for planning, for acquisition, and for construction for a new facility is a clear gesture of the U.S.'s long-term commitment to the people of Taiwan.

The American Institute in Taiwan plays a valued role in U.S.A.-Taiwan relations. For more than 20 years, the AIT has implemented all programs and transactions for the United States Government in Taipei. But the current conditions of the AIT's facilities are undoubtedly inadequate. Built as temporary structures some 50 years ago, the cost of maintenance and repair are becoming increasingly more expensive. The facilities also have virtually no setback, and steps to meet security standards are not cost effective.

The AIT needs a modern and effective base of operations to perform its duties in these historical times. I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend my distinguished colleague and friend from Nebraska, the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Asia of our International Relations Committee, Mr. BEREUTER, for his leadership in introducing H.R. 3707, the American Institute in Taiwan Facilities Enhancement Act.

Under the provisions of the Taiwan Relations Act, the American Institute in Taiwan (AIT) is the unofficial entity through which we maintain our unofficial relationship with Taiwan. For the past twenty years, the AIT has served us well. I want to commend the individuals who have played such an important role in the activities of the AIT. In particular, I want to express appreciation for the current head of AIT, Richard Bush, who is a former outstanding member of the staff of the Subcommittee on Asia of the House International Relations Committee.

Mr. Speaker, as several of my colleagues have already emphasized, the current AIT facilities in Taipei are grossly inadequate. They were not designed for the important functions which AIT performs. They are old, having been built over 50 years ago, and the facilities are increasingly difficult and expensive to maintain. Furthermore, authorities in Taiwan want back the land on which they are located.

From a security perspective, the facility is even more seriously inadequate. Following the bombings of our nation's embassies in Nairobi and Dar es Salaam, the concern for the security of all American facilities has increased. The AIT buildings in Taipei are dangerously inadequate. There is virtually no setback, and major security enhancements would be necessary to bring the facilities into compliance with current security standards. The legislation we are considering today requires that the new facility meet the embassy security standards set forth in the Omnibus Diplomatic Security and Antiterrorism Act of 1986 (commonly referred to as the Inman Standards) and the Security Embassy Construction and Counter Terrorism Act of 1999.

The Congress has already recognized the need to improve AIT's facilities, and the FY 2000 appropriations legislation included \$5 million for the design of a new facility. AIT staff, using standard cost factors unofficially provided by the State Department, have estimated that constructing a new facility would cost in the range of \$80 to \$100 million. This estimate is in line with recent construction costs of new embassy facilities, such as our Embassy in Nairobi. The staff of AIT has made a good faith effort and has set aside funds for capital construction, managing to accrue approximately \$25 million thus far. Therefore, an authorization of \$75 million, plus the \$25 million AIT already has on hand, should be sufficient to cover construction costs.

Mr. Speaker, United States relations with Taiwan are extremely important, and it is critical that AIT have an appropriate facility in Taipei. We must also protect the safety of those Americans and Taiwanese who work or conduct business at AIT in Taipei. This legislation represents a reasonable and responsible effort to deal with the inadequate facilities currently in use. I urge my colleagues to support this important piece of legislation.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3707, as amended.

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

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize funds for the construction of a facility in Taipei, Taiwan suitable for the mission of the American Institute in Taiwan."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMENDING LIBRARY OF CONGRESS FOR 200 YEARS OF OUTSTANDING SERVICE

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 269) commending the Library of Congress and its staff for 200 years of outstanding service to the Congress and the Nation and encouraging the American public to participate in bicentennial activities.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 269

Whereas the Library of Congress, America's oldest Federal cultural institution, was established on April 24, 1800, and in its 200 years of existence has become the largest and most inclusive library in human history;

Whereas the Library's mission is to make its resources available and useful to the Congress and the American people and to sustain and preserve a universal collection of knowledge and creativity;

Whereas, in furtherance of its mission, the Library has amassed an unparalleled collection of 119 million items, a superb staff of "knowledge navigators", and networks for gathering the world's knowledge for the Nation's good;

Whereas the Library, the Congress, and the Nation have benefitted richly from the work of thousands of talented and dedicated Library employees throughout the Library's 200-year history;

Whereas the citizens of the United States have generously contributed to the Library's collections through their own creativity, social and scholarly discourse, donation of materials in all formats, and generous philanthropic support;

Whereas the goal of the Library's bicentennial commemoration is to inspire creativity in the centuries ahead and remind Americans that all libraries are the cornerstones of democracy, encouraging greater use of the Library of Congress and libraries everywhere;

Whereas this goal will be achieved through a variety of national, State, and local projects, developed in collaboration with Members of Congress, the staff of the Library of Congress, libraries and librarians throughout the Nation, and the Library's James Madison Council and other philanthropic supporters;

Whereas the centerpiece of the bicentennial celebration is the Local Legacies Project, a joint effort of Congress and the Library of Congress to document distinctive cultural traditions and historic events representing local communities throughout the country at the turn of the 21st century; and

Whereas the bicentennial commemorative activities also include symposia, exhibitions, publications, significant acquisitions, the issuance of a commemorative coin and stamp, and enhanced public access to the collections of the Library of Congress through the National Digital Library: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That the Congress commends the Library of Congress and its employees, both past and present, on 200 years of service to the Congress and the Nation and encourages the American public to participate in activities to commemorate the Library's bicentennial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS).

□ 1600

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

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to speak on this resolution today. I hope the Chair will indulge me as I go through some of my history of involvement in libraries and why I believe this is a very important resolution.

This story goes back many years to the time when I was a young lad in Minnesota. I had chronic asthma. I was unable to go to school, and did all my schoolwork at home. I was home schooled before people knew that term. And that left me with a great deal of time to read because I could do most of my schoolwork in 3 hours a day.

I lived in a small town of 800 people. We had a library that contained probably that same number of books, about 800 books. I believe I read every book in that library at least once, except for those that the librarian kept hidden under her desk, as they did in those days. This led me to a great interest in reading and a great appreciation for libraries.

As I grew up, I continued to value and treasure libraries and the resource they represent for our communities and for our country. Little did I know at that time that I would become involved in politics. I never expected to, never intended to, and yet here I am. But, on the way, I have served as a member of a county library board. I have served as a member of a city library board. I also served as a member of the Board of the State Library of Michigan. And now I am on the Joint Committee of the Library of Congress.

My experience with all these libraries increased my appreciation of libraries and librarians. Tremendous resources are available in libraries, and I found this out as I got into the academic world first at Calvin College and then at the University of California at Berkeley.

Coming from a very small town, I was just amazed at what I could find in a library not only in terms of books to read but also in material useful for research.

I also remember the first time I used the Library of Congress. I was engaged in academic research on energy resources sometime after the energy crisis of 1973, and I studied various aspects relating to scientific analysis of energy resources, the use of energy, alternative sources of energy, improv-

ing efficiency of energy use, and so forth.

On a trip to Washington, I spent a day at the Library of Congress doing research. I was just delighted with all the materials that I found there which were very, very useful in my research. I could easily have spent a couple of weeks devouring the material there and condensing it for use in my work.

I was truly astounded at the resources of the Library of Congress but also very, very pleased at the way the employees helped me and treated someone from a small town in Michigan trying to do research on a major national issue. They were extremely helpful. They determined what I needed to find and they helped me find it.

My appreciation of the Library of Congress increased even more after I came to the Congress and observed firsthand the services they provide to our country and to our Congress. It is a marvelous institution and is blessed with a good administration, and is blessed now and has been blessed for 200 years with an outstanding staff.

It is a venerable institution that started in a small way in this building and then was burned out when the British came in and burned the Capitol and the White House some years ago. Thanks to Thomas Jefferson, who after the fire willingly offered his personal library of some 20,000 volumes to the Congress for purchase at a reasonable price, the Library of Congress was revived and eventually developed into what we have today, the largest collection of books and materials in the entire world.

The Library and its employees have also advanced into the modern age with the addition of the Internet, which first of all helps make all public documents of the House of Representatives and the Senate available to every person in this country and indeed on this planet.

In addition to that, they make much other information available; they have developed what is called the digital library. With the help of grants from various good citizen and corporations in this country, much of the material in the Library of Congress is available to schoolchildren everywhere.

So the Library continues to adapt to the changing times and changing technology, and they are doing a marvelous job of not only providing that information but training the staff to enter the digital age.

I am very appreciative of all that they have done, and I rise to support this resolution and urge its passage. It recognizes not only the history of the institution and the contributions they have made but, in particular, the contributions that the staff has made working very diligently to meet the needs of our citizens.

I must confess to a little personal interest here as well. I have a daughter who became a librarian and has been the manager of a branch library in Grand Rapids, Michigan, and was re-

cently promoted to become the head of the reference section in the main library there; she also has enlightened me about many of the problems of modern-day libraries, and she is my personal consultant on matters relating to libraries.

So it is with great pleasure that I recognize the major role that libraries have played but, in particular, what the Library of Congress has meant to this Nation and, indeed, to all academic institutions worldwide and, in addition to that, recognize the staff and administration for the outstanding work they have done for 200 years.

We welcome their contributions, and we admire them and congratulate them as they reach their bicentennial. We wish them a wonderful bicentennial year as they engage in many different celebrations.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my very distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS). I might say that he started out with saying that he had a long history in dealing with libraries and was going to go back to his childhood; and I want to tell my friend I was going to jump to my feet and yield him more time on the theory that it might take some time. He is a distinguished scholar and a distinguished Member of this body, and I want to join in his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support this concurrent resolution which honors the Library of Congress and its extraordinary staff. As the oldest Federal cultural institution and the largest library in the world, the Library of Congress serves a unique role in American life. It is the keeper of our past and a teacher of our future.

The Library archives America's cultural history through its collections of 119 million items, including books, films, musical recordings, prints, maps, and photographs.

Make no mistake, though, the Library is not simply a collection of documents wasting away in a Federal warehouse. Due to an extraordinarily talented and dedicated staff, the Library, as the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) has pointed out, is a true American treasure. The employees of the Library of Congress make millions of items in the collection come to life as a living history of our Nation.

Through its 22 reading rooms on Capitol Hill and its extensive web site, the Library, as I said, educates America. Whether it is a Member of Congress examining an issue, a school child researching a report, or an author writing a book, the Library of Congress will have what they are looking for and its staff of "knowledge navigators" will make sure they find it.

Just last month, Mr. Speaker, I introduced my new web site at the James Madison Middle School in Upper Marlboro, Maryland. The student who was

helping me demonstrate the site was doing a paper on the Gold Rush. Through my site, we linked to the Library of Congress' American Memory web site.

The student searched for information on the Gold Rush and emerged with a treasure trove of information, letters from frontiersmen, pictures of the Old West, lyrics from music sung on the trail. I saw a light, Mr. Speaker, in that young boy's eyes as history came alive for him.

This is but one small example of the power and impact of the Library of Congress. It is an example that is repeated daily in classrooms all across America. The answers that boy found, the answers the Library helps all of us find, do not come to us simply because we click the mouse or pick up a phone or visit the reading room. The answers, Mr. Speaker, come because of the hard work and dedication of the staff of the Library of Congress.

We do not always know their names, but it is impossible not to know their work. They are the ones who find the books, who organize the materials, who research the issues, who write the summaries, and, yes, who update the web site. Our lives and the American people's lives are richer for their work.

I am proud to join my friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS), in honoring them today and the Library itself. I am honored and privileged to support this resolution.

The Library of Congress is among the finest institutions in our land and, yes, even more so than that, probably the finest library in the world and one of the finest institutions in the world.

It is led by an extraordinary American, Dr. Jim Billington, my friend, a scholar himself, one of the intellectuals of this Nation, one of the experts on Russia and many other subjects. But he and the staff with whom he works have brought alive the information so necessary to succeed in our society today.

Mr. Speaker, the Library of Congress was relevant when it was founded 200 years ago. In the information age, I suggest to my colleagues, the Library is more relevant today than it has ever been. It is opening up the gateway to knowledge, knowledge essential not just to the young but to all of us if we are to succeed and to enjoy this information age in which we live. Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, I rise in strong support of this concurrent resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I do not have any requests for time, I tell the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS). I know my colleagues on the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS), join me in my comments and in the comments of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) and in their congratulations to the Library of Congress and to its staff.

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

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume in concluding.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for his comments about the Library. He truly recognizes the value of the Library of Congress and what it has done for this Nation. But one comment in particular rang true, that this has truly become the library of the world.

When I was a youngster, it was a library of Congress. It soon became the library of this country. And now, through the Internet and through its leadership, it has truly become the library of the world. I personally believe it is having as much or more impact on what is happening in the world around us today than the Library of Alexandria over two millennia ago had on the known world at that time.

It is truly a venerable institution and filled with very good people, good scholars, helpful scholars; and it has meant so much to this Congress and to this Nation. I am very pleased that the Congress will be joining us in honoring them for their good work. Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of this resolution.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I welcome the effort of our colleague from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) for this legislation we are considering today commending the Library of Congress and its employees, both past and present, on 200 years of service to the Congress and the Nation and encouraging the American public to participate in activities to commemorate the Library's bicentennial.

As my colleagues have noted, Mr. Speaker, on April 24 of the year 1800, President John Adams signed legislation establishing the Library of Congress and appropriating \$5,000 for this modest effort. The year after President Adams and the Congress established our nation's national library, 740 volumes and three maps purchased from a London bookseller comprised the initial holdings of the library.

By 1812, the collection had grown to 3,076 books. During the War of 1812, however, the British military occupied Washington, D.C., and burned the Library of Congress as well as torching a number of other prominent Washington buildings, including the White House and the Capitol.

The nature of the institution was transformed in 1815 when Thomas Jefferson sold his personal library to the Library of Congress to reconstitute the collection. The Jeffersonian purchase was fortuitous because it permitted the Library to re-establish a collection, but it also fundamentally changed the nature of the Library of Congress. Before 1814, the Library was a narrow collection of books dealing with legal and historical topics. Jefferson's personal library was a broad collection which included literature on a wealth of topics and fields of knowledge, including literature.

In 1815, some Members of Congress objected to books in foreign languages and books on spiritualism, architecture, and other topics that they considered to be of no interest to the Congress. But Jefferson argued that "there is, in fact, no subject to which a Member of Congress may not have occasion to refer." Fortunately, Jefferson's conception of the Library of Congress won out, and that concept still guides the accessions of the Library today.

The library today comprises almost 119 million items—18 million books, 12 million photographs, 5 million maps, millions of technical reports, music, movies, prints, manuscripts, microfilm. The collection includes items in 490 languages. The library collection requires some 530 miles of bookshelves and the collection increases by 10,000 items each day.

Mr. Speaker, I want to pay particular tribute to Dr. James Billington, the 13th and current Librarian of Congress, who has played such a critical role in the modern transformation of the Library. Dr. Billington has taken the lead in emphasizing the continuing importance of knowledge in the modern world, and he has undertaken a number of critical innovations to bring the library into line with our digital and Internet era.

When he launched the bicentennial of the Library of Congress three years ago, Dr. Billington gave the celebration the theme "Libraries, Creativity, Liberty." That theme is particularly appropriate, Mr. Speaker. Libraries are the knowledge they preserve and disseminate are fundamental to our nation's creativity and innovation in this age of rapid change. At the same time, libraries and their repository of knowledge are essential for the function of a democratic society. Knowledge available to a nation's citizens is a requirement for a free people and for a democratic society to function.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join in supporting this important resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I submit Dr. James Billington's personal reflection, "The Library of Congress turns 200" which appeared in the April 2000 issue of the magazine *American History*. Dr. Billington reflects his insight regarding the role and position of the Library of Congress in the United States. At the same time, he provides a personal insight as one of our nation's foremost historians.

On April 24 of this year the Library of Congress—America's national library and oldest federal cultural institution—will turn 200. The Library was founded in 1800 with the primary mission of serving the research needs of the United States Congress, but during the past two centuries the collections have evolved into the largest repository of knowledge in the world. The Library now houses more than 115 million books, maps, manuscripts, photographs, motion pictures, and music.

The Library's history reflects in many ways the story of the passions of its builders—beginning with Thomas Jefferson and James Madison. Initially the Library's holdings were no bigger than some home libraries. A mere 740 volumes and three maps ordered by Congress from London booksellers arrived in 1801 and were kept in the office of the secretary of the Senate. A year later Thomas Jefferson appointed the first Librarian of Congress, John J. Beckley, who also was the clerk of the House of Representatives. Little did Jefferson know at the time that his own library would be the seed from which the present collections would grow.

On August 14, 1814, British soldiers burned the U.S. Capitol and with it the contents of the Library of Congress, that by then contained more than 3,000 items. Following the conflagration, Jefferson offered to sell Congress his personal collection of 6,487 volumes for \$23,950. Congress approved the purchase, though not without some debate. Several members believed Jefferson's library included books unrelated to legislative work, to which he retorted: "There is, in fact, no subject to which a member of Congress may

not have occasion to refer." That statement has guided the collecting policies of the Library of Congress to this day and is one of the main reasons why the institution's collections have a breadth and depth unmatched by any other repository.

Disaster struck the Library again on Christmas Eve 1851 when a faulty chimney flue started a fire that destroyed nearly two-thirds of the Jeffersonian collection. Over the years, the Library has worked, with some success, to find duplicates of these volumes. An aggressive campaign to acquire the remaining missing tomes is currently under way in conjunction with Gifts to the Nation, a bicentennial program that encourages donations of rare and important materials to the national collection. All books found will be featured in "Genius of Liberty," an exhibition about Jefferson that will open in April.

Over the years Congress has generously supported the Library and the Librarians of Congress in their pursuit of building this grand house of knowledge. For example, when Abraham Lincoln appointed Ainsworth Rand Spofford Librarian of Congress in 1864 (he served until 1897), he selected the man, more than any other individual, who transformed a legislative library into an institution of national importance. At the time of Spofford's appointment, the Library's collections numbered only 82,000 volumes. That number was to explode to roughly 900,000 by Spofford's retirement.

In March 1865 Congress followed Spofford's recommendation and changed the copyright law to require that one printed copy of every copyrighted "book, pamphlet, map, chart, musical composition, print, engraving or photograph" created in the United States must be sent to the Library for its use. That law is chiefly responsible for the growth of the institution's collections. In 1870, President Ulysses S. Grant approved an act of Congress requiring that two copies of every copyrighted item be sent to the Library and that all U.S. copyright activities be centered there.

Spofford also persuaded Congress to appropriate funds for a separate Library of Congress building, since space in the Capitol had been exhausted. The new structure, now known as the Thomas Jefferson Building, opened in 1897. Some have called it the most beautiful public building in America. Since then, the Library has constructed two more buildings on Capitol Hill. The John Adams Building opened in 1939, and the James Madison Memorial Building was completed in 1981. The Madison is not only the Library's third major structure but also the nation's official memorial to its fourth president, the "father" of the Constitution and Bill of Rights. While a member of the Continental Congress in 1783, Madison was also the first person to sponsor the idea of a library for Congress, and he was president when Jefferson's personal library became the foundation of the renewed Library of Congress.

Since 1987 I have served as the 13th Librarian of Congress. The position has given me unique access to this vast treasure house, and I have found some items in the collections that stand out for me personally. As a student of Russian history and culture I am intensely interested in the Prokudin-Gorskii Collection of Imperial Russia. Sergei Prokudin-Gorskii was one of the first Russians to experiment with color photography. At the outset of the revolution in 1917, the photographer escaped to Paris with 1,900 glass-plate negatives, providing a remarkable look at Russia from 1909-1911.

Other items of personal interest include the Presidential Papers Collection, which features documents from 23 U.S. presidents, beginning with the Founding Fathers and

continuing through to the twentieth century's Calvin Coolidge. The documents constitute the foremost source for the study of American leaders and provide a personal view of history that no textbook can offer.

In 1996, the Library acquired the Marian Carson Collection of Americana, believed to be the most extensive existing private assemblage of rare materials relating to the nation's history. The Carson family of Philadelphia had collected such precious materials as an extremely rare broadside printing (only one other copy is known to exist) of the Declaration of Independence, believed to have been printed circa July 10-20, 1776; an 1839 photographic self-portrait of Robert Cornelius, the earliest extant U.S. portrait photograph known; and a chalk-drawing of George Washington, made within a year of his death in 1799. These and the many other items in the collections have reinforced the Library's preeminence as a source of materials relating to American history.

Established by an act of Congress in 1976, the American Folklife Center holds the largest archives of the nation's distinctive cultures. The center's collections will increase significantly with Local Legacies project, which is providing a snapshot of American creativity at the turn of the century. Local Legacies is the premiere project of the Library's bicentennial effort and is jointly sponsored by Congress.

Among the many resources of the Library's Rare Book and Special Collections Division, the Lessing J. Rosenwald Collection of illustrated books from the fifteenth through twentieth centuries stands out. It features an amazing number of books of great rarity. Two of this collection's many treasures include the magnificent fifteenth-century manuscript known as the Giant Bible of Mainz, kept on permanent display in the Library's Great Hall, and one of only two known copies of the 1495 edition of *Epistolae et Evangelia*, sometimes called the finest illustrated book of the fifteenth century.

During the 1990s, the Library moved into the digital age, with its award-winning and widely popular web site (www.loc.gov), which now handles more than 80 million "hits" per month. In April internet users will find information on five million items relating to American history that the Library is making available on the site as its Gift to the Nation. This technology makes the collections at the Library of Congress accessible to people from across the country who are unable to make the trip to Washington, D.C. "America's library" has truly become the nation's library.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, on April 24, 2000, the Library of Congress will celebrate its bicentennial. With House Concurrent Resolution 269, we commend the Library and its staff for two hundred years of service to the Congress and to the American people, and encourage all Americans to participate in the Library's bicentennial activities.

On April 24, 1800, President John Adams approved legislation appropriating funds for purchasing "such books as may be necessary for use of the Congress." The first collection of 740 books and 3 maps arrived in 1801 and was stored in the U.S. Capitol, the Library's first home. On January 26, 1802, President Jefferson approved the first law which defined the role and functions of this new institution, creating the post of Librarian of Congress and creating the Joint Committee on the Library to oversee the Library's activities.

Since then, the Library's collections have grown to some 119 million items, making it the largest library in the world. The Library's collections now consist of over 18 million books,

53 million manuscripts, 12 million photographs, 4.5 million maps, 2.4 million sound recordings, nearly a million moving images and millions of other items.

Mr. Speaker, on April 24, 2000, the Library will begin a yearlong program of bicentennial activities, which will be a national celebration of all libraries and the important role they play in our society. The centerpiece of this effort is a project called Local Legacies, which created an opportunity for citizens to participate in the Library of Congress Bicentennial celebration.

Senators and Representatives, working with their constituents and local libraries and cultural institutions, have selected at least one significant cultural event or tradition that has been important to their district or state. These events have been documented and forwarded to the Library to be added to the American Folklife Center's archives to provide a cross section of the grassroots creativity of America that will be preserved and shared with future generations.

Members will be able to provide links on their webpages to the Local Legacies projects they have chosen and to the main Local Legacies Project page on the Library of Congress' website. Materials selected for Internet access will encompass the widest possible range of contributions, including video, sound, print, manuscript, and electronic formats.

Several months ago, I requested that the Library consider further enhancing public participation in the bicentennial by holding an exhibit of the Library's top treasures during the summer when the greatest number of constituents visit our Nation's capital. I am pleased to report that some of the most exciting items from the Library's enormous holdings will be on display throughout the summer at the Library and I would encourage all Members to direct visiting constituents to this once in a lifetime exhibit.

Mr. Speaker, I once again would like to congratulate the Library of Congress, the Librarian of Congress, Dr. James Billington, and all of the Library's staff on two hundred years of outstanding service to the Congress and the American people.

Mr. LARSON. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor one of our nation's most revered cultural treasures: the Library of Congress. This year marks the 200th year of the library's compilation of America's history and human knowledge. In this bicentennial year, I am honored to take a moment to extend my deep appreciation to Dr. James H. Billington, the Librarian of Congress. I would be remiss, Mr. Speaker, if I didn't also commend Dr. Billington's fine staff, especially Geraldine M. Otremba, Pamela J. Russell, Ralph Eubanks, Norma Baker, Peter Seligman, and Judy Schneider, who serve the Library so well and have been so helpful during my tenure in Congress. It is through their creative and dedicated efforts that our nation is reminded this year about the importance of libraries, and is encouraged to celebrate the uniqueness of their communities.

The Library's historic architecture may be deceiving to some, but once inside its marble walls the building continues to stimulate and inspire all who visit. It is that inspiration, that re-connection with American culture, which is the focus behind one of the Library's key bicentennial programs, the Local Legacy Project.

The Local Legacy Project was created to give hometown libraries, cultural institutions,

and other groups, in concert with their United States Senator or United States Representative, an opportunity to document the unique customs and cultures that make us Americans. I think of the Local Legacy Project as a patchwork quilt of American communities; no two are exactly alike, but each is a true treasure.

I am very pleased that the First Congressional District in Connecticut will be participating in the Library's Local Legacy Project with four projects of our own: The Legacy of Our Education will feature six historic and influential institutions: American School for the Deaf, Trinity College, University of Connecticut School of Law, University of Hartford, Teaching Hospitals and St. Joseph's College; The Legacy of Our Natural Resources includes the Riverfront Recapture—Connecticut River and Elizabeth Park Rose Garden; The Legacy of Our Proud Heritage includes the First Congressional District Foot Guard, Old State House, Mark Twain House, Harriet Beecher Stowe House, Noah Webster House, Oliver Ellsworth Homestead, Cheney Homestead, Warehouse Point Fire and Drum Corps, and the Eighth Connecticut Regiment Fire and Drum Corps; and The Legacy of the Creative Spirit includes the following organizations: Wadsworth Atheneum, Hartford Stage, Bushnell Memorial Hospital, Hartford Symphony, and Real Art Ways.

I am optimistic that our "creative spirit" will not be limited to our Legacy projects alone. One of the Library's other bicentennial programs includes the exhibition of its unparalleled collection of Thomas Jefferson materials, documents, books, drawings, and prints. I am hopeful that a collection of his works may make their way to Hartford, Connecticut, our state's capital, to be displayed.

While much is taking place in communities across America to preserve our culture, I am pleased to have played a role in the preservation of our legislative culture here in the House of Representatives. As a former high school history teacher, I was heartened by the support I received from Dr. Billington and his staff last year as I worked to obtain passage of my History of the House Awareness and Preservation Act. This bill authorizes the Library of Congress to commission eminent historians to assemble a written history of the House. Presently, the Library is beginning the process by gathering the names of eminent historians.

The largest rare book collection in North America, the largest and most diverse collections of scientific and technical information in the world, and the most comprehensive collection of American music in the world, are just a fraction of the unique documents housed in the Library. In addition, the Library receives 22,000 items each day. How could Thomas Jefferson ever imagine that his personal library of 6,487 books would one day grow to be such a tremendous source of knowledge.

The Library of Congress: an institution that has touched the world, and an institution that has touched history. Congratulations on your bicentennial, and may you continue to make America proud.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PETRI). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 269.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. EHLERS. 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 H. Con. Res. 269.

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

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 5 p.m.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 5 p.m.

□ 1702

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT) at 5 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.

SENIOR CITIZENS' FREEDOM TO WORK ACT OF 2000

Mr. SHAW. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order at any time today to take from the Speaker's table H.R. 5, with a Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House a motion offered by the Chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, or his designee, that the House concur in the Senate amendment, that the Senate amendment and the motion be considered as read; that the motion be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means, or their designees; and that the previous question be considered as ordered on the motion to final adoption without intervening motion.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAW. Madam Speaker, pursuant to the unanimous consent request just agreed to, I call up the bill (H.R. 5) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the earnings test for individuals who have attained retirement age.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. SHAW

Mr. SHAW. Madam Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mr. SHAW moves to concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 5.

The text of the Senate amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment:

Page 2, line 1, strike out all after "SECTION" over to and including line 3 on page 7 and insert:

1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Senior Citizens' Freedom to Work Act of 2000".

SEC. 2. ELIMINATION OF EARNINGS TEST FOR INDIVIDUALS WHO HAVE ATTAINED RETIREMENT AGE.

Section 203 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 403) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(1), by striking "the age of seventy" and inserting "retirement age (as defined in section 216(l))";

(2) in paragraphs (1)(A) and (2) of subsection (d), by striking "the age of seventy" each place it appears and inserting "retirement age (as defined in section 216(l))";

(3) in subsection (f)(1)(B), by striking "was age seventy or over" and inserting "was at or above retirement age (as defined in section 216(l))";

(4) in subsection (f)(3), by striking "age 70" and inserting "retirement age (as defined in section 216(l))";

(5) in subsection (h)(1)(A), by striking "age 70" each place it appears and inserting "retirement age (as defined in section 216(l))"; and

(6) in subsection (j)—

(A) in the heading, by striking "Age Seventy" and inserting "Retirement Age"; and

(B) by striking "seventy years of age" and inserting "having attained retirement age (as defined in section 216(l))".

SEC. 3. NONAPPLICATION OF RULES FOR COMPUTATION OF EXEMPT AMOUNT FOR INDIVIDUALS WHO HAVE ATTAINED RETIREMENT AGE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 203(f)(8) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 403(f)(8)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

"(E) Notwithstanding subparagraph (D), no deductions in benefits shall be made under subsection (b) with respect to the earnings of any individual in any month beginning with the month in which the individual attains retirement age (as defined in section 216(l))."

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 203(f)(9) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 403(f)(9)) is amended by striking "and (8)(D)," and inserting "(8)(D), and (8)(E)."

SEC. 4. ADDITIONAL CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) ELIMINATION OF REDUNDANT REFERENCES TO RETIREMENT AGE.—Section 203 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 403) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c), in the last sentence, by striking "nor shall any deduction" and all that follows and inserting "nor shall any deduction be made under this subsection from any widow's or widower's insurance benefit if the widow, surviving divorced wife, widower, or surviving divorced husband involved became entitled to such benefit prior to attaining age 60."; and

(2) in subsection (f)(1), by striking clause (D) and inserting the following: "(D) for which such individual is entitled to widow's or widower's insurance benefits if such individual became so entitled prior to attaining age 60.".

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT TO PROVISIONS FOR DETERMINING AMOUNT OF INCREASE ON ACCOUNT OF DELAYED RETIREMENT.—Section 202(w)(2)(B)(ii) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 402(w)(2)(B)(ii)) is amended by striking "or suffered deductions under section 203(b) or 203(c) in amounts equal to the amount of such benefit" and inserting "or, if so entitled, did not receive benefits pursuant to a request by such individual that benefits not be paid".

SEC. 5. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this Act shall apply with respect to taxable years ending after December 31, 1999.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House today, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW).

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHAW. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 5.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I strongly support H.R. 5, legislation to repeal the earnings penalty for hard-working seniors age 65 and over.

Madam Speaker, I am especially pleased that the Senate acted quickly and unanimously in support of this important legislation. The technical changes made in the Senate improve on the legislation passed unanimously by this House, and I urge all Members to once again support this excellent bill.

Due to this quick work, seniors will soon receive all the benefits that they are owed, even if they continue to work after reaching the age of 65. That is their choice. As the name of our legislation suggests, they deserve the freedom to choose to work without losing Social Security benefits.

It is worth noting that many seniors now affected by the earnings limit will receive back payments from months this year that they have lost their Social Security benefits. That will be a welcome relief for many, including some who have lost Social Security benefits for years due to this unfair penalty. Seniors can save this money for their future, use it to help with their grandchildren's college education, or buy prescription drugs. Again, it is their money and it should be their choice.

Madam Speaker, ending the earnings penalty is the right thing to do. It is also an affordable thing to do, as the Social Security Administration's independent actuaries have told us. They agree this legislation will not affect the soundness of the Social Security program and its trust funds.

We still must address Social Security's long-term financial imbalance, but we were very careful to ensure this legislation does not make that task any more difficult than it already is.

I would like to congratulate the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON), our colleague, and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON) who first in-

troduced this legislation at the beginning of this Congress. I also congratulate the gentleman from Texas (Chairman ARCHER) for his years of tireless work in relaxing and now repealing the earnings penalty. He is a personal testament to what hard-working seniors can do. In large part, passing this legislation is a tribute to his tireless devotion to helping our Nation's taxpayers, including the seniors who have spent decades working to support their families, their businesses, and this great country.

Madam Speaker, I urge all Members to support this outstanding legislation. Our hard-working seniors deserve no less. I would also like to pay tribute to the minority side and thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI) for making this really a landmark bipartisan bill and one that every Member of the House can be very proud to support.

Mr. Speaker, since there will be no House-Senate conference, and the Senate manager's amendment to H.R. 5 proceeded without a full committee report being filed by the Finance Committee, I believe a brief explanation is in order of the differences between the legislation before us today and the version of H.R. 5 that was approved by the House on March 1, 2000.

First, some background is needed. Under current law there are two separate senior earnings limits: a stricter limit that affects those who start drawing Social Security benefits before reaching the full retirement age (which is currently age 65) and a more lenient limit affecting seniors who have reached the full retirement age. After reaching age 70, seniors are no longer affected by an earnings limit. The stricter earnings limit is \$10,080 this year, with a 50% benefit offset for earnings above the limit. The more lenient limit is \$17,000, with a 33% benefit offset for earnings above the limit. H.R. 5 repeals the earnings limit for seniors who reach the full retirement age.

The legislation before the House today is slightly modified from the version that passed unanimously on March 1 with respect to the earnings limit for the first months of the calendar year during which a senior reaches the full retirement age. For seniors turning 65 in 2000, the issue is what earnings limit will apply for months prior to their 65th birthday (that is, while they are still 64)? Under the legislation previously approved by the House, the more lenient limit would apply for such months for seniors who turn 65 in 2000; for seniors who reach the full retirement age in future years, the stricter limit would apply during those months. Under the legislation we are considering today, the more lenient limit would apply for such months in all years.

I am pleased that the House is supporting this change today, which has the effect of slightly broadening the relief from the earnings penalty afforded by the version of H.R. 5 the House has already passed. It is worth noting that this change will not affect Social Security's long-run financial soundness, just as the underlying H.R. 5 would not affect program solvency. This change is certainly in keeping with the spirit of H.R. 5, which is designed to help seniors who want or have to work to bet-

ter support themselves and their families. These hardworking seniors deserve to keep the benefits they have paid for, as this legislation provides.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I would like to congratulate the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER), chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, for the cooperation that they gave to us in the minority in indicating that this would be a priority piece of legislation. It gave those of us on the Committee on Ways and Means the opportunity to get the support of our Members on this side of the aisle and to demonstrate how cooperation can have both sides of the aisle working a lot more closely.

We hope that this sign of cooperation means that before this year ends, that we will have the opportunity to show that there are plenty of differences between our parties and how we achieve the goals, and we do not challenge each other's intent in terms of what is good for this country, but certainly there should be a lot of things that we can agree upon. I think it would be healthy and it would be the right political thing for us as an institution to bring those things forward, Democrats and Republicans, to show the House, to show the other body, and indeed to show the President and the country that we are a body that can work.

This is a good piece of legislation. It is long overdue. The manner in which it has received overwhelming support is just indicative of what we can do when we put our minds to it.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI), ranking member of the Subcommittee on Social Security, and that he may control the time.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Madam Speaker, first of all, I would like to just reiterate what the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), ranking member on the Committee on Ways and Means, has said. First of all, I want to commend the gentleman from Texas (Chairman ARCHER) for his bipartisan approach on this legislation. And, of course, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) for his leadership on the Democratic side.

I want to pay particular thanks and commendation to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Social Security. I think he did a tremendous job on moving the bill from the subcommittee

to the full committee and the floor of the House.

Obviously, Democrats and Republicans working together made sure that the other body kept their amendments to a minimum. We just appreciate the cooperation and the bipartisan spirit, I think, that both sides of the aisle have had. But I do want to take that moment to make that observation.

Madam Speaker, I would just like to very briefly reiterate some of the things that have been said before. The Senate had two technical amendments to our legislation. Both were very technical in nature and actually improved the basic underlying legislation.

As a result of that, we think that this bill should have, as it had when it left the House, unanimous approval. 422 Members voted for it and no Member voted against it.

This will go a long way in encouraging senior citizens who are so needed when the unemployment rate is under 5 percent, to stay in the workforce. These are people that undoubtedly have years and years of experience and a wealth of knowledge to pass on to their co-workers, and to ensure that they can stay in the workforce and garner the same wages without any penalty is something that the Congress is now about to do in sending this bill to the President.

Certainly, I think it is a major achievement. Obviously, we have a long ways to go in terms of ultimately the comprehensive Social Security reform. And I think the gentleman from Florida and myself and others such as the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) that have been working on comprehensive reform know that that is a task that looms before us. This action, in and of itself, should not deter us from trying to grapple with that very difficult and complex subject. And we know that there is partisan undertones to it. We also know that it is very difficult to deal with. But we are going to have to address that particular issue.

So, again, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this conference report so we can send it immediately to the President. And, again, I want to commend all individual Members who have worked on this legislation, including, I might add, I saw him come in, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, and, of course, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON) on the Democratic side who were the original two cosponsors of this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I want to congratulate my colleagues for all their hard work on this bill. I am very pleased to be here today to see this bill through another step toward becoming law.

Our vote today signals the end of the Social Security retirement earnings test for people who have reached the normal retirement age. This is a remarkable event because as the title of the bill indicates, we are freeing our seniors from the work limits imposed by current law.

No longer will the most experienced members of our labor force have to experience a

reduction in their Social Security benefits if they choose to work. No longer will seniors have to calculate just how many months and days each year they can work without hitting that earnings limits.

This is good for senior citizens who want to work, good for our workforce which benefits from the experience and knowledge of older workers, and of course good for the economy.

Repealing the retirement earnings test will allow thousands of Social Security recipients to work without a reduction in their benefits. The Social Security Administration estimates that in 1999, 793,000 beneficiaries between the ages of 65 and 69 had some or all of their benefits withheld because of the retirement earnings tests.

By allowing beneficiaries to work without suffering a reduction in benefits, more older workers may decide to remain in, or to return to, the labor force.

Repealing the retirement earnings test will not affect Social Security's finances over the long run and would not change the date by which the Social Security Trust Funds are projected to be exhausted. Repealing the retirement earnings test for beneficiaries above the normal retirement age has a short-run cost, but over the long run, that cost is entirely offset.

Further, repealing the retirement earnings test will make the Social Security program easier and less expensive to administer. The Social Security Administration estimates that savings from the cost of administering the earnings test could be as high as \$100 million.

I am particularly pleased that the only modification to the bill that the Senate accepted was a relatively minor one and one that improves the bill. The amendment adopted by the Senate changes the way in which the bill applies to Social Security beneficiaries during the year in which they reach the normal retirement age and ensures that no one will be worse off under this bill than under current law. I am certain that no Member of the House will have an objection to this change and I look forward to sending this bill quickly to the President for his signature.

I'd like to point out that not a single Member of Congress has voted against this bill, a clear testament to the bipartisan support it has received. When the bill was first considered by the House, it passed 422-0.

When the bill was considered by the Senate, it passed 100-0. I expect the outcome of our vote today to be the same.

Additionally, our support for H.R. 5 sends a clear signal that by working together, Democrats and Republicans, we can accomplish much more than we could by working at odds.

Over the past several weeks, as this bill moved through the Ways and Means Committee, the House floor, and the Senate, Members have set aside their differences so that this bill could proceed and we could achieve a victory for seniors who need to work without penalty. I am proud of our accomplishment.

I am extremely pleased that the Congress has addressed the earnings test in a bipartisan manner, and I remain hopeful that the Congress might address other much-needed Social Security legislation in the same fashion to deal with the shortfall that the system will face in the coming decades.

Again, I want to thank my colleagues again for all their hard work. This is truly an historic day and a big victory for our senior citizens.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHAW. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH), a respected member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. ENGLISH. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Social Security, and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON), my distinguished colleague, for their extraordinary efforts as well as my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

Madam Speaker, right now the Social Security system places a higher tax penalty on working seniors than on billionaires. We have been sending seniors the message that when they hit retirement age, we do not want them anymore. The earnings limit that was created 60 years ago is a relic of Depression era economics that says that seniors should make room for younger workers. But we all know, seniors add more to the workforce and more to the economy than they could ever take away. They add their years of experience and their talents.

H.R. 5 repeals the earnings limit which unfairly punishes seniors who earn more than \$17,000 a year. That is not a lot. This legislation has received virtually unanimous support in the House and Senate, but more importantly, a ground swell of support from our constituents. After all, a 65-year-old who works as a barber or a cashier currently loses \$500 in benefits just because they have earned \$18,500 a year. That is absurd. This arbitrary limit serves as a barrier to many low- and middle-income seniors who need to work in order to improve their quality of life or even to make ends meet.

The Social Security Administration reports that more than 800,000 working seniors between the ages of 65 and 69 lose part or all of their Social Security benefits due to this outdated earnings limit.

□ 1715

My own State of Pennsylvania ranks sixth with the number of seniors adversely affected by that earnings limit. It is important that Congress protect the dignity of retirement. The time has come for us to unshackle the creative energies of America's seniors.

Today, by supporting this legislation, Congress says to seniors, you may choose to work, choose to remain part of the productive economy, and choose to share your talents, and we will not punish you.

Mr. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam Speaker, let me thank the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI) for yielding me this time and for his work on bringing this legislation forward and the gentleman from

Florida (Mr. SHAW), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Social Security.

This is a very important piece of legislation. It will be enacted, I think, very shortly once we complete our action and it is forwarded to the President. It will affect 800,000 seniors who have had their Social Security checks reduced just because they decided to continue to work. That makes no sense at all.

We need more workers in the workforce, not less. In today's economy and with the shrinking workforce that we have of more people retiring and less people working, it makes common economic sense to allow those 65 years of age who want to work to be able to work.

Without this legislation, the marginal tax rate is 33 percent. That is unacceptable. That is why we are changing it. It is interesting that this particular legislation will have no impact on the long-term solvency of the Social Security system, for it is a plus in having people work and contributing to the system.

It also benefits women more than men, because women's work history is not as strong, generally, as men. This will allow women to be able to continue to work without being penalized under the Social Security system.

Madam Speaker, this legislation becomes effective January 1. It is retroactive to the current year, as it should be, so that individuals in this current year will be able to get their full Social Security benefits without the reduction for their work.

As the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), Chair of the Subcommittee on Social Security, pointed out, we are able to do this even though we cannot bring forward at this point comprehensive Social Security reform. I think we would all like to do that. We know that we need to deal with the Social Security system in a broader context, but we have an agreement on this very important piece of legislation, so we are bringing that forward. We are doing it in a bipartisan way.

Madam Speaker, as the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means, said, we should use this as a model to work together, Democrats and Republicans, to bring other legislation forward.

I think about the need for seniors for prescription drugs. We may not be able to agree on Medicare reform; but we can agree, I would hope, on prescription drugs.

Let us in a bipartisan way bring that forward, which will also help our seniors.

This is a good day for seniors. It is a good day for our Nation. I congratulate all involved.

Mr. SHAW. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means and one of the original sponsors of H.R. 5.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, I thank all on both sides of the aisle for their support.

Today, 800,000 seniors are one step closer to gaining their freedom to work. It sounds unbelievable, does it not? To think that, since 1935, when Social Security was first proposed, we have been penalizing our seniors for working. That is right. Since the inception of the Social Security system, our seniors have lost \$1 in benefits for every \$3 they earn over a set amount.

Currently, as was stated, seniors may only earn \$17,000 before losing their benefits.

But today, thanks to the hard work and dedication of the gentleman from Texas (Chairman ARCHER); Speaker HASTERT; the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Social Security, we find ourselves ready to pass the Senior Citizens' Freedom To Work Act, a bill I introduced last year.

I know that 64,500 seniors in Texas alone, including Tony Santos and his family, whom I spoke of earlier, are going to celebrate their new-found freedom to work.

I fought in both Korea and Vietnam for freedom, and I believe that includes the freedom for our seniors to work without being penalized by the Federal Government.

Our seniors are dedicated, experienced workers who have endured this Depression-era law for far too long. We are in a new century, 60 years past the Great Depression, where laws passed in 1935 are no longer relevant.

This Nation was built by generations of Americans who believed in the free enterprise system. In the words of Thomas Edison, "There is no substitute for hard work." This legislation will make sure that our seniors have the freedom to work, save, and invest in a better America for tomorrow.

Mr. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), the distinguished ranking Democrat on the Committee on Agriculture, who has been really one of the leaders in the whole Social Security reform issue.

Mr. STENHOLM. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding me this time, and I appreciate the leadership of him and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) on this effort and other efforts regarding Social Security.

I strongly support repeal of the Social Security earnings limit. In fact, repeal of the Social Security earnings limit has been part of the comprehensive Social Security legislation that the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) and I introduced in the last two Congresses.

However, I do want to take this time to reiterate my disappointment that we are considering legislation to increase Social Security benefits without even discussing the long-term financial challenges facing Social Security. We should have spent the last year working on a comprehensive plan to strengthen Social Security that would restore solvency, reduce unfunded li-

abilities, give workers greater control of their retirement income, improve the safety net, and reward work.

But we, both the President and Congress, have ignored our opportunity to deal with the long-term challenges facing Social Security.

Later this week, the Social Security trustees will issue their annual report which will show that the short-term outlook for Social Security has improved slightly. We cannot afford to let this good news distract us from the problems that remain. While the short-term outlook for the Social Security Trust Fund may be improved, the long-term problems and the pressures facing the rest of the budget may actually be worse.

When the Senate considered this legislation, Senator JUDD GREGG proposed an amendment which would have made a modest step in advancing the discussion about the challenges facing Social Security among policy makers and the public. The Gregg amendment would have required the commissioner of Social Security to provide the public and policy makers with easily understood and readily available information about the financial challenges facing Social Security. The purpose of the amendment was simply to encourage a more honest discussion of the challenges facing Social Security.

Unfortunately, the Senate did not have time to discuss these issues when it considered the earnings bill. However, the Senate Finance Committee chairman did indicate his willingness to work with Senator GREGG on this issue later this year.

I would respectfully encourage the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER), chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), chairman of the Subcommittee on Social Security, to conduct hearings on these recommendations so that they may receive the attention they deserve.

More importantly, I encourage all of my colleagues to remember that we still have serious financial problems facing Social Security that must be addressed. So while all Members should vote for the earnings limit repeal today for the reasons we have so eloquently heard made already, we should not forget that we still have much hard work to do in making sure that Social Security remains financially sound for our children and for our grandchildren.

Mr. SHAW. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH), a respected member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Social Security from our Committee on Ways and Means, for yielding me this time.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON) lamenting a long-term solution to the Social Security challenges that we

face. But I think a word is in order to put this debate and this challenge in context. One of the elemental lessons we learn in civics class is that the President proposes; the Congress disposes.

Sadly, executive leadership has been lacking and, indeed, missing when it comes to a serious, long-term solution of Social Security challenges we face.

Now it is true the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON), along with the gentleman from Arizona, have one remedy that they have proposed. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), the chairman of the subcommittee, and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER), the chairman of the full committee, likewise, have a long-term solution.

But, again, the missing ingredient, sadly, is effective leadership from the administration; and it looks like it will take a verdict of the people on the first Tuesday following the first Monday in November to make that change.

However, Madam Speaker, it is well worth asking the question, what took us so long to correct the injustice that at long last this House will correct tonight? Since the mid-1930s, since the advent of the Social Security program, those seniors who chose to work past retirement age have been penalized to the tune of \$1 out of every \$3 of benefits earned, simply because they chose to work.

Now, with a labor shortage, with so many senior Americans, healthy, willing and able to work, at long last, this House has moved to correct this inequity.

Again, Madam Speaker, I welcome my colleagues on the left who join with us at long last in this bipartisan effort. But, again, Madam Speaker, the question that so many Americans will continue to ask is, why did it take so long? Even as we deal with the responsible question of a long-term remedy for Social Security, the question remains, why did it take the denizens of the left so long to join with us?

Even as we extend the hand of bipartisanship, we welcome now this new-found coalition. We hope that it will result in other moves to restore tax fairness and balance for all Americans. But this important step we take, and we welcome the newcomers to this endeavor with the hand of bipartisanship.

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

Madam Speaker, one of the issues I think that the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) raised of why are we doing this now, if we would have done it 3 or 4 years ago, we would have had either taken it out of Defense or perhaps other domestic programs or else increased the deficit. We have a surplus now. As a result of that, we were able to do it without cutting other programs, including the Defense budget.

In addition, I would just add that, over the length of the Social Security program itself, we will not see any lost

revenues because there is a pick up of revenues in terms of the credit that is given.

So the reason we did it is quite simple, we have a surplus. We did not have a surplus before.

Mr. KLECZKA. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATSUI. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KLECZKA. Madam Speaker, the only reason I rise is to ask if the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI) would respond to a question.

Mr. MATSUI. Yes, Madam Speaker.

Mr. KLECZKA. Madam Speaker, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH), the previous speaker, indicated that there was no initiative coming from this administration on this proposal. I believe the gentleman from California served during the Bush administration and Reagan administration. Does he recall similar legislation coming down from either President Reagan or President Bush asking Congress to repeal the earnings limit?

Mr. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I think President Reagan did, but I do not know if President Bush did. I am not quite sure.

Mr. KLECZKA. Okay, Madam Speaker.

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

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

Madam Speaker, I think the old adage comes to mind of never ask a question that you do not know the answer to.

Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER), the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. ARCHER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me this time.

Madam Speaker, today is a great day for hundreds of thousands of working seniors across this country. It is also a special day for me personally, because it is a culmination of my 27-year effort to repeal the earnings limit.

In fact, I introduced a bill to do so in 1973, and we have taken out of the archives a copy of that bill, H.R. 10148. The reason to repeal the earnings penalty then was the same as it is today, it is simply wrong.

Twenty-seven years is a long time to wait for me. But I am more thrilled that working seniors will not have to wait any longer to be free from this punishing tax.

I also want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), chairman of the subcommittee on Social Security, for their tireless efforts on this bill.

The Social Security earnings limit is not only wrong, it is unfair, and it is backwards.

□ 1730

The earnings penalty actually cuts Social Security benefits from many

working seniors over the age of 65 and gives them the highest effective tax rate of their entire lives at a time when senior citizens should be realizing lower taxes. It discourages them from working. And why in the world would we want to discourage any American, whether they are 16 or 67, from working?

Clearly, repealing this penalty is the right thing to do. More seniors are choosing to work today past their retirement for many reasons: for their own financial needs, to help their families or their grandchildren through school, or for their own personal fulfillment. The point is Americans are living longer now and older Americans can and do make a great contribution to our society. They should not be punished.

In addition, repealing the earnings penalty will now unleash the productivity of one of the most experienced and talented workforces in this country at a time when our growing economy needs it and will need even more of it in the new century. This is clearly a win-win for everyone, which is why the bill today enjoys widespread bipartisan support.

In summary, repealing the earnings penalty is based on the fundamental principles of fairness and freedom. Seniors can now be free to work without penalty and be treated fairly by a program that they paid into their entire lives.

The victory today goes to the hundreds of thousands of older Americans who do not see retirement as an end but as a new beginning.

Mr. SHAW. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time remains on either side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) has 17½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI) has 19 minutes remaining.

Mr. SHAW. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DUNN), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Ms. DUNN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise today in enthusiastic support for H.R. 5, the Senior Citizens' Freedom to Work Act.

It is really a joy to be on the floor and be debating this bill in concert with the minority. It is a great feeling that we all believe this is something that needs to be changed for the fairness of our Nation's valued seniors.

The Social Security earnings penalty is yet another aspect of the Social Security System that just no longer applies to today's society. It is a 60-year old system. It was written in the 1930s, and it just does not work any longer, and that is why we unite today in wanting to change this provision.

Seniors are living longer, healthier lives and we need their strength and their experience in our communities. We need their examples and their institutional memories to provide the example to young new workers who are moving into the job market.

In my State, Washington State, some of our very best workers right now are sitting in rocking chairs because they cannot afford the loss of their Social Security income that would come with their continuing in their jobs. Thirteen thousand seniors in my State are being forced to choose between the jobs that they love or need and losing the retirement income for which they have worked all their lives. This is not only wrong, as our chairman said, but it keeps an intelligent and productive part of the work force at home.

Seniors who are currently retired have been called the greatest generation for the sacrifices they made in defending freedom and building America into the world's only remaining economic and military superpower. It is time that we honor their contributions to America by allowing them to continue to give one of the most precious gifts of all to us: Their work ethic.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this very important bill.

Mr. SHAW. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise today to strongly support the Senate amendments for H.R. 5, the Senior Citizens' Freedom to Work Act.

This modified bill removes earnings limits for working seniors who receive Social Security. For too many years seniors aged 65 to 69, who chose to continue to work, had their Social Security benefits deducted by \$1 for every \$3 earned when their total earnings exceeded \$12,500 annually.

The 104th Congress, with my support, made a needed change, raising the earnings limit to \$30,000 by the year 2002. This year's earnings limit went up to \$17,000. I have long believed that more needed to be done on this issue. Ever since coming to Washington in our 93rd Congress, I have introduced legislation to either raise the earnings limit or eliminate it all together.

The Social Security earnings limit only serves to discourage seniors from working and diminishes their potential impact on society. It is a condescending regulation. It conveys a message that seniors have nothing to contribute and are better off not serving in the workforce. And, of course, that is not true.

It is gratifying the President has voiced his support for eliminating the earnings limit. I commend the Committee on Ways and Means for their attention to this issue; and, likewise, the Senate should be commended for their rapid attention in bringing the measure to the floor, making their legislation retroactive to December 31, 1999, so that those seniors who turn 65 this

year may take full advantage of this bill's benefits.

Accordingly, Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join in supporting this worthy legislation.

Mr. SHAW. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP), a member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. CAMP. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise in strong support of H.R. 5.

I am proud that today we are moving forward in eliminating the Social Security earnings limit. Today, one of the biggest problems facing our country is not lack of jobs but lack of workers. This is in direct contrast to the 1930s, when the earnings limit was enacted and imposed a tax on working seniors.

H.R. 5 is important to seniors in the State of Michigan, where nearly 653,000 adults age 65 and older depend on Social Security to make up half their total income. At least one in 11 seniors in my State are still working. These seniors have earned their Social Security benefits through a lifetime of contributions, and the government does not have the right to impose a 33 percent tax on them.

The earnings limit is unfair and discriminates against working seniors. No retiree should be penalized for choosing to work. Our proposal would eliminate this tax penalty on earnings and would allow seniors to collect their full Social Security benefits if they choose to work. After all, it is their money.

I am pleased that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle are supporting this legislation. It is time to stop penalizing our seniors with such an unjust tax, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 5.

Mr. SHAW. Madam Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER), a respected member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

Mr. WELLER. Madam Speaker, what a great day. We have legislation before us that is all about fairness and it is legislation, I believe, that will pass with overwhelming bipartisan support.

In Illinois there are 800,000 senior citizens between the ages of 65 and 70 who, because of their circumstances, either want to continue working or need to work because their savings and retirement plans did not work out quite the way that they had wanted. But these seniors suffer what is called the Social Security earnings penalty limit. Essentially, their Social Security benefits are taxed away if they continue working. That is just wrong.

This has gone on for far too long. In fact, this was put into place back in the 1930s to discourage senior citizens from working. We are fortunate today to have a pretty good economy. But many times employers who are looking for workers are told by senior citizens who would like to work that if they are

hired and they begin working, they are going to lose their Social Security.

I am sure my colleagues can recall conversations they have had with their neighbors or constituents where that has been a statement that they have heard. In my home State of Illinois, 58,000 senior citizens between the ages of 65 and 70 are currently punished because they are working. They are losing almost one-third of their Social Security benefits if they make more than \$17,000 a year. Essentially, they are being taxed at Donald Trump's rates. That is not right. That is not fair.

Senior citizens today are working longer; they are living longer; and they want to be active longer, but our Tax Code punishes them. That is just wrong. It is an issue of fairness. Just like elimination of the marriage tax penalty, where 25 million married couples pay higher taxes just because they are married. This is a case where, if a senior citizen wishes to continue working, they must pay higher taxes and lose their Social Security benefits.

My colleagues, this legislation passed the House with a unanimous vote, it passed the Senate with a unanimous vote. Let us send this legislation with this little modification to the President. I am pleased the President is going to sign this legislation. It is nice to see a bipartisan effort work around here.

My colleagues, it is all about fairness. Let us vote today to eliminate the Social Security earnings limit. Please vote "aye."

Mr. SHAW. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. MCCRERY), an esteemed member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

Mr. MCCRERY. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Subcommittee on Social Security for yielding me this time.

As I was listening to speakers here on the floor extol the virtues of this legislation, I was reminded of what I think is an old Chinese proverb that I am going to paraphrase, that victory has many fathers, defeat is an orphan. We are all claiming credit for this bill, which is good for us all to claim credit for something that the Congress is doing and makes sense. It is just common sense not to penalize seniors who make work.

But the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) is not the only one who took this as a personal project. When I first came to Congress in the spring of 1988 as a Member of the 100th Congress, I was adopted by my colleagues who were elected in the regular election which constituted the 100th Congress. And in one of our early meetings as a class, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), who was a member of our class, came up with the idea for a class project. And our class project was to introduce legislation and fight to repeal the earnings limit for seniors, for

Social Security recipients. So we took that upon ourselves to do, and we introduced legislation.

So I rise today to give the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) and the class of the 100th Congress our due credit for pushing this issue for the last 12 years and, finally today, we gain victory here on the House floor.

But surely every member of the Committee on Ways and Means who saw the benefit of finally doing away with this antiquated law deserves credit; and I do not mind at all Democrats, Republicans, everybody in the House coming to the floor and taking credit for doing this.

It is certainly a happy day for seniors in this country, and I think a happy day for the Congress to finally do something that makes a lot of good old-fashioned common sense to all of us in this country but particularly our seniors, our Social Security recipients.

I thank the Chair for yielding and encourage him to keep up the good work.

Mr. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Madam Speaker, I feel it is a blessing that many people today are able to continue working and leading productive lives when they reach their golden years. That is why I urge my colleagues to support the Senate amendments to this bill.

Productivity helps give meaning to life. For many it helps prolong life.

□ 1745

We should honor our seniors, not deny them what is rightfully theirs. The earnings penalty is a disincentive to work. In today's world, many seniors need the extra income, particularly when burdened with the high cost of prescription drugs and other essential needs. With so many seniors needing every single penny, Madam Speaker, we must help them in any way we can.

It is about time that we reach out and help our mothers, our fathers, and all those who have helped to shape this Nation. Currently, the amount of income withheld from Georgia beneficiaries exceeds \$91.2 million yearly and more than \$4.2 billion is withheld nationally. This measure will not only put money in the pockets of nearly 17,000 Georgians but more than 700,000 seniors nationwide.

Let us send this bill to the President and eliminate this burdensome earnings penalty.

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

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

Madam Speaker, I would again just urge my colleagues to vote for the conference report. Only two changes were made that were technical in nature. Obviously, we want to move this bill on

to the President, who strongly supports this legislation.

Again, I want to commend my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for a job well done and for the bipartisan cooperation I think that we saw on both sides of the aisle. That is why we were able to get 422 votes when the bill left the House. I am sure the vote will be unanimous here.

So, again, I urge a yes vote.
Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, when I was in my district this last weekend, an older lady was working where we were eating, and she was waiting on tables. I had helped her some years ago with a matter concerning her son, who is very badly retarded on an SSI matter.

I mentioned it to her, and I asked her her age. Her age is a little above 65 but below 70. She is working waiting on tables, very hard work for someone that age, on her feet all day long, never complains. And yet we are taxing her at such an unconscionable rate. I told her that we were going to be passing this and that she would not only no longer be penalized but that she was going to receive back the penalties that she has incurred from the first of this year.

I do not know whether she really believed me or not, but I am going to be very pleased to go home and tell her that indeed we did. And then I will go home again and tell her indeed that the President joined with this Congress and signed this great piece of legislation.

This is a first step, only a first step, towards Social Security reform, but it is one that is purely one of fairness. It is so unfair for us to have continued to penalize older workers just simply because they were between the age of 65 and 70, saying that they could not keep their entire benefit. So many of them had to work. Whether they were waiting on tables, whether they were working in construction, no matter what they were doing, these wonderful people were working, many because they just wanted to work and many because, as the case of Mary, she had to work.

This is very important that we stay together on this legislation. And I also want to compliment the other body. That is something we do not hear very often in this House is compliments for the other body, but they kept this legislation clean.

The President asked for it to be clean. We asked for it to be clean, and they obliged us and they passed a clean bill. So I think this is really a landmark day for this House. We are coming together in complete cooperation with the Democrats in the White House and with the Republicans controlling the legislative branch.

It is a wonderful day, and I would urge all Members to vote yes and make this again a unanimous statement by this House of Representatives showing our commitment to American seniors.

Again, I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI), the ranking member on the Democratic side, and the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

Of course, again, I want to compliment the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER), who has steadfastly stood for elimination of the earnings penalty for many, many years now, as he demonstrated on the House floor earlier.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) to concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 5.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6 p.m.

□ 1802

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT) at 6 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will now put the question on the motion to concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 5 and on each motion to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today in the following order:

H.R. 2412, by the yeas and nays;
House Concurrent Resolution 292, by the yeas and nays;

House Concurrent Resolution 269, by the yeas and nays;

Concurring in Senate amendment to H.R. 5, by the yeas and nays.

The Chair may reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first such vote in this series. The Chair intends to conduct this series of four votes as one 15-minute vote followed by two 5-minute votes followed in turn by another 15-minute vote.

E. ROSS ADAIR FEDERAL BUILDING AND UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 2412.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2412, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 417, nays 0, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 76]
YEAS—417

Abercrombie	Condit	Green (WI)
Ackerman	Conyers	Greenwood
Aderholt	Cook	Gutierrez
Allen	Cooksey	Gutknecht
Andrews	Costello	Hall (OH)
Archer	Cox	Hall (TX)
Army	Coyne	Hansen
Baca	Cramer	Hastings (FL)
Bachus	Crowley	Hastings (WA)
Baird	Cubin	Hayes
Baker	Cummings	Hayworth
Baldacci	Cunningham	Hefley
Baldwin	Danner	Herger
Ballenger	Davis (FL)	Hill (IN)
Barcia	Davis (IL)	Hill (MT)
Barr	Davis (VA)	Hilleary
Barrett (NE)	DeFazio	Hilliard
Barrett (WI)	DeGette	Hinchev
Bartlett	Delahunt	Hinojosa
Barton	DeLauro	Hobson
Bass	DeLay	Hoefel
Bateman	DeMint	Hoekstra
Becerra	Deutsch	Holden
Bentsen	Diaz-Balart	Holt
Bereuter	Dickey	Hooley
Berkley	Dicks	Horn
Berman	Dingell	Hostettler
Berry	Dixon	Houghton
Biggert	Doggett	Hoyer
Bilbray	Dooley	Hulshof
Bilirakis	Doolittle	Hunter
Bishop	Doyle	Hutchinson
Blagojevich	Dreier	Hyde
Bliley	Duncan	Insee
Blumenauer	Dunn	Isakson
Blunt	Edwards	Istook
Boehlert	Ehlers	Jackson (IL)
Boehner	Ehrlich	Jackson-Lee
Bonilla	Emerson	(TX)
Bonior	Engel	Jefferson
Bono	English	Jenkins
Borski	Eshoo	John
Boswell	Etheridge	Johnson (CT)
Boucher	Evans	Johnson, E. B.
Boyd	Everett	Johnson, Sam
Brady (PA)	Ewing	Jones (OH)
Brady (TX)	Farr	Kanjorski
Brown (FL)	Fattah	Kaptur
Brown (OH)	Filner	Kasich
Bryant	Fletcher	Kelly
Burr	Foley	Kennedy
Burton	Forbes	Kildee
Buyer	Ford	Kilpatrick
Callahan	Fossella	Kind (WI)
Calvert	Frank (MA)	King (NY)
Camp	Frelinghuysen	Kingston
Campbell	Frost	Klecza
Canady	Gallegly	Knollenberg
Cannon	Ganske	Kolbe
Capps	Gejdenson	Kucinich
Capuano	Gekas	Kuykendall
Cardin	Gephardt	LaFalce
Carson	Gibbons	LaHood
Castle	Gilchrest	Lampson
Chabot	Gilman	Lantos
Chambliss	Gonzalez	Largent
Chenoweth-Hage	Goode	Larson
Clay	Goodlatte	Latham
Clayton	Goodling	LaTourrette
Clement	Gordon	Lazio
Clyburn	Goss	Leach
Coble	Graham	Lee
Coburn	Granger	Levin
Collins	Green (TX)	Lewis (CA)

Lewis (GA)	Pease	Smith (TX)
Lewis (KY)	Pelosi	Smith (WA)
Linder	Peterson (MN)	Snyder
Lipinski	Peterson (PA)	Souder
LoBiondo	Petri	Spence
Lofgren	Phelps	Spratt
Lowe	Pickering	Stabenow
Lucas (KY)	Pickett	Stark
Lucas (OK)	Pitts	Stearns
Luther	Pombo	Stenholm
Maloney (CT)	Pomeroy	Strickland
Maloney (NY)	Porter	Stump
Manzullo	Portman	Stupak
Markey	Price (NC)	Sununu
Martinez	Pryce (OH)	Sweeney
Mascara	Radanovich	Talent
Matsui	Rahall	Tancredo
McCarthy (MO)	Ramstad	Tanner
McCarthy (NY)	Rangel	Tauscher
McCollum	Regula	Tauzin
McCrery	Reyes	Taylor (MS)
McDermott	Reynolds	Terry
McGovern	Riley	Thomas
McHugh	Rivers	Thompson (CA)
McInnis	Rodriguez	Thompson (MS)
McIntyre	Roemer	Thornberry
McKeon	Rogan	Thune
McKinney	Rogers	Thurman
Moore	Rohrabacher	Tiahrt
Moakley	Ros-Lehtinen	Tierney
Vitter	Rothman	Toomey
Sanders	Roukema	Towns
Sandlin	Roybal-Allard	Trafficant
Sanford	Royce	Turner
Sawyer	Rush	Udall (CO)
Saxton	Ryan (WI)	Udall (NM)
Scarborough	Ryun (KS)	Upton
Schaffer	Sabo	Velazquez
Schakowsky	Sanchez	Vento
Scott	Sanders	Visclosky
Sensenbrenner	Sandlin	Vitter
Serrano	Sanford	Walden
Sessions	Sawyer	Walsh
Shadegg	Saxton	Wamp
Shaw	Scarborough	Waters
Shays	Schaffer	Watkins
Sherman	Schakowsky	Watt (NC)
Sherwood	Scott	Watts (OK)
Shimkus	Sensenbrenner	Waxman
Shows	Serrano	Weiner
Shuster	Sessions	Weldon (FL)
Simpson	Shaw	Weldon (PA)
Sisisky	Shays	Weller
Skeen	Sherman	Wexler
Skelton	Sherwood	Weygand
Slaughter	Shimkus	Whitfield
Smith (MI)	Shows	Wicker
Smith (NJ)	Shustert	Wilson
	Simpson	Wise
	Sisisky	Wolf
	Skeen	Woolsey
	Skelton	Wu
	Slaughter	Wynn
	Smith (MI)	Young (AK)
	Smith (NJ)	Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—17

Combest	Jones (NC)	Mollohan
Crane	Klink	Obey
Deal	McIntosh	Quinn
Fowler	Meeks (NY)	Salmon
Franks (NJ)	Metcalf	Taylor (NC)
Gillmor	Miller, George	

□ 1828

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

CONGRATULATING THE PEOPLE OF TAIWAN FOR SUCCESSFUL CONCLUSION OF PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS AND REAFFIRMING UNITED STATES POLICY TOWARD TAIWAN AND THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 292, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 292, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 418, nays 1, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 77]
YEAS—418

Abercrombie	Carson	Fletcher
Ackerman	Castle	Foley
Aderholt	Chabot	Forbes
Allen	Chambliss	Ford
Andrews	Chenoweth-Hage	Fossella
Archer	Clay	Frank (MA)
Army	Clayton	Frelinghuysen
Baca	Clement	Frost
Bachus	Clyburn	Gallegly
Baird	Coble	Ganske
Baker	Coburn	Gejdenson
Baldacci	Collins	Gekas
Baldwin	Combest	Gephardt
Ballenger	Condit	Gibbons
Barcia	Conyers	Gilchrest
Barr	Cook	Gilman
Barrett (NE)	Cooksey	Gonzalez
Barrett (WI)	Costello	Goode
Bartlett	Cox	Goodlatte
Barton	Coyne	Goodling
Bass	Cramer	Gordon
Bateman	Crowley	Goss
Becerra	Cubin	Graham
Bentsen	Cummings	Granger
Bereuter	Cunningham	Green (TX)
Berkley	Danner	Green (WI)
Berman	Davis (FL)	Greenwood
Berry	Davis (IL)	Gutierrez
Biggert	Davis (VA)	Gutknecht
Bilbray	DeFazio	Hall (OH)
Bilirakis	DeGette	Hall (TX)
Bishop	Delahunt	Hansen
Blagojevich	DeLauro	Hastings (FL)
Bliley	DeLay	Hastings (WA)
Blumenauer	DeMint	Hayes
Blunt	Deutsch	Hayworth
Boehlert	Diaz-Balart	Hefley
Boehner	Dickey	Herger
Bonilla	Dicks	Hill (IN)
Bonior	Dingell	Hill (MT)
Bono	Dixon	Hilleary
Borski	Doggett	Hilliard
Boswell	Dooley	Hinchev
Boucher	Doolittle	Hinojosa
Boyd	Doyle	Hobson
Brady (PA)	Dreier	Hoefel
Brady (TX)	Duncan	Hoekstra
Brown (FL)	Dunn	Holden
Brown (OH)	Edwards	Holt
Bryant	Ehlers	Hooley
Burr	Ehrlich	Horn
Burton	Emerson	Hostettler
Buyer	Engel	Houghton
Callahan	English	Hoyer
Calvert	Eshoo	Hulshof
Camp	Etheridge	Hunter
Campbell	Evans	Hutchinson
Canady	Everett	Hyde
Cannon	Ewing	Insee
Capps	Farr	Isakson
Capuano	Fattah	Istook
Cardin	Filner	Jackson (IL)

Jackson-Lee (TX)
 Jefferson
 Jenkins
 John
 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
 McIntyre
 McKeon
 McKinney
 McNulty
 Meehan
 Meek (FL)
 Menendez
 Mica
 Millender-
 McDonald
 Miller (FL)
 Miller, Gary
 Minge
 Mink
 Moakley

NAYS—1

Paul
 NOT VOTING—15

Crane
 Deal
 Fowler
 Franks (NJ)
 Gillmor

□ 1837

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMENDING LIBRARY OF CONGRESS FOR 200 YEARS OF OUTSTANDING SERVICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 269.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 269, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 416, nays 0, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 78]

YEAS—416

Abercrombie
 Ackerman
 Aderholt
 Allen
 Andrews
 Archer
 Armey
 Baca
 Bachus
 Baird
 Baker
 Baldacci
 Baldwin
 Ballenger
 Barcia
 Barr
 Barrett (NE)
 Barrett (WI)
 Bartlett
 Barton
 Bass
 Bateman
 Becerra
 Bentsen
 Bereuter
 Berkeley
 Berman
 Berry
 Biggert
 Bilbray
 Bilirakis
 Bishop
 Blagojevich
 Bliley
 Blumenauer
 Blunt
 Boehlert
 Boehner
 Bonilla
 Bonior
 Bono
 Borski
 Boswell
 Boucher
 Boyd
 Brady (PA)
 Brady (TX)
 Brown (FL)
 Brown (OH)
 Bryant
 Burton
 Buyer
 Callahan
 Calvert
 Camp
 Campbell
 Canady
 Cannon
 Capps
 Capuano
 Cardin
 Carson
 Castle
 Chabot

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
 McIntyre
 McKinney
 McNulty
 Meehan
 Meek (FL)
 Menendez
 Mica
 Millender-
 McDonald
 Miller (FL)
 Miller, Gary
 Minge
 Mink
 Moakley

NOT VOTING—18

Burr
 Crane
 Deal
 Fowler
 Franks (NJ)
 Gillmor

□ 1846

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Neal
 Nethercutt
 Ney
 Northup
 Norwood
 Nussle
 Oberstar
 Obey
 Olver
 Ortiz
 Ose
 Owens
 Oxley
 Packard
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Pastor
 Paul
 Payne
 Pease
 Pelosi
 Peterson (MN)
 Peterson (PA)
 Lazio
 Phelps
 Pickering
 Pickett
 Pitts
 Pombo
 Pomeroy
 Porter
 Portman
 Price (NC)
 Pryce (OH)
 Radanovich
 Rahall
 Ramstad
 Rangel
 Regula
 Reyes
 Reynolds
 Riley
 Rivers
 Rodriguez
 Roemer
 Rogan
 Rogers
 Rohrabacher
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Rothman
 Roukema
 Roybal-Allard
 Royce
 Rush
 Ryan (WI)
 Ryan (KS)
 Sabo
 Sanchez
 Sanders
 Sandlin
 Sanford
 Sawyer
 Saxton
 Scarborough
 Schaffer
 Schakowsky
 Scott
 Sensenbrenner
 Serrano
 Sessions
 Shadegg
 Shaw
 Shays
 Sherman
 Sherwood
 Shimkus

Hastings (WA)
 Herger
 Johnson (CT)
 Klink
 McIntosh
 Meeks (NY)
 Metcalf
 Miller, George
 Mollohan
 Quinn
 Salmon
 Taylor (NC)

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 78, I was inadvertently, detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

SENIOR CITIZENS' FREEDOM TO WORK ACT OF 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT) The pending business is the question of agreeing to the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW) to concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 5.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 419, nays 0, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 79]

YEAS—419

Abercrombie	Clay	Gallegly
Ackerman	Clayton	Ganske
Aderholt	Clement	Gejdenson
Allen	Clyburn	Gekas
Andrews	Coble	Gephardt
Archer	Coburn	Gibbons
Army	Collins	Gilchrest
Baca	Combust	Gilman
Bachus	Condit	Gonzalez
Baird	Conyers	Goode
Baker	Cook	Goodlatte
Baldacci	Cooksey	Goodling
Baldwin	Costello	Gordon
Ballenger	Cox	Goss
Barcia	Coyne	Graham
Barr	Cramer	Granger
Barrett (NE)	Crowley	Green (TX)
Barrett (WI)	Cubin	Green (WI)
Bartlett	Cummings	Greenwood
Barton	Cunningham	Gutierrez
Bass	Danner	Gutknecht
Bateman	Davis (FL)	Hall (OH)
Becerra	Davis (IL)	Hall (TX)
Bentsen	Davis (VA)	Hansen
Bereuter	DeFazio	Hastert
Berkley	DeGette	Hastings (FL)
Berman	Delahunt	Hastings (WA)
Berry	DeLauro	Hayes
Biggert	DeLay	Hayworth
Bilbray	DeMint	Hefley
Billirakis	Deutsch	Heger
Bishop	Diaz-Balart	Hill (IN)
Blagojevich	Dickey	Hill (MT)
Bliley	Dicks	Hilleary
Blumenauer	Dingell	Hilliard
Blunt	Dixon	Hinchey
Boehlert	Doggett	Hinojosa
Boehner	Dooley	Hobson
Bonilla	Doolittle	Hoeffel
Bonior	Doyle	Hoekstra
Bono	Dreier	Holden
Borski	Duncan	Holt
Boswell	Dunn	Hooley
Boucher	Edwards	Horn
Boyd	Ehlers	Hostettler
Brady (PA)	Ehrlich	Houghton
Brady (TX)	Emerson	Hoyer
Brown (FL)	Engel	Hulshof
Brown (OH)	English	Hunter
Bryant	Eshoo	Hutchinson
Burr	Etheridge	Hyde
Burton	Evans	Inslee
Buyer	Everett	Isakson
Callahan	Ewing	Istook
Calvert	Farr	Jackson (IL)
Camp	Fattah	Jackson-Lee
Campbell	Filner	(TX)
Cannon	Fletcher	Jefferson
Capps	Foley	Jenkins
Capuano	Forbes	John
Cardin	Ford	Johnson (CT)
Carson	Fossella	Johnson, E. B.
Castle	Fowler	Johnson, Sam
Chabot	Frank (MA)	Jones (NC)
Chambliss	Frelinghuysen	Jones (OH)
Chenoweth-Hage	Frost	Kanjorski

Kaptur	Nethercutt	Shows
Kasich	Ney	Shuster
Kelly	Northup	Simpson
Kennedy	Norwood	Sisisky
Kildee	Nussle	Skeen
Kilpatrick	Oberstar	Skelton
Kind (WI)	Obey	Slaughter
King (NY)	Olver	Smith (MI)
Kingston	Ortiz	Smith (NJ)
Kleczka	Ose	Smith (TX)
Knollenberg	Owens	Smith (WA)
Kolbe	Oxley	Snyder
Kucinich	Packard	Souder
Kuykendall	Pallone	Spence
LaFalce	Pascrell	Spratt
LaHood	Pastor	Stabenow
Lampson	Paul	Stark
Lantos	Payne	Stearns
Largent	Pease	Stenholm
Larson	Pelosi	Strickland
Latham	Peterson (MN)	Stump
LaTourette	Peterson (PA)	Stupak
Lazio	Petri	Sununu
Leach	Phelps	Sweeney
Lee	Pickering	Talent
Levin	Pickett	Tancredo
Lewis (CA)	Pitts	Tanner
Lewis (GA)	Pombo	Tauscher
Lewis (KY)	Pomeroy	Tauzin
Lipinski	Porter	Taylor (MS)
LoBiondo	Portman	Terry
Lofgren	Price (NC)	Thomas
Lowey	Pryce (OH)	Thompson (CA)
Lucas (KY)	Radanovich	Thompson (MS)
Lucas (OK)	Rahall	Thornberry
Luther	Ramstad	Thune
Maloney (CT)	Rangel	Thurman
Maloney (NY)	Regula	Tiahrt
Manzullo	Reyes	Tierney
Markey	Reynolds	Toomey
Martinez	Riley	Towns
Mascara	Rivers	Trafficant
Matsui	Rodriguez	Turner
McCarthy (MO)	Roemer	Udall (CO)
McCarthy (NY)	Rogan	Udall (NM)
McCollum	Rogers	Upton
McCrery	Rohrabacher	Velazquez
McDermott	Ros-Lehtinen	Vento
McGovern	Rothman	Visclosky
McHugh	Roukema	Vitter
McInnis	Roybal-Allard	Walden
McIntyre	Royce	Walsh
McKeon	Rush	Wamp
McKinney	Ryan (WI)	Waters
McNulty	Ryun (KS)	Watkins
Meehan	Sabo	Watt (NC)
Meek (FL)	Sanchez	Watts (OK)
Menendez	Sanders	Waxman
Mica	Sandlin	Weiner
Millender-	Sanford	Weldon (FL)
McDonald	Sawyer	Weller
Miller (FL)	Saxton	Wexler
Miller, Gary	Scarborough	Weygand
Minge	Schaffer	Whitfield
Mink	Schakowsky	Wicker
Moakley	Scott	Wilson
Moore	Sensenbrenner	Wise
Moran (KS)	Serrano	Wolf
Moran (VA)	Sessions	Woolsey
Morella	Shadegg	Wu
Murtha	Shaw	Wynn
Myrick	Shays	Young (AK)
Nadler	Sherman	Young (FL)
Napolitano	Sherwood	
Neal	Shimkus	

NOT VOTING—16

Canady	Linder	Quinn
Crane	McIntosh	Salmon
Deal	Meeks (NY)	Taylor (NC)
Franks (NJ)	Metcalfe	Weldon (PA)
Gillmor	Miller, George	
Klink	Mollohan	

□ 1904

So the motion 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.R. 3252

Mrs. MYRICK. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 3252.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCKEON). 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 Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

TRIBUTE TO HENRY W. MCGEE

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding American, Mr. Henry W. McGee, who passed away on March 18 at the age of 90.

Mr. McGee was a trailblazer and an advocate for equal rights and justice throughout his entire life. He worked 44 years as an employee of the United States Postal Service, delivering mail through the rain, sleet, and snow. His entire life was representative of someone who came in at the bottom but worked his way to the top.

In 1952, he was promoted general foreman and later served as superintendent of the largest finance station in the U.S. Postal Service.

In 1976, he became the first African American appointed Chicago Regional Postmaster by President Lyndon B. JOHNSON, upon the recommendation of U.S. Senator Paul Douglas. Under his leadership, the Chicago Postal Service was able to improve its delivery rates and effectiveness in meeting the needs of its consumers.

There is an old adage that says of life: "It is not how long one lives, but how much one gives." This statement really is the epitome of the life that Henry McGee led. He found time to get involved in the community and take on issues greater than himself, despite his busy career.

In 1946, he was selected to serve as president and acting executive director of the Chicago chapter of the NAACP. While there, he dedicated himself to the causes of ending segregation and fighting for equal justice.

In addition to the NAACP, he became one of the charter members of the

Joint Negro Appeal, a self-help organization that was organized by such individuals as Truman Gibson and Judge Odas Nicholson.

As president, Mr. McGee served diligently for more than 17 years and raised thousands of dollars to help such organizations as the Beatrice Caffey Youth Service League, the Good Shepherd Neighborhood Club, and other organizations.

After he retired from the postal service, Mr. McGee still found time to give of himself and his talents, as Mayor Richard J. Daley appointed him to a 5-year term on the Chicago Board of Education. It was an opportunity for him to give back to Chicago and, more importantly, give back to the next generation, our children.

The legacy that Mr. McGee leaves behind is both inspirational and impressive. I am so pleased that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) has determined to name a post office in his honor.

I ask that all of America join me in paying tribute to the life and legacy of Henry McGee, and may his loved ones be comforted in knowing this his life touched thousands of citizens throughout not only Chicago but, indeed, throughout America. He lived a great and inspirational life.

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

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

EXPLOSION AT PHILLIPS PETROLEUM PLANT IN PASADENA, TX

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight with a great deal of sorrow and concern because yesterday an explosion and fire occurred at Phillips Petroleum Company plant in Pasadena, Texas, which is part of the district that I represent. This tragedy resulted in the death of one worker and the injury of 71 others.

According to the Houston Chronicle, at least three of the injured were listed in critical condition, and six were listed in serious condition. Our thoughts and our prayers are with the men and women of the Phillips plant and their families.

The cause of this accident has not been determined. In fact, just today were they allowed to go back into the plant except for the suppression personnel.

About 850 Phillips employees and about 100 subcontractors work at the Pasadena plant complex. Phillips Petroleum officials said about 600 workers were on duty when the explosion occurred yesterday afternoon about 1 p.m.

As a result of the fire and smoke, 23 campuses in the Pasadena Independent School District and 8 campuses in the Galena Park Independent School District were forced to turn off their air conditioning and close their doors and windows and keep the children inside.

According to Phillips, the chemicals that burned in the fire could irritate one's eyes and nose and throat if inhaled in high concentrations, but the air monitors that were around the plant and in the community found no signs that anyone outside the plant was exposed to these toxic chemicals.

The explosion occurred in the section of the Phillips plant that produces K-Resin. K-Resin is the chemical used to make cups, lids, toys, shower doors, coat hangers, and clear packaging materials, such as shrink wrap that we wrap our groceries in and leftovers, bread wrappers, bottles for drinking water, clear boxes and trays.

I have visited the Phillips plant on several occasions and have met numerous times, not only with the management, but with the employees who are represented by PACE, the Paper, Allied-Industrial, Chemical and Energy Workers, International Union, formally, known as the OCAW.

I have also attended annual events, including the annual memorial that both the industry and the union plan every year in tribute to workers who have lost their lives in workplace accidents.

The work of the chemical plant is dangerous. The employees who work at the Phillips plant and the many others along the Houston Ship Channel know the impact an explosion can make.

That is why we need stronger worker protections. We cannot prevent every accident, but we can ensure that every worker has a reasonable expectation that he or she will be safe.

The Phillips Petroleum plant has a long history of accidents that have resulted in facilities and many safety violations. We hope that again we learn from our experiences.

In the last year, this facility has experienced three other explosions. The worst of these occurred last June and resulted in the death of two employees. The other two explosions occurred in August and April of last year.

By far the deadliest year for Phillips Petroleum was in 1989. On October 23, 1989, an explosion resulted in 23 deaths and 130 injuries. A few months before this explosion, six employees were injured when a natural gas pipeline near the plant's boiler room exploded. Two of the injured workers later died of their injuries.

Producing the products that our Nation and our world require is inherently dangerous. It is important that OSHA inspectors move quickly to investigate the cause of this most recent explosion. We need to do everything we can to ensure that accidents like this will never happen again.

In closing, our prayers are for the speedy recovery for those injured and

also for the loss of that one life. The loss of one life is one too many.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BILIRAKIS. 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 subject of my special order this evening.

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

There was no objection.

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

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

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise proudly to celebrate Greek Independence Day, an event which marks the symbolic rebirth of democracy.

On March 25, 1821, Archbishop Germanos of Patras raised the flag of freedom and was the first to declare Greece free. We honor the valiant Greek freedom fighters who began an arduous struggle to win independence for Greece and its people 179 years ago.

Although many Greeks died, they were undeterred from their ultimate goal. "Eleftheria I Thanatos," liberty or death, became the Greek patriots' battle cry, a cry all too familiar to us because of the similar pronouncement of Patrick Henry, who said "Give me liberty or give me death."

One particular story best signifies the spirit which existed then. A significant wave of rebellion against Turkish oppression was ignited by the fiercely patriotic Suliotes villagers who took refuge from Turkish authorities in the mountains of Epiros.

□ 1715

When the Suliotes women, left alone, learned that Turkish troops were fast approaching their village, they began to dance the "Syrtos," a patriotic Greek dance. One by one they committed suicide by throwing themselves and their children off Mount Zalongo. They chose to die rather than surrender and face slavery.

When news of the revolution arrived in the United States after the initial uprising, there were widespread feelings of compassion. This sentiment was shared by several American presidents, including James Monroe and John Quincy Adams. Each conveyed his support for the revolution through his annual messages to Congress.

William Harrison, our ninth president, expressed his belief in freedom for Greece, saying, and I quote him, "We must send our free will offering. The Star-Spangled Banner," he went on to say, "must wave in the Aegean, a message of fraternity and friendship to Greece."

So we should not overlook the fact that American leaders have always

been drawn to Greece's democratic ideals. In drafting our constitution, American colonial leaders cited Greek and Roman sources. The very basis of our constitution derives from Aristotle and was put into practice in ancient Rome. As Thomas Jefferson once said, "To the ancient Greeks we are all indebted for the light which led ourselves, American colonists, out of Gothic darkness."

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS).

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. Every year the gentleman faithfully executes his special order for remembrance of March 25 and what it means to Americans of Greek descent.

The recollections I have as a young person in attending the Greek Orthodox church in my community was that this particular holiday was a blend of two momentous events in the life of a Greek Orthodox Christian. One was the Celebration of the Annunciation and, at the same time, the ethnic revolutionary epic of the revolution to which the gentleman has referred. This blending of both faith and nationalism has made this particular holiday very distinct and very unusual. And it evokes memories not only of those two events simultaneously occurring but the fact that they helped us, those young Americans of Greek descent, recognize the value of being Americans.

We, as Americans, were able to see that democracy's home, Greece, had an inexorable link with the founding of our country, our United States, and continues to have this absolutely wonderful bond between the democracies that we both cherish.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for always joining me year after year after year in this special order.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that the price of liberty can be very high, hundreds of thousands of lives. Socrates, Plato, Pericles, and many other great scholars throughout history warned we maintain democracy only at great cost. The freedom we enjoy today is due to a large degree to the sacrifices made by men and women in the past, in Greece, in America, and all over the world.

Unfortunately, there are several countries where the struggle for freedom continues, and tensions persist in the former Yugoslavia, Kosovo, the Middle East, Africa, Greece, and Turkey, and particularly in the Republic of Cyprus. Turkey still illegally occupies a large part of Cyprus, as it has since its brutal invasion in 1974. The United States has exerted its influence to improve chances for peace in the Middle East and Northern Ireland. Now it is time for the U.S. to promote a fair solution for Cyprus.

Turkey continues to refute U.N. resolutions on Cyprus. Our Nation has the influence to encourage to Turkey to abide by the U.N. resolutions which set out conditions and suggestions for a

settlement. Turkey also needs to respect international law regarding Greek sovereignty in the Aegean.

Mr. Speaker, on a more optimistic note, the chronically strained relations between Greece and Turkey have recently become less in the aftermath of severe earthquakes that hit both countries last summer. The acts of humanity that Greece and Turkey demonstrated in aiding each other generated a new favorable world sentiment and opened a new chapter in the relations between the two countries. Consistent with this new spirit of cooperation, Greece has moderated its previous inflexible objection to Turkey's acceptance to membership in the European Union. Hopefully, this new spirit will gain momentum and thereby help to restore harmony and peaceful coexistence between the two countries.

Mr. Speaker, we celebrate Greek independence to reaffirm the common democratic heritage we share. Greek Independence Day, like the Fourth of July, reminds us that we have the duty to defend liberty—whatever the cost. To maintain our freedom, we can take neither it nor its architects for granted. That is why we honor those who secured independence for Greece so many years ago.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect and profound admiration that I rise today to recognize the 179th anniversary of Greek Independence.

March 25th is a date that will live forever in the hearts and minds of Greeks and Greek-Americans. On March 25, 1821, after nearly 400 years under the Ottoman yoke, the Greeks revolted against the Turks and after a fierce struggle won their independence. During all these years of occupation the people of Greece kept their language, their religion and their sense of identity.

We share with the people of Greece this fierce spirit of independence and love of freedom.

A country with a history stretching back almost 4,000 years, Greece is the cradle of democracy and its great philosophers were an invaluable inspiration for our founding fathers. In ancient Athens they found a model for the new democracy they were going to establish in America.

For many years, Greece has been a reliable ally of the United States. During World War II, the Greeks sided unanimously with the Allies. The years of German occupation were a particularly hard time for Greece. Starvation decimated the population while executions and deportations contributed to the catastrophe. But from the first moments of the occupation a mass resistance movement came into being, bravely fighting the Nazi conquerors.

After enduring a military dictatorship, the Greek people from 1974 onwards devoted all their efforts to consolidating democracy in the land of its birth and laying the foundations for a better life. Today, Greece is a member of NATO and the European Union and remains faithful to the cause of peace and democracy.

My fellow colleagues, please join me as we celebrate Greek independence and remember those of Greek heritage who are living in the United States and have contributed so greatly to our communities and our country.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak today in honor of the 179th anniversary of Greek independence. As a member of the Congressional Caucus on Hellenic Issues, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to the Greek nation and its people.

Over the last year, Greece has continued to be an active and important member of the international community. During the devastating earthquakes that ravaged Turkey last year, Greece reached out its hand to help its neighbor. This act of kindness was inspiring to us all, proving that it is possible to set aside differences in times of need. We should not be surprised, though, by Greece's actions. As a member of NATO and the European Union, Greece has continually shown its commitment to international peace and security.

The United States and Greece share a common philosophy that promotes democracy. Of course, it was Greece that paved the way for the great experiment which became the United States of America. Every American who enjoys freedom and democracy owes the Greek people a debt of gratitude for inspiring our founding fathers.

On behalf of the people of the Sixth Congressional district of Massachusetts and myself, I wish to extend congratulations to the people of Greece on this happy occasion. I am honored to have been selected to be one of two Grand Marshals in this year's Independence Day parade in Boston and know the day will be enjoyed by many. I look forward to many more years of happy and productive relations between the United States and Greece.

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join in this special order commemorating Greek Independence Day.

As a Member of Congress representing a district with a great many Greek-American constituents, I am well aware of the many contributions that Greek Americans have made to our nation. Today I join over 1 million Greek Americans and the people of Greece in commemorating the fight for Greek independence.

It is only fitting that the Congress of the United States commemorate the struggle that led Greek independence. The ancient city-states of Greece made many vital contributions to western civilization. The foundations of Western literature, drama, science, architecture, and philosophy were laid by the people of ancient Greece. The Greek language has enriched other languages with words and concepts like philanthropy, harmony, music, techne, sophistication, architecture, ecology and thousands of others. But perhaps ancient Greece's most important gift to the modern world was the creation of the concept of democratic self-government. The Founding Fathers of this country, educated in the classics, looked to the ancient Greeks, among others, for insight and inspiration when they were working to form a new national government.

179 years ago, however, when our country was prospering under its newly established democratic government, Greece—the cradle of democracy—was a subjugated nation ruled by the Ottoman Empire. In fact, at that point, the Ottoman Empire had dominated the Greek people for over 400 years, and many Greeks were finding Ottoman rule to be increasingly oppressive and unacceptable.

Greek patriots rose up against the Ottomans in March of 1821. The struggle of the courageous Greek patriots against a powerful empire won the support of many influential figures in Western Europe and the United States. Europeans and Americans identified with the Greek people—the descendants of the nation that had so strongly influenced western civilization. The French, British, and

Russian governments eventually intervened in the conflict on the Greeks' behalf and forced the Ottoman Empire to recognize Greece as an independent state in 1829.

Mr. Speaker, thousands of Greek patriots fought and died for their country's freedom with the same passion that inspired the Founding Fathers. Consequently, it is appropriate that we remember them today, the 179th anniversary of the beginning of the struggle for Greek independence. I am pleased to join my colleagues in commemorating this very special day.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise on this occasion on which we salute the great nation and people of Greece, the Hellenic Republic as they celebrate the 179th anniversary of Greece's independence. I commend the gentleman from Florida, Mr. BILIRAKIS for taking the initiative once again to ensure that members have the opportunity to convey our thoughts on this important day. The United States and Greece have enjoyed a long and close relationship. The people of the United States recognize and revere Greece as the cradle of the democratic tradition that has allowed this country to rise to the heights of its greatness.

We are fortunate to have benefitted from the contributions of those immigrants from Greece who have contributed their toil, their knowledge and their culture to our American civilization, and we appreciate the warmth of the citizens of Greece reflected in the welcome they provide to Americans that are fortunate enough to be able to visit the shores of Greece, its beautiful islands and countryside.

Greece plays an important role in helping to stabilize the Balkans, one of the more dangerous neighborhoods of Europe. In our International Relations Committee we keep the relations between Greece and the United States under close review. I am pleased to report that the state of those relations is healthy. I am calling on this occasion for our government to support the process of reconciliation that is now underway between our two NATO allies, Greece and Turkey. The Congress is fully supportive of this effort, and we hope for an outcome that will produce lasting stability in this strategically vital part of the world.

I hope that all my colleagues and fellow citizens will avail themselves of this occasion to reflect upon the blessings of democracy, for which we will be forever indebted to the ancient Hellenes, and upon our good fortune today in having such a close and reliable ally as the great nation of Greece.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, it is with great enthusiasm that I stand before you today to recognize the 179th anniversary of Greece, one of our nation's closest allies. I want to praise my colleagues from Florida and New York for their efforts in organizing this special order and also for organizing the Congressional Caucus on Hellenic issues.

It is no secret that the democratic principles of equality and freedom were advocated by great Greek thinkers. These principles served as an inspiration to our founding fathers and were heavily relied upon as they drafted the Declaration of Independence and the United States Constitution. In the words of Thomas Jefferson: "to the ancient Greeks * * * we are all indebted for the light which led ourselves out of * * * darkness." Just as today's youth is educated on our nation's humble beginnings by studying the lives of the framers, they

should also learn about the great Greek thinkers whose visions of democracy helped our nation advance towards a free society.

The ties that bind Greece and the United States also extend towards the common role that our respective countries played in revolting against oppressive rule. Borrowing from the successful experience that our young nation utilized to free itself of English rule, the people of Greece rose up and declared their independence from the Ottoman Empire. After a long decade of struggle, freedom came to Greece. Just as it did in the democratic world at the time, their victory continues to inspire us today.

Greece has contributed to this nation in many other ways. The hard work of Greek-Americans has made an impact on our nation, especially in Greek communities such as Providence, Pawtucket and Newport, Rhode Island. It is a great honor to be able to represent the people of these communities in the United States Congress.

As the birthplace of classical political thought, as a strong ally to the United States, and as the motherland to the many valuable Greek immigrants who reside within our borders, Greece is indeed a country worthy of much praise. Again, I thank my colleagues for all their hard work in making this Special Order and I look forward to working with the Hellenic Caucus for the advancement of Greek issues.

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise proudly in recognition of the 179th anniversary of Greek Independence and for the common democratic heritage shared by Greece and the United States. The struggle and victory of the Greek people against their Ottoman oppressors deserves special recognition for its contribution to human freedom and the triumph of democratic ideals and self-determination over those of tyranny and empire.

In 1821, the people of Greece, inspired by the American Revolution, broke out in open rebellion against four centuries of foreign occupation in an effort to rule themselves in accordance with the principles of democracy first developed in ancient Greece. Fully cognizant and proud of their past, the Greeks strove for their own traditions and engaged in an independence movement that can only be described as heroic and inspirational to all free peoples.

The Greeks defeated not only the Ottoman Turks to gain their independence, but also the Concert of Europe established at the Congress of Vienna following the Napoleonic wars. After decades of chaos and revolution, the Great Powers created an international system based upon conservative, counter-revolutionary rule designed to empower the monarchs and imperial states of the Continent with the primary goal of stability. Freedom, democracy and self-determination were not recognized by the statesmen of Europe as legitimate claims to independence.

However, the people of Europe, in spite of their leaders' beliefs, were inspired by the Greek cause and their struggle for freedom over tyranny. Recognizing that nothing would stop the Greek people from realizing their dreams and faced with a popular, just cause, the Great Powers of Europe embraced a free and independent Greece. It is a testament to the Greeks that they, and they alone were the only people to achieve independence in the first quarter of the 19th century despite many attempts by other peoples of Europe.

The Greek patriots' battle cry "Eleftheria I thanatos"—liberty of death—brings immediately to mind Patrick Henry's revolutionary speech "Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what course others may take; but as for me, give me liberty or give me death!" As we know America's revolutionaries of the 18th century were inspired by the traditions and philosophy of Greek antiquity. The influence and contributions of the Greeks to modern democracy, are to say the least, incalculable. We, as Americans, cannot place enough emphasis on the political and social contributions of the Greeks to our own nation.

"Our Constitution is called a democracy because power is in the hands not of a minority but of the whole people. When it is a question of settling private disputes, everyone is equal before the law; when it is a question of putting one person before another in positions of public responsibility, what counts is not a membership of a particular class, but the actual ability which the man possesses".

The statement, Mr. Speaker, was not made by our Founding Fathers, but by Pericles in an address more than two thousand years ago. With that, I would like to thank my colleagues for holding this special order and once again congratulate Greece on the anniversary of its independence.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege once again to take time to reflect and honor Greek Independence Day from the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives. March 25, 2000 marked the 179th Anniversary of the beginning of the revolution that freed the Greek people from the Ottoman Empire.

For almost 400 years, from the fall of Constantinople in 1453 until the declaration of Greek Independence in 1821, Greece remained under the rule of the Ottoman Empire. These were dark centuries for the nation that was the cradle of Western democracy, philosophy and art. During this time, Greeks were deprived of all civil rights. Their schools and churches were shut down. Greek Christian and Jewish boys were kidnapped from their families and raised as Moslems to serve the Sultan.

Shortly after Greece regained her independence, in December 1823, the great and famous U.S. Representative from Massachusetts, Daniel Webster, reflected on this time in Greek history, "This (Greek) people, a people of intelligence, ingenuity, refinement, spirit and enterprise, have been for centuries under the atrocious unparalleled Tartarian barbarism that ever oppressed the human race." We are all proud of the fact that many volunteers from across the United States went to Greece to participate in the war for Greek independence.

Greece and the United States have always been linked by their common histories of waging wars for independence, their beliefs in freedom and basic human rights, and their commitment to democracy. We are also closely tied by blood. During the 1900s, one in every four Greek males between the ages of 15 and 45 departed for the United States. Today, American society flourishes and benefits from the contributions of the descendants of these original Greek immigrants. Further forging the links of blood and sacrifice, over 600,000 Greeks died fighting on the side of the Allies during World War II and in the civil war that followed—that was nine percent of the entire population of Greece at the time.

Massachusetts, with such famous Greek Americans as Governor Michael Dukakis and Senator Paul Tsongas, has a rich Greek American culture. In my hometown of Worcester, Massachusetts, the Greek Orthodox Cathedral of St. Spyridon, under the leadership of Father Dean Paleologos, reminds us of this vibrant Greek American community. Each year, in Worcester, this important day is celebrated by teaching children to recite poetry and songs commemorating their past and their heritage.

Today, we see the generous heart of Greece at work again, as President Stephanopoulos and Foreign Minister Papandreu endeavor to end decades of hostility between Greece and Turkey. The improved climate of relations between Greece and Turkey cultivated by these Greek leaders continues to sustain hopes that some of the long unresolved issues between these two nations may eventually be tackled.

In a concrete way, Greece has moved toward better relations with Turkey. Following an arrangement made when Mr. Papandreu visited Ankara last January, a delegation of Greek Foreign Ministry officials, headed by Secretary-General Stelios Perrakis, opened discussion in the Turkish capital on February 28th to impart Greece's knowledge and experience, as a member of the European Union, on the measures and methods Turkey needs to pursue in its own quest to become a member of the EU.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my gratitude and respect to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) and the gentlelady from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN MALONEY) for their leadership of the Hellenic Caucus. Through their hard work, all Members of this House are better educated on and involved in the challenging issues facing modern Greece today.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am honored to commemorate the 179th anniversary of Greece's independence from the Ottoman Empire, and to celebrate the shared democratic traditions of Greece and the United States.

Greece declared its independence on March 25, 1821, ending nearly 400 years of domination by the Ottoman Empire and restoring a democratic heritage to the very cradle of democracy.

The special relationship between the people of Greece and the United States has been reinforced throughout our country's short history. Our Founding Fathers established this nation based on the teachings of ancient Greek philosophers and their struggle to build a democratic society. And, in turn, the American experience inspired the Greek people in their struggle for independence nearly 180 years ago.

Our shared democratic ideals have formed the basis of a strong and sustained friendship between Greece and the United States, and even today, Greece remains one of our most important allies and trusted partners in the global community.

And the many contributions of Greek-Americans to shaping our society and building our cultural heritage have been as critical to the United States as its friendship with Greece. My district in New York has benefitted immeasurably from the many contributions of our Greek-American community over the years.

I am proud to join my colleagues today in commemoration of Greek Independence Day,

and in celebration of the many contributions of Greece and Greek-Americans to the United States and the world.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCKEON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON 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 North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina 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 Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MINK of Hawaii 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 New York (Mr. FOSSELLA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

IN CELEBRATION OF GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I too would like to join my colleagues, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) in honor of the 179th anniversary that marks the Greek's national day of independence, and I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS) for organizing a special order each year to celebrate Greek Independence Day.

Greece had remained under the Ottoman empire for almost 400 years; 400 years that Greek people were deprived of all their civil rights. Even under the threat of death, Greeks fought back by continuing to educate their children in their culture, their language, and their religion. On March 25, we celebrate this courage; this the 179th anniversary of freedom and independence for Greece.

I wish we had more to celebrate today, to be able to celebrate the return of the Elgin Marbles to their homeland. The Elgin Marbles are magnificent sculptures that were created to adorn the Parthenon. Their detail and beauty are even more profound when one knows these sculptures were actually carved into the Parthenon itself after it had been constructed.

However, in 1806, these sculptures were removed, sometimes broken in half, and transported to England. They are now in view in the British museum, far away from their native land.

In this age of open communication, friendship, and a unified Europe, we must work together to see that these marbles will soon be returned to their homeland. In this respect, I join my colleagues, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) in their House Resolution stating the importance of returning the Elgin Marbles back to Greece.

I am also very pleased to have welcomed today Dimitris Avramopoulos, the mayor of Athens, to Washington. He joined members of the Hellenic Caucus and other Members of Congress today for a discussion on the progress that Athens has made in becoming a global partner and leader and city. Through his efforts, the mayor's, he has made Athens a leading contributor to cities around the world in policy; and he has diligently worked to create a forum for mayors from other cities and capitals throughout the world to work together on their common goals.

I am very fortunate and privileged to represent the largest Hellenic community outside of Athens, one of the most vibrant communities of Hellenic Americans in our country. It is truly a very great pleasure for me to co-chair the Hellenic Caucus and to represent so many fine friends from Greece in my district. The caucus now has a record 72 bipartisan membership who are committed to bringing the voices of Hellenic Americans to the floor of the United States capitol, as we are tonight. We continue to strengthen the voice of Hellenic Americans in promoting legislation, monitoring and arranging of briefings on current events and handing out information to all Congressional Members on such important developments as the renewed talks between Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots, U.S. aid to Greece and Cyprus and the continued dispute in the Aegean.

In the coming year, we hope to see peace and justice in the Aegean, and justice, finally, in Cyprus after so many years of illegal occupation and invasion. And we need to see not only peace in northern Greece, but the restoration of human rights to the many cultures and people suffering throughout the world.

As we celebrate the 179th anniversary of Greek independence and the special bond of friendship between our two great countries, I would like to leave my colleagues with a quote from Percy Shelley, and he said, "We are all Greeks. Our laws, our literature, our art have their roots in Greece."

So I join him and many others in not only paying tribute to Greek Independence Day, but also the many contributions of Greek Americans to our culture here in America.

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

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

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure to address the House while our presiding officer is a fellow representative from the San Fernando Valley, the area that can best be described currently as the center of world culture. Throughout the ages, however, Greece has been the center of world culture; and that is why I am proud to join with so many members of the Hellenic Caucus in addressing the House with regard to the 179th anniversary of Greek independence.

Mr. Speaker, 179 years ago, on March 25, 1821, the Greek people declared their independence, throwing off the yoke of over 400 years of Ottoman oppression. Greek patriot Regas Fereos issued the rallying cry of the struggle, shouting that it is better to be free for an hour than to have 40 years of imprisonment and enslavement.

Greek freedom fighters looked to the American revolution and American democracy for inspiration, and adopted their own declaration of independence. At the same time, our Founding Fathers were guided by the democratic principles that first arose in Greece, and they took to heart the Hellenic ideals of ancient Greece, the birthplace of democracy.

This is a day for us to reflect on the vital alliance between Greece and the United States and to pay our debt to Hellenic ideals and to Hellenic culture. It is a day for Greek Americans to take pride in the independence of Greece and in the ancient culture of all Hellenians.

Mr. Speaker, as we take note of Greece's great victory in its war of independence, we must also remember that there remain problems in the eastern Mediterranean, problems between Greece and the successor to its former colonial master, Turkey, the successor to the Ottoman empire. We must work to bring peace to the Aegean and the eastern Mediterranean, and to do that we must deal with some of the remaining problems.

A Greek-Turkish dialogue can go forward, and I and my colleagues, so many of us, have called upon Turkey to stop making invalid claims on Greek sovereign territory and take respect for international law regarding the Aegean.

We have passed the Peace in Cyprus resolution, which calls upon a full withdrawal of Turkish troops from Greece. We must also recognize the importance of having Turkey adhere to

human rights standards and to respect the ecumenical patriarchy of the orthodox churches in Istanbul, also known as Constantinople. So as we look at history, we must also look at the current situation in the Aegean.

But returning, Mr. Speaker, to the historical ties between Greece and the United States, I should note that since its liberation, Greece has stood by America in each of our involvements in Europe; and America should continue to stand by Greece. Greece is one of only three nations outside of the British Empire that has been allied with the United States in every major international conflict of this century.

□ 1930

One out of every nine Greeks lost his or her life fighting the Nazis in World War II. Through the Marshall Plan, Greeks were able to rebuild; and the Marshall Plan stands as a monument to the close relations between the United States and Greece.

Grease remains a staunch NATO ally in a region of grave concern and, as I have noted, deserves American support.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with Greece and the Greek American community and the Hellenic Caucus in celebrating the 179th anniversary of Greek independence. I look forward to working with my colleagues in strengthening relations with this important ally.

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

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

EDUCATION SAVINGS ACCOUNTS

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

Mrs. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I am the gentlewoman from Albuquerque, New Mexico; and I have been asked to lead a discussion this evening about a bill that will be coming to the floor of the House this week. The bill is H.R. 7, and it is about education savings accounts.

What I would like to do tonight is talk a little bit about what they are, how the current law is set up with respect to education savings accounts, and what the proposed changes are that we are going to be considering on Thursday. Because there is quite a bit of misperception about what these changes will do. But before I do that, I would like to try to set this in the context of where we need to go in America with respect to public education.

In 1900 in this country, at the turn of the last century, 15 percent of American adults had a high school degree.

When we turned this century into the 21st century last New Year's Eve, 85 percent of American adults had a high school degree.

The big difference, though, was that, back in 1900, a third of Americans still lived on the farm. They could get a good job and support a family without having a high school degree.

My grandparents did not graduate from high school. My parents graduated from high school but did not go on to college. Like many Americans, I was the first generation in my family to go to college and get a college degree.

But what was good enough for us and what was good enough for our parents or our grandparents is not going to be good enough for our kids. And the reason is that Americans do not work on the farm anymore, except for about 2 percent of us; and the jobs that will be available for our children who graduate in 2010, 2012 and beyond are going to be profoundly different than they were for us when we graduated from high school, in my case, over 20 years ago.

They are going to require more education, more technical training, the ability to read and understand and solve problems, which means that, if we are going to make the 21st century just as much an American century as the 20th century was, we need to recommit ourselves as a Nation to public education.

In my hometown of Albuquerque, New Mexico, a third of our students do not graduate from high school. We have one of the highest drop-out rates in the Nation. We can no longer afford to let any child lag behind; and so we have to recommit ourselves as individuals, as parents, as teachers, as administrators, as communities, and as a Nation to make sure that, by the end of the next decade, 95 percent of our children graduate from high school and three-quarters of them go on to college or technical training or into the military. We need to commit ourselves to a decade of dreams for public education.

The bill that we are going to consider on Thursday is really only one little piece of that dream, but it is designed to encourage private investment in education and savings by parents and families and even corporations to invest in public schools and public education.

What does this do? It is called H.R. 7, and it is the Education Savings and School Excellence Act. But it builds on something that is already in public law.

Back in 1997, which was before I was elected to Congress, the Congress passed a law to establish education savings accounts.

So what is an education savings account? About 110 million Americans now have IRAs. To put it in its simplest terms, an education savings account is an IRA for our kids' college education. The way that the law works now is that we can put money into an education savings accounts, into one of

these education IRAs, every year, up to \$500, we can put into this account for each child that we have up to the age of 18.

When that child turns 18, they cannot keep contributing into that account, but then the child can use that money that has been saved while he has been growing up to go to college.

Now, they can use the money for a private college or a public college or even a technical school as long as they use the money before they turn 30. So a parent can put \$500 a year, a kind of annual Christmas present to put in the education savings account to save for college. And the money that goes into it, they have to pay the taxes on the money that they earn to put in in the first place, but as the money sits there in that education IRA, they do not have to pay taxes on the interest that it earns. So the interest accrues tax free.

Now, the money that is saved up in that education savings account can be used for tuition or fees or books or supplies or equipment and, in some cases, for room and board, as long as it qualifies under the rules, but only for post-secondary education, post-high school. It can be used for college. And it does not matter if it is a public university or a private university or religious school, as long as it is for post-secondary education, public, private or vocational.

So that is what education savings accounts are. They have been in place as part of public law since 1997 in this country.

There have been two previous attempts to expand education savings accounts in important ways. Both of the attempts were bipartisan efforts. In both cases, they were vetoed by the President.

We are going to go back at it again. The principal sponsors of this piece of legislation on the Senate side are Senator TORRICELLI and Senator COVERDELL of Georgia. Those two men have really led this effort to try to encourage savings and expand education savings accounts for more Americans.

So what are the problems with the current bill and where do we want to go with this bill that we are going to be considering on the floor of the House this Thursday?

Right now, a family can only put \$500 a year per child into an education savings account in order for it to get the tax benefits, to not have to pay taxes on the interest in that account. \$500 a year is not a lot of money when we consider how much college costs have escalated over the last 20 years.

Indeed, if a family puts \$500 a year starting when a child is born and does that every year until they are 18, even if they get 7½ percent interest or so, they really are going to only have about \$15,000 in that account by the time the child turns 18 and is likely to go to college.

Well, unless they are going to a State university where they get State sub-

sidized tuition, that is not going to go very far when it comes to tuition and room and board and books and fees to pay for college.

So the first thing that the bill will do that we are going to take up on the floor here on Thursday is to change that from allowing \$500 per child in savings every year to allowing \$2,000 per child, the same that we do now for regular IRAs.

Now, what will that mean in terms of the amount that a family can save? Well, there have been some folks who have done some analysis on this and have gotten out their stubby pencils and computers to do interest rates, which I do not do very well. But if a family started saving \$2,000 a year from when a child is born, by the time that child is in first grade there will be over \$14,000 in that account. By the time that child reaches middle school, there will be \$36,000 in that account. By the time they get to high school, assuming that they had not used it already in elementary and middle school, there would be \$46,000 in that account.

If that family put in \$2,000 a year and did not withdraw any of it, by the time that that child graduated from high school and turned 18 years old, was a college freshman, they would have almost \$72,000 in college savings; and that would all have accrued with the interest tax free. \$72,000 is a pretty good chunk of change to save for college and is something that I think most Americans would like to have when their son or daughter gets that important acceptance letter to go to the school of their choice.

So it would expand the ability to save, and it would allow that savings to accrue at a higher rate so that it is more reasonable by the time that somebody finishes high school and gets ready to go to college from an expanded \$500 per year per child to \$2,000 a year per child.

Now, the second thing that this bill will do on Thursday that we are considering and probably the most controversial aspect of it is that it would allow these education savings accounts to be used not just for college tuition but for tuition and fees and expenses associated with education for kindergartners through 12th-graders. That is a big change, but it is also I think an important change.

The reality is that most parents contribute to their child's education around the edges, whether it is tutoring or summer school or buying books for the classroom or participating in the fund-raiser to buy new equipment for the playground.

Encouraging that kind of savings and investment in schools and giving people a tax break for doing that is a good thing, and we should expand that ability to save and invest in public education from kindergarten through 12th grade.

I see one of my colleagues, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HULSHOF), has joined me here and is one of the

principal supporters and sponsors of this piece of legislation, and I yield some time to him since he has worked so hard on it.

Mr. HULSHOF. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my friend from New Mexico yielding and especially for taking the initiative to really focus on what I believe should be a national dialogue, and that is the education of our kids.

I am not embarrassed to admit that I am a 5-month-old parent. And, of course, as a new parent, one's attention begins to focus maybe on different priorities. I know in our household we have, and we have begun to think about the education of our daughter Casey Elizabeth.

Here in Washington, as my friend knows, too often I think we begin to focus on or define our Nation's educational success by how many dollars that we put toward public education. If that were the yardstick, then I think the Republicans here in the House deserve great credit. Since 1995, public funding education has been increased by 27 percent over those several years.

But that is not how I think we should define educational success. To me, it is much simpler than that; that success is defined by how much our children learn. And, of course, I think key in that is trying to get parents to become more involved in the education of their kids.

Now, as my colleague knows, as a mother, we cannot pass a law in this body that mandates parents' attendance at PTA meetings. Some wish maybe we could force that mandate on families, but that is not the role of the Government. But I think there are things that we can do. And as my friend has talked about, the bill that we have on the floor on Thursday this week, H.R. 7, I think is a key component. It is not the answer to all of our educational problems; but I think as far as parental control, we do provide some incentives, yes, through the Tax Code.

Our idea of this bill is very simple. We think that the Federal tax should be eliminated if they are saving for education. As my colleague was pointing out just a few minutes ago, current law that this President signed into law, this education savings account, says that up to \$500 a year can be contributed by a family member into an account.

□ 1945

But as you also very ably pointed out that even if, let us say, over the course of the lifetime of your child, from the moment they were born every year until they go to college, the money they would have saved for college is about \$15,000 and that is assuming compound interest at about 7½ percent. So I think first and foremost, we have to sort of take that limit off to really encourage parents to be saving even more for the education of their kids.

To me, the perfect bill that the President should sign into law would be,

number one, an elimination of the marriage penalty tax; and since most of that is about \$1,400 more per couple, then that family with children can plug that money into an expanded education savings account. As you pointed out, the point is saving for higher education is important.

And yes, perhaps the controversy in this bill as we are probably going to hear in less measured tones as we debate this bill in the next couple of days is, we think that elementary and secondary education expenses should qualify. If your first grader is having a tough time reading, why not use the proceeds of an education savings account to maybe purchase Hooked on Phonics to help bring your child up to the reading level that he or she should be in a particular grade. If you are having trouble with math, maybe a home computer or a computer program that might help a child learn math better, or maybe a foreign language. It could even be expenses like car pooling or transportation expenses. The beauty of an expanded savings account is, it is not the government saying how money should be spent. It is the parents. I think what a powerful ally that a parent can be working with a teacher in addressing the special needs of that particular child.

Mrs. WILSON. I was just sitting here thinking about the tremendous opportunities and possibilities that this brings for more parents who are trying to work with a teacher, whether that teacher is in public school or private school or parochial school or wherever, to meet the individual needs of that child. It is not unusual for a teacher to say, well, we think this is what your child needs and he is not a special ed kid but there are some additional materials or some additional help that might be available and to be able to use tax-free money to do that so that you are reinforcing what the teacher and the school are trying to do with your child so that they can learn and achieve, whether that is kids who are gifted or kids who are having a little bit of trouble or even if your school does not have a foreign language program and your child is particularly interested in it, or there is not music available at the elementary school level and you can bring music into the schools, whether it is parents getting together to do it or a parent doing that individually alongside the school and wrapping educational experiences around a child.

All of us have looked at, what are we going to do this summer. What besides Little League or AYSO soccer or swim lessons are we going to do this summer. There are tremendous opportunities for summer school for kids, whether your child needs some extra help or whether it is that enrichment opportunity that you have really just been working for and saving for. If parents are willing to work and save for that opportunity, we should not be penalizing them by taxing them before they do so.

So this change that we are looking at Thursday is going to do a couple of things: Will go from \$500 to \$2,000 for the amount you can save per child per year. Will expand it, not just college expenses but kindergarten through 12th grade as well. Expenses so that if it is tuition or fees or materials or supplies or computers, whether they are in a public school, private school, home school, it does not matter. It would be kindergarten on up.

The other interesting change, I think this is an important one when we talk about investing in education beyond what the government does at State, Federal and local levels, is that it will allow corporations to contribute to education savings accounts. The current law says that parents or family members can put money in a child's name in an education savings account. But this bill will expand that and say that if your employer wants to make an annual contribution to the education savings accounts for the children of its employees, it would be allowed.

You can very easily see where that will become a potential corporate benefit that employees will look for, just as they look for health benefits and other kinds of things when they decide who they are going to be working for. I think that that provision could encourage corporations to really make those contributions, and that is particularly important for families that may not be able to save that full \$2,000 a year, but their employer is going to help to make up the difference.

Mr. HULSHOF. If the gentlewoman will yield on that point, not just businesses and corporations but not-for-profits would also be allowed under this expanded savings account to provide a contribution as you have suggested, perhaps for that low-income child. It could be a church who might establish on behalf of a parishioner an expanded education savings account to really provide an incentive for that child to continue to go on.

One of the arguments that I hear and probably that we will hear more over the course of the debate on this bill is that allowing, and again we are talking about the interest buildup or the earnings, first of all these are after-tax dollars going into an education savings account and then the power of compound interest being used to create additional earnings, we are talking about allowing those earnings to accumulate tax-free if used for a qualified education expense.

Now, one of the arguments against elementary and secondary education expenses is that only the affluent, or we are taking money away from public education. I think as my friend from New Mexico has the chart right next to her, it speaks volumes. The reductions that we would see in Federal education spending would be zero. No money would be diverted away from public education.

In fact, the official scorekeeper that we work under, the Congressional

Budget Office along with the Committee on Joint Taxation, says that we will have additional resources committed to the education of our kids coming from the private sector, that is, coming from families that we do not see now. In fact, they tell us some of these numbers. Fourteen million families would benefit from this expanded savings account, and about 11 million of those families have kids going to public school. So, in other words, we are committing even additional resources from the private sector, from the families for education expenses at the elementary and secondary education level.

The other point I would make, current law restricts education savings accounts to be used just for public college, obviously a worthy goal, higher education, but that means education savings accounts are useless in addressing problems that are being experienced in elementary school or in high school. And so while you may try to get to college, it might be that if we could have parents working with teachers as allies in the lower grades, then children will be more prepared to enter college. So I think it is a little bit of a myth as far as the argument on the other side that somehow we are taking money out of the Federal education system. Just the contrary. We are committing more private funds, that is, private savings funds committed to the education of our kids, both primarily in public education and yes, perhaps private education or even home schooling. The idea is simple. We do not think any child should be discriminated against based on where he or she chooses to attend school.

Mrs. WILSON. This issue of, well, would it be draining resources from the public schools in some ways. There are some people who disagree with this, but we have for many years in this country used the Tax Code to encourage people to do things, to encourage people to make choices, to encourage people to save for their retirement, to encourage people to invest and buy a home.

What we are doing in this bill with the Tax Code is encouraging them to invest in the education of their children. While some people disagree with using our Tax Code that way, I have to say that I think it is a noble goal. The folks who work at the Joint Committee on Taxation have estimated that this kind of a program based on what is happening in other similar kinds of tax changes would result in \$12 billion of investment in our schools that is not there now. \$12 billion nationwide, 70 percent of which would go to kids who are in public school to wrap those additional things around them that maybe the public school just could not directly afford but parents working together with teachers might be able to do. I think that that is a noble goal.

There is one other change in the bill that I think is worth discussing a little

bit. Right now, many States have prepaid tuition accounts for State colleges. New Mexico has that kind of a system where you can decide to save pretax and prepay your tuition if you are sending your child to UNM or New Mexico State. There are probably 20 or so States that have similar things set up under State law.

Under the current Federal law, you are not allowed to take advantage of the education savings account if in the same year you are taking advantage of the prepaid tuition account that your State may offer. In other words, you cannot do both for the same child in the same year.

The piece of legislation that we will be voting on on Thursday eliminates that restriction. So if in New Mexico I have a child that I am determined is going to be a Lobo when he is 18 years old and go to the University of New Mexico, I can make a prepaid tuition contribution but I could also be saving money in the education savings account in that same year. It allows parents who are committed to making those contributions up-front and making those savings up-front to do both under Federal law for one and under the State tax law for the other.

Mr. HULSHOF. In addition, and that is so critically important, what a popular idea that is in place in your State and in other States as far as prepaid State tuition plans, to be used again as a tool focusing on higher education.

Here are a couple of other perhaps noncontroversial measures in H.R. 7 that I think deserve some mention in addition to the prepaid tuition plans, ending that taxation on both public and private plans. We also help those that are saddled with heavy student loans. How many of us in this body perhaps have used student loans to invest in ourselves in education to maybe go on to higher education or to post-graduate studies. What we do to try to give some relief to those under that heavy burden of student loans is that we continue, we expand the student deduction, the loan interest deduction under current law, we expand that, allow more time for that deduction to be made possible.

In addition, there is a lot of discussion about school construction. Interestingly as we debated this bill in our committee, in the Committee on Ways and Means last week, we had a representative from the U.S. Treasury, obviously from the administration, and I pointed out in a document that was printed in 1996 that the statement of the administration was they believed the construction of schools is a local initiative. Yet I guess over the course of the last couple of years, we have suddenly changed or at least the White House has changed into thinking that suddenly school construction and modernization should be a Federal initiative. Without getting into the merits of whether it is a State, and I happen to think it is a State and local initiative, in fact in my home county, Boone

County, Missouri in the Ninth Congressional District on the April ballot, we will be going to the polls to decide a bond issue as it appropriately should be done at the local level.

But what we also do is provide in this bill relief from some of the complicated rules called bond arbitrage rules that both States and localities use when they make that decision, when they go to the local voters and decide whether to renovate or to build or modernize their school structures, we provide some relief for them. That is also in this bill. Finally, we encourage the private sector to donate computers to schools. And so we have that provision in H.R. 7, as well. Probably not as controversial as some of the other things we have discussed.

As a final point, and I see we have got one of our other classmates here, then I will yield to the two of you. You mentioned the policy, and I want to talk about the policy, about using the Tax Code for certain incentives. Let me tell you why I think that it is just good policy generally to encourage savings. Right now, and for those, Mr. Speaker, that may be wrestling with their 1040 forms and maybe have C-SPAN on in the background, if you look at your 1040 form on line 8A and line 8B, you plug into, as far as part of your taxable income, your adjusted gross income, any interest you may have earned, whether on a certificate of deposit, whether it is on a savings account, the old traditional savings account or any dividends you receive, you have to add that obviously to your taxable income according to current law and Uncle Sam wants his share.

□ 2000

There is no wonder that we are the lowest savings Nation among industrialized countries. We have already precedent in existing law. We encourage people to put aside money after tax dollars for their retirement, with the Roth IRA, a very popular idea. That is, one puts aside one's after-tax dollars, it accumulates interest or earnings, and then it is not taxed when used for retirement.

We had a provision that we sent to the President called the SAFE Act that would shield about the first \$500 of interest or dividend income again, to help the small or moderate investor, not the Wall Street types that make a living at investment, but really trying to help middle-class families.

Along that line, this education savings account, I think, falls right in that good tax policy, and that is trying to provide this incentive to encourage people, especially families, to plug away more money, whether it is putting nickels and dimes or a monthly set-aside from their paycheck into an education savings account for their child or children. Again, what could be more of a worthy exercise than to invest in your own children's future, not rely upon the Federal Government?

Again, I commend the gentlewoman for bringing this issue to the attention

of the full House. I look forward to the debate. I hope we can have the debate on policy; and I hope the rhetoric does not get too harsh or hot, although that may be asking for a lot; but nonetheless, I urge, Mr. Speaker, my colleagues to support H.R. 7 when it gets to the floor. I thank my friend for yielding me time this evening.

Mrs. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri for his leadership on the Committee on Ways and Means, the tax committee that deals with these bills. I also congratulate him on being a new father. I know that that brings a real focus to his commitment to a great education for all kids in this country.

Now we are joined here tonight by one of my other colleagues, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and I would be happy to yield him some time to talk about this issue.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New Mexico, and I congratulate her on her efforts tonight to talk about this issue. I have been listening to both the gentlewoman and the gentleman from Missouri discuss this issue and my first thought is, how could anybody be against this. Why would anybody oppose this? The gentlewoman has talked about all of the new changes, expanding the limits, the usability, and tying it into the State prepaid programs that are already out there. All of that makes sense.

But I think we ought to talk a little bit about why the President and the Vice President are opposed to this legislation and why they have vetoed this legislation twice. It just seems incredible to me that anyone could be opposed to this legislation.

The interesting part, I find, is that when it comes down to the parents and the families who have accumulated this money to prepare for their children's future, someone in government wants to tell them what they can purchase and what they cannot purchase. It just seems so incredible.

I am a product of public education; my children and grandchildren are going to public education, I think as the vast majority of Americans do. But it seems so farsighted to think that if parents would choose on how to spend the money they have saved, their families have put together, would be some threat to public education. But we know, because twice the President and the Vice President have vetoed this legislation because of that fear.

I would use the example of maybe a young lady or a young gentleman that is in high school preparing to go to a certain college, and they find out they need to strengthen their English and so they want to take honors English, and maybe nobody in their family is really good in English so they go down the street and hire a tutor so that they can get into the college, get into the program they want. I am constantly talking to parents who are dismayed because their kids have good grades, but

some weakness that prevented them from getting the courses at the competitive university that they wanted to go to, and why they could not use a little bit of their savings account to hire a tutor down the street who might not have been in the public school system, might have been a university professor down the street who would be glad to assist. It just seems incredible to me that anyone would fear people saving their money to be able to use it for how they want to educate their child in some small way, other than the public system.

Mr. Speaker, I know that when we debate this bill in a day or two, that will be the big issue, that this bill will be destructive to public education. Nothing could be further from the truth, because as parents plan and families save, sacred to education is family involvement. And if we have families involved, putting a little away for their grandchildren, their nieces and nephews, or an employer who is very futuristic and says I would like to help with your children's education, I mean these are all the sorts of things, helping Americans to be self-sufficient.

Middle-class America can only get loans. If you have a decent income, you only get loans; you do not get grants, and college education is becoming more and more expensive. Young people and families are indebted for years. I have staff people who have been out of school for a long time and still have big education loans, paying on them monthly, because they made the effort to get a good education, grants were not available, they had to borrow all of the money, did not come from a family with cash, did not have the money in the bank. This will enable a lot more Americans to participate in the higher education system. It also will help them in the elementary years if they need some extra help, or if they need to go to a special school to strengthen art or strengthen music so that they can get into the famous program at some university that they want to get into. It will help them.

To take away the options of parents like the President and Vice President want to do, in my view, is the basic argument. This whole thought concept is getting people to save for their future and the future of their children. I just find it incredible that anyone would think that we should then control how parents spend that money. Yes, they should spend it for educational efforts, but whether they would hire a private tutor or whether they would go to a private school for a short period of time or in the summertime take some summer classes and not be able to use money out of their educational savings accounts if they did not have the cash available just seems incredible to me. I will never understand the fear of giving Americans a choice once they have had the foresight to save for their children's education.

Mrs. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I appreciate his comments here tonight.

We are talking about education savings accounts and a bill that is going to be on the floor this Thursday. It is called H.R. 7, and it would expand current law which allows education savings accounts only for college expenses and only allows a 500 per-ear, per-child contribution. The bill we are going to consider on Thursday has already passed the Senate; a very similar bill has passed the Senate. It passed the first week of March, so now this is our opportunity in the House to do the right thing with respect to allowing families to save for education.

I would like to talk a little bit about some of the myths and some of the attacks that this legislation has been subjected to. I think we are probably going to hear more of it over the next couple of days here in the House. But the thing that bothers me about it is that it is like throwing chaff, it is just trying to throw any argument out there, even if it is not valid at all, just to try to block the legislation, when really a lot of it just is not true. I want to talk about it a little bit.

One of the major attacks on this piece of legislation is that it is just another tax break for the rich. I think that that sentence is etched in marble somewhere around Washington. Whatever we want to do, it is just another tax break for the rich. The reality is that one cannot even qualify for an education savings account if one's family income, it starts to phase out at \$150,000 a year. So this is for that section of folks who are middle-income Americans, the ones who do not qualify for the grants, the ones who are looking at huge college loans or incredible expenditures, particularly when one gets more than one kid in college at the same time, who want to plan for that in advance.

So the Joint Committee on Taxation looked at this and their estimates are that 70 percent of the people who benefit from this have a family income of less than \$75,000 a year. This is about saving for middle-class kids. It does not affect the wealthy kids at all, really.

The other interesting thing about that analysis is that three-quarters of the kids are going to be going to public school. It is about giving families the incentive to save and wrap things around kids that the public schools may not offer.

It is science fair season in New Mexico. I do not know how that is in Pennsylvania, but it is a really big deal in New Mexico. My son is in kindergarten in a public school in Albuquerque, and he is doing his first science fair project. It is not that big a deal in kindergarten, but for some of these kids who are in middle school and high school, some of these science fair projects are both a huge commitment of their time, but also a fair commitment in resources too. Would it not be nice to be able to use tax-free dollars that one had been saving for those kinds of expenses, or when one's kid gets to be in

middle school and high school and joins the band and really gets committed to music and wants to take private lessons in addition to playing in the band or the orchestra. It seems to me that if one is willing to support that, one should have the option to use tax-free money to do that in an education savings account.

So that is one myth, that it is for the rich. It is not. The rich do not even qualify, and 70 percent of the folks who are going to benefit from this make less than \$75,000 a year, hardly rich in America.

The second myth is that we are going to deplete money from the public schools, that this will all be taken away in some way for the public schools. That is just absolutely flat out not true. Frankly, I got involved in public life because of a commitment to public education and a belief that we have to improve public education and make sure that all of our kids are benefiting from public education.

The idea that doing something like this would take away from the public schools really bothers me. I find that myth to be personally offensive, particularly given that we just passed a budget last week that will increase, yet again, the Federal commitment to education. Mr. Speaker, almost 10 percent this year in increased funds to education. Now, that is more than our State government has been able to do for the last several years, and we will continue our commitment to funding schools. But we should also do things that encourage corporations and nonprofits and parents to save and invest in public education too. That is, I think, good public policy.

The quote here that I have up next to me is from United States Senator BOB TORRICELLI, who is one of the principal sponsors in the Senate. He makes it very clear: this is using private money. It is using a family's own resources. By our estimation, after 5 years, \$12 billion in private money will be used to educate children kindergarten to 12.

This cannot be a bad thing. Yet, critics argue it is a diversion of money from public schools. Not one dime of money that is now going to a public school goes anywhere else but to that same school on that same basis. This is new money, private money, a net increase of \$12 billion in education. That has to be a positive thing and it does not take a dime away from the school in your neighborhood.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman would yield, if my math is still good, 75 percent of \$12 billion would be those who oppose this legislation for the reasons we have talked about, their fear, are saying no to \$9 billion that would flow into the public educational system from private families, not government money, but private money would say no to that because they could not be guaranteed every dime of it.

Mr. Speaker, I had a father yesterday just really upset because his son was

unable to attend a Pennsylvania college that he and all of his family had graduated from. He had very high grades, but he was weak in art and music. And if he would have known that, he would have had him tutored, but he had taken all the art and music that was available to him. But for some reason, he, being unaware of that, was unable to enter the program at the school of his choice. His grades were just under 4.0, so it was not the total, it was the lack of some special needs. Here is a situation where they could have used some of the money they had put away for their children's future to prepare him so that he could enter the field.

I do not think that is uncommon. I hear a lot of parents talking about how their children are doing wonderfully, but there is something missing in their local school program to allow them to be prepared for some very competitive national programs where they may only take 30 a year from across the country, and to enter that select rank, they have to have all of the credentials that that university requires. In those situations, they talk about again taxing the rich. The middle class, many of them are so dedicated about preparing their children for their future and really sacrificing.

□ 2015

I have had friends who really were poor for a decade, and yet they had a good income because they had two and three children in college at the same time. By the time they wrote those tuition checks year after year after year, they were driving a much older car than they used to, they were going without any new furniture, they were taking smaller and shorter vacations, but their priorities were to educate their youngsters. They can call them rich because they have a good income, but by the time they pay three college tuitions, they are poor when it comes to spending dollars for other things.

So I guess I still go back to the turning away of \$9 billion of investment in public education because \$3 billion might go to private education. That seems to me to be very shortsighted and just not having one's eyes on the ball and not looking at this in the big picture. Because we all know that public education, probably in our lifetime, will continue to provide the education for most of our youngsters.

Mrs. WILSON. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

There are some other myths I think we are going to hear some more about. There is one that the gentleman started to touch on. That is the issue of, well, this will just mean that money is going to private schools and it is going to go to parochial schools, and not only is this wrong as a matter of public policy, but it might be unconstitutional. That is also, I think, kind of a red herring. This passes all of the constitutional tests because the benefit accrues to the family and the child. They decide what to use that money for.

I find it amusing that we could say that the current law, which allows education savings accounts to be used in saving, and a child can go to Notre Dame, but it would be unconstitutional to use that same money to send that child to St. Pious High School, which is a Catholic high school in my district. It is fully constitutional and complies with all of the constitutional mandates for use of public funds.

This is not about vouchers, though some people are going to argue that, as well. If we are allowed to take money after we have paid taxes on it and put it in an account so it can accrue interest without paying taxes on that interest, that is our money. We use that money. The only thing that is different about it is that they are not going to take the taxes on it if we say we are going to use that money to invest in our child's education.

That is the only thing that is going on here. This is not about taking public money and funding private or parochial schools. So I think that that is an important myth that we are going to need to deal with over the next couple of days.

I think there is another myth, too. It is really kind of the one that is not spoken. We might as well just come right out and say it.

There are folks who believe that there is a desire to fund these kinds of things and not public schools; that what this really is about is about changing the debate and changing the flow of funds and abandoning public education.

Nothing could be further from the truth. I think this Congress over the last 4 or 5 years has reaffirmed its commitment to great education in this country and great public schools in this country, because every one of us in this room, no matter what party we belong to, benefited from public education, for the most part. There are some folks here on both sides of the aisle who went to Catholic schools, but we all know that America would not be the great Nation it is today without a strong public school system. We have known that in this country, that democracy cannot thrive without a great system of public schools.

The biggest chunk of Federal funding for education here goes into special ed, the IDEA funds. I think it is important to talk about a few facts here on the commitment to education.

The brown bar here is what the President has requested since 1996. In every single year, Congress has appropriated more funds for special education than has been requested in the President's budget. We will do that again this year. In the budget resolution we passed last week, we will increase special education funding this year by \$2.2 billion, and \$20 billion over the next 5 years. We are committed to a great system of education.

But that also means doing things with the Tax Code to encourage others to be equally committed, whether they

are corporations or whether they are parents trying to plan for the future of their children.

The final myth is that what this really is about is encouraging folks to leave the public schools; that this will somehow make it possible for a kid who is in third grade in Albuquerque to go to St. Mary's, rather than to the local public school. That may happen on the margins, but frankly, it is really probably not enough to make that happen in a large sense. If that is what works for that kid, I am not sure that that bothers me at all.

We are not going to see, no matter what we do, a huge exodus from the public schools. The reason is that parents want a great school in their neighborhood. They want to be able to have their kid walk to a school that is safe, that will educate them for the 21st century. They do not want to abandon the public school system any more than we do in this body. But what they do want to do is be able to spend some money on their child's education without being penalized for it under the Tax Code.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman will yield, she mentioned the IDEA funding, special education funding. I think Congress has really stepped up to the plate there.

When this legislation was passed, special education is a mandate that every child receives the same kind of education, the same quality of education. Some people with serious problems are a lot more expensive to educate than those who do not have those difficulties.

Yet, just back in 1996, if I look at this correctly, we were only paying 3.5 percent of special education costs. If my memory is correct, the legislation that was passed by this Congress before that some years said we would pay 40 percent of the costs of special education. We were at 3.5, and I think we are up to, looking at that chart it is a little hard to tell, it is over 6. So we have almost doubled the Federal commitment.

These are dollars that follow the student and go to all of our schools. That is not true of all Federal money. Much of the Federal education dollar is not spread equally across this country. Some large urban districts do pretty well. There are a few suburban districts which do pretty well. I have lots of districts that get 1 percent of their funding. Yet, we say we are funding 6.8 percent of education.

So the biggest frustration I have had with Federal programs is the complexity. To reach them, you have to have consultants or you have to have specialists on your staff. My rural school districts often do not have an assistant superintendent, let alone a grantsman. They do not have educational consultants nearby, because it is rural. So many of my districts have no idea how to apply to the hundreds of Federal programs that are available, and do not have the expertise to do that.

I will find an occasional anomaly where you will have a school superintendent who worked in a suburban district who was very good at getting Federal money and he brought that expertise to the school with him, but that is the rarity. That is not common.

With the IDEA, when we fund that instead of another Federal program such as construction of schools, which would have only gone to a few schools in this country, the average school never would have seen it, which would have complicated the process, which would have made building of schools more costly, we need to free up those Federal education dollars and get them into the classroom, and get away from all the bureaucratic mumbo-jumbo that is there.

But back to the issue that we were talking about, the education savings accounts, again, it is our chance to give people a chance to prepare for their children's education and have some money set aside that can grow tax-free. They have paid the tax on it first, but it can grow tax-free. Then they can choose to use it when they feel it is necessary and they cannot afford it out of their general income.

Under the President's and the Vice President's plans, we might have someone who is a senior. The parents do not have the money for a special needed program so their daughter or son could go to a certain school of their choice, and they would miss that opportunity, because it would be somehow wrong for them to choose to pay for that program that would prepare them for their college education.

Again, as I said when I had listened to the earlier discussion, as the gentleman began this evening, how anybody could really oppose this bill, how anybody could be fearful that this is going to crush public education or harm public education when it has the potential of contributing \$9 billion to public education is just not being honest.

I think when we have this debate on Thursday, I hope that people will be honest, because if they are honest they will not be making those kinds of statements. Allowing parents to save their money and let it grow and then spend it on their child for educational purposes that they think is appropriate is exactly how America should function. To oppose this legislation, I think they are saying, parents, you do not know how to spend your money that you have saved for your children, and just because we did not charge you taxes on the increase in value, you cannot spend it where you think it ought to be spent.

That is taking control from our families and putting it in Washington bureaucracy, in a Washington educational establishment that in my view is afraid of something that they should not be afraid of at all.

Mrs. WILSON. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I thank him for joining us here tonight.

Just to sum up before the hour ends here, we have been talking about the education savings accounts. We are going to be having a bill on the floor of the House on Thursday about education savings accounts. They exist under current law, but they are limited to only \$500 a year per child. They can only be used for college expenses.

We would like to make some changes to that. The Senate has already passed a bill, and we are going to work on it and hopefully pass it here on the floor of the House on Thursday, that would do a couple of things. It would allow you to save not \$500 a year per child but to put \$2,000 per year per child into that account and allow it to grow, allow the interest to accrue without paying taxes on that interest.

We are going to try to extend it from college expenses down to kindergarten through 12th grade and college expenses, so it can cover tuition or tutoring or supplies or computers or books, whether that is for a child in public school or private school or parochial school or home school.

The estimates are that 70 percent of the kids who are going to benefit from that at the elementary and secondary level are going to be in public school, and that parents will use those funds to wrap things around a child that they may not be getting, or they may be having trouble with in public school.

The third change that the law is going to try to make on Thursday is to let corporations or nonprofits contribute to education savings accounts set up for low-income kids. One of the criticisms is that there is really no advantage to this if you are low-income or low enough income that you are not paying taxes.

Of course, those generally are the kids who qualify for the grants to go to college in the first place. It is middle-income families that are really strapped when it comes to paying for education expenses.

The other thing that the change will do is for those States and for those families who are making pre-paid college tuition payments who have set up an account to go to State school, as many States already have, they would be able to contribute to their educational savings account for that child, also. They would not have to choose either one or the other. That change will be in the law that we hope to pass on Thursday.

They still will not be able to qualify for this if they are rich. They will still have to save and pay interest on the savings if they are making over \$150,000 a year as a family. But this is really targeted towards middle-class Americans, to the kids who are wondering when they are in high school how they are ever going to pay for college, and to the parents who are despairing about the same thing. Those are the families that need the help and the encouragement through the Tax Code to invest in education.

I started out talking this evening almost an hour ago now about our com-

mitment to public education and our commitment to our kids in the 21st century. What was good enough for us and what was good enough for our parents and for our grandparents is not going to be good enough for our kids. We need to redouble our efforts and redouble our commitment to education for our children.

Ten years from now, I hope that we are standing here able to celebrate the reality that 95 percent of our kids are graduating from high school and three-quarters of them are going on to college or technical school or into the military.

We are not there yet, but we cannot afford to leave any child behind. No child must be left behind. We have to narrow the gap between rich and poor and black and white and brown, because in America, we will not have a 21st century that is an American century, just as much as the 20th was, unless we do.

□ 2030

I want to thank my colleagues for joining me here this evening.

THE NEED FOR MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG BENEFITS AND OTHER VITAL ISSUES

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, this evening, I would like to talk for a little bit about the issue of a Medicare prescription drug benefit, because I believe that it is imperative that this Congress, this House of Representatives in particular, pass a prescription drug benefit that is affordable and that every American, every senior citizen, everyone that is eligible for Medicare, would be able to take advantage of.

Mr. Speaker, so far we hear the Republican leadership talking about the need for a prescription drug benefit in the context of Medicare, but yet we have seen no action. No action in committee, no action on the floor in either House.

President Clinton has rightly pointed out that the government must subsidize drug coverage for all Medicare beneficiaries, not just for those who have modest incomes or use large amounts of medicine. Some of my Republican colleagues want to give Federal grants to the States to help low-income elderly people buy prescription drugs. But my point tonight is that that approach is unacceptable, because more than half of the Medicare beneficiaries who lack prescription drug coverage have incomes more than 50 percent above the official poverty line.

Another Republican proposal that I hear from some of my colleagues would give tax breaks to elderly people so they can buy private insurance covering prescription drugs. But again this

proposal would benefit the wealthiest seniors without providing any help to low- and middle-income seniors.

The point I am trying to make, Mr. Speaker, and President Clinton has made it over and over again, and Democrats on our side of the aisle will continue to make the point, that we need to provide prescription drug coverage for all seniors and we need to end the drug price discrimination which so many of our seniors are witness to and suffer from.

Just by way of background, Mr. Speaker, some information or some factual background about why this prescription drug benefit is necessary. Fifteen million Medicare beneficiaries right now have no prescription drug coverage, requiring them to pay their outpatient prescription drug costs entirely themselves. Millions of other seniors are at risk of losing coverage or have inadequate, expensive coverage. Indeed, the Consumers Union has found that seniors currently receiving prescription drug coverage through private Medigap policies are not getting a good deal.

Specifically, in 1998, Consumers Union analysis found that a typical 75-year-old is paying an additional premium of \$1,850 per year for a prescription drug benefit that is capped at \$1,250 a year. Hence, the typical 75-year-old is paying in premiums more than the value of the prescription drug coverage.

There are so many problems with the so-called coverage that we have out there in terms of its being inadequate and consumers having to pay too much, as well as a large amount of seniors that have no coverage at all. The problem of seniors paying prescription drug costs out of pocket has become particularly acute because the costs of prescription drugs continue to soar. The cost of prescription drugs rose by 14 percent in 1997 compared to 5 percent for health services overall.

The pinch on seniors is especially hard because people buying prescription drugs on their own, such as the seniors who have no or inadequate insurance coverage, usually have to pay the highest prices for them and they are unable to wield as much leverage as health plans and insurance companies that often can negotiate discounts. They do not have that opportunity to negotiate the discounts.

Seniors are the portion of the population that is the most dependent on prescription drugs. Whereas seniors are only 12 percent of the total population, they use more than one-third of the prescription drugs used in the U.S. every year. When Medicare was created back in 1965, prescription drugs did not play a significant role in the Nation's health care; and that is why it was not included in the time when Medicare was started. However, due to the great advances in pharmaceuticals in the past 34 years, prescription drugs now play a central role in the typical senior's health care.

As President Clinton has pointed out, if we were creating Medicare today, no one would ever consider not having a prescription drug benefit. Drugs that are now routinely prescribed for seniors to regulate blood pressure, lower cholesterol, ward off osteoporosis, these kinds of drugs had not been invented when Medicare began as a Federal program in 1965. Today, the typical American age 65 or older uses 18 prescription drugs a year.

Mr. Speaker, the bottom line that I am trying to get across, and that so many of my colleagues on the Democratic side have been trying to get across, is essentially that too many seniors find themselves unable to pay for their prescription drugs. The Democrats want to address this crisis and we want to enact a prescription drug plan this year to help all seniors afford the overwhelming cost of medication.

Now, I do not insist, and Democrats in general have not insisted, on any particular plan as long as it covers everyone and it is affordable. But because of the fact that the Republican leadership has so far refused to take any action on the prescription drug issue in the context of Medicare, we have been forced to essentially move to a procedure in the House called the discharge petition. If a bill is not released from committee or does not come to the floor, the Members of the House of Representatives have the option of signing a discharge petition at the desk here to my right that would essentially force the bill to come to the floor for a vote.

So, because of the Republican inaction on the prescription drugs issue in the context of Medicare, we have been trying to get as many Democrats, as well as Republicans, as possible to sign a discharge petition on two bills that would address the problem in a comprehensive way.

Mr. Speaker, I want to spend a little time talking about those two bills, because I think they may not be the only answer, but they are certainly a good answer to the problem that so many seniors face in terms of their inability to afford or have access to prescription drugs.

The first bill is sponsored by the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK) and the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), H.R. 1495. It would add an outpatient prescription drug benefit to Medicare; basically provide for the benefit. The bill covers 80 percent of routine drug expenditures and 100 percent of pharmaceutical expenditures for chronically ill beneficiaries who incur drug costs of more than \$3,000 a year.

This legislation would create a new outpatient prescription drug benefit under Medicare Part B. The benefit has two parts: A basic benefit that would fully cover the drug needs of most beneficiaries; and, as I mentioned, a stop-loss benefit that will provide much-needed additional coverage to the beneficiaries who have the highest drug costs.

After beneficiaries meet a separate drug deductible of \$200, coverage is gen-

erally provided at levels similar to regular Part B benefits with the beneficiary paying not more than 20 percent of the program's established price for a particular product. The basic benefit would provide coverage up to \$1,700 annually. Medicare would provide stop-loss coverage; Medicare would pay 100 percent of the costs once annual out-of-pocket expenditures exceed \$3,000. Seniors with drug costs in excess of the basic benefit but below the stop-loss trigger would be allowed to self pay for additional medications at the private entity's discount price.

As I said, there are two aspects of this that the Democrats as a party have tried to address. One is the need for a basic prescription drug benefit, and the other issue relates to the price discrimination that seniors face right now if they are not part of a plan, in which case they have to pay a lot more for the coverage because they cannot negotiate a good price for prescription drugs.

In the second bill that we have been seeking to discharge to the House floor, and various Democrats have signed the discharge petition for, this bill is the bill sponsored by the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER), H.R. 664, that calls for drug companies to end price discrimination and make their products available to seniors at the same low prices that companies give the Federal Government and other favored customers.

If I could just talk about this bill in a little more detail. It is called the Prescription Drug Fairness for Seniors Act. Basically, it was put together by the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) because of various studies that were done by the Committee on Government Reform and that Democrats have looked into in order to suggest an answer to the problems that seniors have with price discrimination.

There have been studies in congressional districts across the country that have shown that drug manufacturers engage in widespread price discrimination. Seniors and others who buy their own prescription drugs are forced to pay twice as much for their drugs as are the drug manufacturers' most favored customers such as the Federal government and, of course, the large HMOs.

For some prescription drugs, seniors must pay 10 times more than these favored customers. This price discrimination has a devastating effect on older Americans. Although they have the greatest need and the least ability to pay, senior citizens without prescription drug coverage must pay far more for prescription drugs than the favored buyers and, as a result of these high prices, many senior citizens are forced to choose between buying food and paying for medication they need.

I do not have to mention, Mr. Speaker, there are so many cases like this in my district and throughout the country where seniors are forced to make

this decision and choose between the drugs and the medication and buying food.

The Prescription Drug Fairness for Seniors Act will protect senior citizens from drug price discrimination and make prescription drugs available to Medicare beneficiaries at substantially reduced prices. The legislation achieves these goals by allowing pharmacies that serve Medicare beneficiaries to purchase prescription drugs at the low prices available to the Federal Government and other favored customers. The legislation has been estimated to reduce prescription drug prices for seniors by more than 40 percent.

Again, if I could summarize what the Allen-Turner bill would do, it would allow pharmacies to purchase prescription drugs for Medicare beneficiaries at low prices. Pharmacies will be able to purchase prescription drugs for Medicare beneficiaries at the same prices available to the Federal Government and these other favored HMOs. It also uses a streamlined, market-based approach. It would allow pharmacies to use the existing pharmaceutical distribution system and will not establish a new Federal bureaucracy. And the new access to discounts by pharmacies will enhance economic competition.

Mr. Speaker, I am not saying, and I want to stress again, I am not saying that these two bills, the Stark-Waxman bill or the Allen-Turner bill, the subject of the Democrats' discharge petitions, are the only approach. But I believe that something has to be done soon along the lines of the approach that these two bills take, and that is a comprehensive benefit for every senior under Medicare and a way to achieve affordable prices.

The problem of the lack of an affordable prescription drug benefit is really the biggest problem facing the Medicare program today. As I mentioned before, Medicare is a good program but this is a huge gap that must be filled in the program. And I do not think it can be corrected piecemeal by simply devising a plan that covers the poorest seniors as some of my Republican colleagues have suggested. It should be a comprehensive and affordable drug benefit available to all seniors, regardless of income.

It is not clear to me whether the Republican leadership is prepared to move away from this idea of covering only one-third of Medicare beneficiaries who lack any prescription drug coverage at all. The Speaker has appointed a partisan task force to study the issue, and I hope this is not a mere diversionary tactic to stall any action to move legislation forward and to end price discrimination.

Hopefully, this task force will report soon and we will see some action that will come into committee and eventually be marked up and come to the floor. I just want to stress that when it comes to an examination of who has taken the lead in trying to fix this

problem, the record is very clear. The Republicans have done very little on this issue. Democrats, on the other hand, have been on the House floor day after day since the 106th Congress began pushing for consideration of legislative solutions such as those that have been offered by the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. STARK), as I mentioned.

The key is that both the Stark and the Allen plans would increase the negotiating power of those seeking to provide a Medicare drug benefit allowing pharmaceuticals to be purchased at cheaper prices and passing the savings on to all interested seniors. The President, we also know, has a comprehensive plan. His plan would also provide pharmaceuticals to seniors who need them at discounted prices. I want to stress that I also support his plan, and his plan also will accomplish the goal of covering all seniors and affordability.

On the other hand, I do not know of any Republican proposals or expressions of support for confronting the issue of pharmaceutical price discrimination. And we cannot, we cannot address this problem without dealing with that price discrimination issue.

Before closing with regard to the prescription drug issue, because I do want to move on to a couple of other subjects, I just want to express my view that it is also important to bring in the pharmaceutical companies in our efforts to pass a Medicare prescription drug benefit. I thought that it was very encouraging earlier this year when the drug companies dropped their initial opposition to a benefit and specifically to the President's proposal. That was refreshing.

In my home State of New Jersey, of course, there are a lot of pharmaceutical companies; and I was contacted by some of the New Jersey pharmaceutical executives who expressed their willingness to sit down and help come up with a plan.

□ 2045

I think that the reason that they did that is because they realize we need action. They realize that seniors are suffering, and they realize that it is possible to put together, hopefully in a bipartisan way, a Medicare prescription drug benefit that will cover all seniors and that will be affordable.

I would simply urge my colleagues and the Republican leadership that are in charge of the House of Representatives to act quickly on this. Until they do, I and other Democrats will come to the House floor on a regular basis demanding action, because seniors need it. This is a major issue for them. They are suffering, and they need to have our attention focused on this issue before the Congress adjourns this year.

LESSONS FOR UNITED STATES DIPLOMACY: INDIA RESPONDS TO CLINTON MESSAGE, BUT NOT PAKISTAN

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to spend some additional time this

evening, if I could, on two other international issues. I just returned last week with the President from an official state visit to India as well as Bangladesh. I thought that the trip and the visit by the President was very worthwhile. There is no question in my mind that it was a historic visit that managed to bring the United States and India closer together. This was the first visit by an American President to India and to the subcontinent in more than 2 decades.

I wanted to just, if I could, in the little bit of time tonight, assess what was accomplished and also make my analysis of how much work still needs to be done.

The key outcome of the President's trip is the message, I think, that should be sent to our administration, our State Department, about which South Asian nation can be relied upon to be an effective partner for the United States in the years to come. That Nation, of course, is India. Then, on the other hand, which South Asian nation stands in direct opposition to America's interests and values. I do not think there is any question, based on that trip, that the Nation in that category is Pakistan.

President Clinton went to South Asia with an agenda of promoting peace, stability, regional integration, democracy, trade, market reforms, and the settlement of disputes through negotiations. Well, India's elected leaders clearly embraced President Clinton's agenda. Pakistan's military dictatorship, on the other hand, clearly ignored it.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this lesson is not lost on the policy makers in our State Department and the National Security Council. During the Cold War, military and intelligence links were established between the United States and Pakistan. But we live in a changed world now. Unfortunately, there are many who are still set in the old ways, both here in Washington as well as in Pakistan. I hope what we have witnessed in the past week with the President's trip to the subcontinent will be taken seriously by our policy makers and that we will see significant changes in U.S.-South Asia policies.

I participated in the President's visit to India, but also to his visit to Bangladesh. I want to report that that trip to Bangladesh was also valuable and productive.

In addition to the goodwill that we generated between India and the United States and Bangladesh and the United States, there were some substantive accomplishments on initiatives that will improve the quality of life for the people of South Asia and create new opportunities for American businesses in this important and emerging region of the world.

One of the President's top priorities in making the trip to South Asia was to call for a peaceful solution to the Kashmir conflict that has divided India

and Pakistan for decades. India's elected leaders have long made it clear that they seek the same thing.

Well, last Monday, not yesterday, but the previous Monday, Mr. Speaker, on his first full day in India's capital of New Delhi, President Clinton and India's Prime Minister Vajpayee signed a vision statement outlining the direction of the partnership of the world's two largest democracies in the 21st century.

In their joint appearance, Prime Minister Vajpayee stated that India remains committed to resolving its differences with its neighbors through peaceful bilateral dialogue and in an atmosphere free from the thought of force and violence.

The prime minister stressed the need for neighboring countries to respect each other's sovereignty and territorial integrity and to base their relationship on agreements solemnly entered into.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, President Clinton did not hear the same message during his brief visit to the Pakistani capital of Islamabad. President Clinton stressed to General Musharraf, the military leader who seized power in Pakistan in a coup last October, that there could be no military solution in Kashmir by incursions across the line of control, the de facto border between India and Pakistani-controlled territory in Kashmir.

Our President called for restraint, respect for the line of control, and rejection of violence and return to dialogue.

In a speech to the Pakistani people, broadcast on national television and radio, President Clinton stated, "We want to be a force for peace. But we cannot force peace. We cannot impose it. We cannot and will not mediate or resolve the dispute in Kashmir. Only you and India can do that, through dialogue."

Now, in marked contrast, Mr. Speaker, to India's elected prime minister, Pakistan's military dictator did not echo the call for a peaceful resolution of the Kashmir conflict. Instead, despite overwhelming evidence to the contrary, the general fell back on the old claim that Pakistan had nothing to do with sending forces across the line of control last year. As a matter of fact, in a recent interview with the Washington Post prior to President Clinton's visit to India, General Musharraf himself admitted the Pakistani government's involvement in last year's attack against India's side of the line of control.

Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's New York Times, yesterday being Monday, the 27th of March, an editorial stated, and I quote, "In his six-hour stop in Islamabad on Saturday, including a 90-minute meeting with General Musharraf and an unflinching television address to the Pakistani people, Mr. Clinton delivered the right messages, but he did not get a helpful response. Indeed, General Musharraf, in a surreal news conference following the visit, sounded as if he had not heard a word Mr. Clinton said."

That New York Times editorial, entitled "Perils in Presidential Peacemaking," cited the disappointing results of the meeting with General Musharraf and of the meeting in Geneva with Syrian President Assad. The meetings accomplished little, quoting from the Times, "because neither interlocutor was in the mood to do business. America may be the sole superpower today, but that does not guarantee cooperation from intransigent leaders like General Musharraf and Mr. Assad."

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that leaders like General Musharraf and President Assad have in common was they were not elected to their post and they do not face the institutions of accountability that we expect in a democratic society. Obviously, we have to deal with such authoritarian leaders around the world, and sometimes we can accomplish productive things with them. But the results are often frustrating. In light of India's willingness to enter into a process of dialogue with Pakistan, it is truly a shame that General Musharraf let this opportunity go by without making any effort at reconciliation.

One of the key challenges of President Clinton's visit was to make it clear to the Pakistani junta that his visit did not constitute American support for the coup that overthrew the civilian government. While maintaining respect for Pakistani sovereignty, the President stated that, "The answer to flawed democracy is not to end democracy, but to improve it."

But on the eve of President Clinton's visit, in what I would characterize as largely a public relations move, General Musharraf announced a timetable for local elections between December of this year and August 2001. But the General refused to provide a time frame for national elections. The bottom line is that the general appears intent on holding on to power for the foreseeable future.

This is a stark contrast, Mr. Speaker, between India and Pakistan. India again proved itself to be the thriving democracy with a free press and respect for what we Americans call first amendment rights. While President Clinton's visit was widely hailed throughout India, there were opponents of the U.S., and peaceful demonstrators were allowed to express their views.

During the President's speech to the Parliament, those of us who were part of the bipartisan delegation in New Delhi that accompanied President Clinton had an opportunity to interact with our counterparts in India's parliament. We sat on the floor with them just as we would in the House of Representatives here. How different was that from the closed door meetings with an unelected general that took place in Pakistan.

Two other huge areas of concern in the U.S.-Pakistani relationship are Pakistan's disturbing close relation-

ship with terrorist organizations, many of which operate on Pakistani soil, and the proliferation of nuclear weapons technology with some of the world's most unstable and dangerous nations. Again, the response of General Musharraf was not encouraging.

Casting a shadow over President Clinton's trip was the tragic and shocking massacre of 36 innocent Sikh villagers in India's state of Jammu and Kashmir. This terrible incident took place while we were in India with the President. It was the first large-scale attack against the Sikh community in Jammu and Kashmir. But it is consistent with this ongoing terrorist campaign that has claimed the lives of thousands of peaceful civilians in Kashmir. This terrorist campaign has repeatedly and convincingly been linked to elements operating within Pakistan, often with the direct or indirect support of Pakistan.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is no coincidence that this massacre in Kashmir took place during Clinton's visit to South Asia. I believe these terrorist groups and those who support them in Pakistan wanted an incident that would draw attention to the Kashmir issue while stepping up the campaign of fear intended to drive Hindus, and now Sikhs, out of Kashmir.

There have been also crude attempts to blame the massacre on India, which is an outright untruth, in an effort to try to turn the Sikh community against India. As always, these actions backfire in terms of their intended propaganda effect.

What is tragic, besides the loss of innocent lives, is the fact that Pakistan continues to squander resources on weapons and support for terrorism in Kashmir.

Estimates have put the average income in Pakistan at about a dollar a day. Democracy has been squelched. President Clinton tried to approach the Pakistani leadership with a message of friendship, but with serious expectations about what steps Pakistan must take to be a full-fledged member of the community of nations. But that message, President Clinton's message, was ignored or rejected by the Pakistani dictatorship.

Lastly on this subject, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to say, in India and Bangladesh, President Clinton outlined a number of programs for increased trade and investment in the United States, as well as ways to increase cooperation among the nations of the region in the energy sector and other areas.

Some day, it is to be hoped that Pakistan will be able to be a part of this new-found cooperation with the United States and with its neighboring countries. But this cannot happen under the terms Pakistan has set for itself. I regret that the current government in Pakistan did nothing to encourage the hope for progress, but it was certainly not for the lack of trying by both the United States and India.

179TH ANNIVERSARY OF GREEK INDEPENDENCE

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, lastly today, if I could just spend a few minutes, I noticed that, earlier this evening, a number of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle made statements on the floor addressing the 179th anniversary of Greek independence. I wanted tonight, before I conclude, to just congratulate the people of Greece and, of course, Americans of Greek descent, on this 179th anniversary, which occurred over the weekend, last Saturday, March 25.

I think we all know that, throughout our country's history, Greece has been one of our greatest allies, joining the U.S. in defending and promoting democracy in the direst of circumstances.

The Greek people have also made invaluable contributions to the betterment of American's society. Following traditions established by their descendants, Greek-Americans have reached the highest levels of achievement in education, business, the arts, politics, and athletics, to name just a few; and American culture has been enriched as a result.

But I wanted to take the opportunity this evening on the anniversary of Greek independence today to discuss an issue that is of great concern to Greece and to Greek Americans, and that is the proposed \$4 billion of attack helicopters to Turkey by the United States and the current negotiations and the Cyprus issue.

Let me just say in unambiguous terms that the U.S. should not go forward with the sale of attack helicopters to Turkey for a variety of reasons. Chief among them are the continued human rights abuses by the Turkish military against the Kurdish people in Turkey and the potential to undermine the recent thaw in relations that has occurred between Turkey and Greece.

Human rights abuses by the Turkish military against the Kurdish minority in Turkey have been well documented, not only by human rights organizations, but by the U.S. State Department as well. These abuses are systematic and in and of themselves are reason enough not to go forward with the sale of U.S. attack helicopters to Ankara.

In 1998, the administration outlined the progress in human rights Turkey would need to make in order for such a sale to go through. Those conditions have certainly not been met, Mr. Speaker. To ignore this fact would be to violate our country's own deeply held beliefs about human rights. This, however, is hardly the only reason why the sale should not go forward.

Moving forward with the sale would undermine our long-standing policy to help ease tensions in the region between Greece and Turkey. The U.S. credibility with Greece will surely suffer if we urge them to take steps to reduce tensions with Turkey at the same time we sell Ankara attack helicopters. Such a sale could hardly come

at a worse time. There had been a thaw in relations between Greece and Turkey sparked by the humanitarian gestures each country made to the other following earthquakes that rocked both nations last year. The helicopter sale could well be seen by Greece as a destabilizing step and upset the fragile progress that has been made in this regard.

□ 2100

Similarly, the proposed sale could have an equally harmful effect on the new round of peace negotiations in Cyprus. With these talks recently underway, it would be particularly foolish to sell Turkey high-tech offensive U.S. weapon systems.

The United States' long-standing policy has been that any settlement of the Cyprus problem be consistent with numerous U.N. resolutions that have been passed on the Cyprus situation over the last two and a half decades. As my colleagues know, that is also the position of the Cyprus government. In other words, the U.S. position on Cyprus is consistent with that of Cyprus and Greece themselves. Moving forward with the helicopter sale would undercut the U.S.'s long-standing position on this issue and it simply should not happen.

The United States, Mr. Speaker, should be doing exactly the opposite of what the administration is proposing. Rather than cozying up to the Turkish military through the sale of attack helicopters, the U.S. should be publicly and privately coming down hard on Ankara and the Turkish military. In unequivocal language, and through both private and public mediums, the U.S. should communicate to Turkey, and particularly to the Turkish military, that there will be immediate and severe consequences in U.S.-Turkish relations if progress is not made on the Cyprus issue.

I do not have to repeat, but I will say that the illegal occupation of Cyprus is now almost 26 years old. Those of us who have worked on this issue in the House of Representatives must take advantage of every opportunity to reaffirm our commitment to bringing freedom and independence back to the Cypriot people. Indeed, reaffirming our commitment to standing firm with the Greek people, just as they have stood with us throughout our history, is a very appropriate thing to do on Greek Independence Day. Indeed, this is precisely why I wanted to talk about the issues I have raised today.

I can think of no better occasion to speak against the proposal to sell American attack helicopters to Turkey than on Greek Independence Day, a day when we should be honoring Greece for its commitment to our shared values and celebrating ways to strengthen the ties between our two countries, not weaken them. To that end, Mr. Speaker, I once again congratulate Greek Americans and the people of Greece on the 179th anniversary of Greek independence.

I urge all my colleagues to do the same and to join me in opposing the sale of attack helicopters to Turkey, in working for a just resolution to the Cyprus problem, and in working to strengthen the special bond that the United States and Greece have shared for so long.

IMPORTANT ISSUE FACING HOUSE-SENATE CONFERENCE ON HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, tonight I am going to talk about a very important issue before the House-Senate conference committee on HMO reform. I think it is important for the members of the conference to understand the issue of medical necessity. It is probably one of the two or three most important issues that they will have to deal with.

I think it would be useful for those members to know about testimony that occurred before the Committee on Commerce on May 30, 1996. We have been working on this for many years now. On that day, a small nervous woman testified before the House Committee on Commerce. Her testimony was buried in the fourth panel at the end of a very long day about the abuses of managed health care. The reporters had gone, the television cameras had packed up, most of the original crowd had dispersed.

Mr. Speaker, she should have been the first witness that day, not one of the last. She told about the choices that managed care companies and self-insured plans are making every day when they determine "medical necessity." Her name was Linda Peno. She had been a claims reviewer for several HMOs. Here is her story.

"I wish to begin by making a public confession. In the spring of 1987, I caused the death of a man. Although this was known to many people, I have not been taken before any court of law or called to account for this in any professional or public forum. In fact, just the opposite occurred. I was rewarded for this. It brought me an improved reputation in my job and contributed to my advancement afterwards. Not only did I demonstrate that I could do what was asked, expected of me, I exemplified the good company employee. I saved a half a million dollars."

Now, Mr. Speaker, as she spoke, a hush came over the room. The representatives of the trade associations who were still there averted their eyes. The audience shifted uncomfortably in their seats, both gripped by and alarmed by her story. Her voice became husky, and I could see tears in her eyes. Her anguish over harming patients as a managed care reviewer had caused this woman to come forth and to bear her soul. She continued:

"Since that day, I have lived with this act and many others eating into my heart and soul. The primary ethical norm is do no harm. I did worse, I caused death. Instead of using a clumsy bloody weapon, I used the simplest, cleanest of tools: my words. This man died because I denied him a necessary operation to save his heart." She continued: "I felt little pain or remorse at the time. The man's faceless distance soothed my conscience. Like a skilled soldier, I was trained for the moment. When any moral qualms arose, I was to remember, 'I am not denying care, I am only denying payment.'"

Well, by this time, Mr. Speaker, the trade association representatives were staring at the floor. The Congressmen who had spoken on behalf of the HMOs were distinctly uncomfortable. And the staff, several of whom subsequently became representatives of HMO trade associations, were thanking God that this witness came at the end of the day when all the press had left.

Linda Peno's testimony continued: "At the time, this helped me avoid any sense of responsibility for my decision. Now I am no longer willing to accept the escapist reasoning that allowed me to rationalize that action. I accept my responsibility now for that man's death, as well as for the immeasurable pain and suffering many other decisions of mine caused."

She then listed the many ways managed care plans deny care to patients, but she emphasized one particular issue, the right to decide what care is medically necessary. She said, "There is one last activity that I think deserves a special place on this list, and this is what I call the 'smart bomb of cost containment,' and that is medical necessities denials. Even when medical criteria is used, it is rarely developed in any kind of standard, traditional, clinical process. It rarely is standardized across the field. The criteria is rarely available for prior review by the physicians or members of the plan." She continued: "We have enough experience from history to demonstrate the consequences of secretive unregulated systems that go awry."

Well, Mr. Speaker, after exposing her own transgressions, she closed by urging everyone in the room to examine their own conscience. "One can only wonder how much pain, suffering and death will we have before we have the courage to change our course. Personally, I have decided that even one death is too much for me."

The room was stone quiet. The chairman mumbled thank you. Linda Peno could have rationalized her decisions, as so many do "Well, I was just working within guidelines"; or "I was just following orders"; or "We just have to save resources"; or "Well, this isn't about treatment, it's really just about benefits." But this brave woman refused to continue that denial, and she will do penance for her sins for the rest of her life by exposing the dirty little secret of HMOs determining medical necessity.

My colleagues on the conference committee, please keep in mind the fact that no amount of procedural protection or schemes of external review can help patients if insurers are legislatively given broad powers to determine what standards will be used to make decisions about coverage. As this HMO reviewer so poignantly observed, "Insurers now make treatment decisions by determining what goods and services they will deliver, they will pay for."

The difference between clinical decisions about medically necessary care and decisions about insurance coverage are especially blurred. Because all but the wealthy rely on insurance, the power of insurers to determine coverage gives them the power to dictate professional standards of care. And make no mistake, along with the question of health plan liability, the determination of who should decide when health care is medically necessary is the key issue in patient protection legislation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, contrary to the claims of HMOs that this is some new concept, for over 200 years most private insurers and third-party payers have viewed as medically necessary those products or services provided in accordance with what is called prevailing standards of medical practice. And the courts have been sensitive to the fact that insurers have a conflict of interest because they stand to gain financially from denying care. So the courts have used "clinically derived professional standards of care" to reverse insurers' attempts to deviate from those standards.

This is why it is so important that managed care reform legislation include an independent appeals panel with no financial interest in the outcome, a fair review process utilizing clinical standards of care guarantees that the decision of the review board is made without regard to the financial interest of either the HMO or the doctor. On the other hand, if the review board has to use the health plan's definition of medical necessity, there is no such guaranty.

In response to the growing body of case law, and their own need to demonstrate profitability to shareholders, insurers are now writing contracts that threaten even this minimal level of consumer protection. They are writing contracts in which standards of medical necessity are not only separated from standards of good practice but are also essentially not subject to review.

Let me give my colleagues one example out of many of a health plan's definition of medically necessary services. "Medical necessity means the shortest, least expensive or least intense level of treatment, care or service rendered or supply provided as determined by us." Well, Mr. Speaker, contracts like this demonstrate that some health plans are manipulating the definition of medical necessity to deny appropriate patient care by arbitrarily linking it to

saving money, not the patient's medical needs.

Now, on the surface some may say, well, what is wrong with the least expensive treatment? Well, let me show my colleagues just one example out of thousands I could cite. Before coming to Congress, I was a reconstructive surgeon. I treated children with cleft palates, like this baby. Clinical standards of care would determine that the best treatment is surgical correction. But under this HMO's definition of medical necessity, the shortest, least expensive and least intense level of treatment, that HMO could limit coverage for correction of this child's roof of his mouth to a piece of plastic to fill the hole.

□ 2115

After all, a piece of plastic would be cheaper. However, instead of condemning this child to a lifetime of using a messy prosthesis, the proper treatment, reconstruction using the child's own tissue, would give this child the best chance at normal speech and a normal life.

But now, Mr. Speaker, now the conference between the House bill, the Norwood-Dingell-Ganske bill, a good strong bill, and the Senate bill, which is a joke, could paradoxically give insurers legislative changes that displace even case law.

Last year, the patient protection legislation that passed the Senate would grant insurers the explicit power to define "medical necessity" without regard to current standards of medical practice. This would be accomplished by allowing insurers to classify as medically unnecessary any procedures not specifically found to be necessary by the insurer's own technical review panel.

The Senate bill would even give insurers the power to determine what evidence would be relevant in evaluating claims for coverage and would permit insurers to classify some coverage decisions as exempt from administrative review.

Now, I know that many of our colleagues in the Senate who supported that Senate bill had no idea about the implications of the "medical necessity" provisions in that bill.

Specifically, insurers now want to move away from clinical standards of care applied to particular patients to standard linking medical necessity to what are called population studies or to "guidelines" by companies like Milliman & Robertson.

Now, on the surface this may seem to be scientific and rational. However, as a former medical reviewer myself who worked with many insurers, large and small, let me explain why I think it is critical that we stick with "medical necessity" as defined by clinical standard of care and that we not bind the independent review panel to the plan's own guidelines.

In the version of patient protection that passed this House, if there is a dispute on a denial of coverage and it goes

through internal review and then goes to external review and to that independent external review panel, unless there is a specific exclusion of coverage, that independent panel can use in its decision many things.

It can use medical literature, the patient's own history, recommendation of specialists, NIH statements. It can even use the plan's own guidelines. But, critically, it is not bound by the plan's own guidelines. That is the provision that we should have come out of conference.

Here are some reasons why we should not rely solely on what are called outcome studies or guidelines. First, sole reliance on broad standards from generalized evidence is not good medical practice. Second, there are practical limits to designing studies that can answer all clinical questions. And third, most of the studies are not of sufficient scientific quality to justify overruling clinical judgment.

Let me explain these points further. And for anyone who wants more depth on this discussion, I refer them to an article by Rosenbaum, et al., in the January 21, 1999, edition of the *New England Journal of Medicine*.

First, while it may sound counterintuitive, it is not good medicine to solely use outcomes-based studies or guidelines for "medical necessity," even when the science is rigorous. Why? Because the choice of the outcome is inherently value laden.

The medical reviewer for the HMO is likely, as shown by the above-mentioned contract, to consider cost the essential value. But I would ask my colleagues, what about quality?

Now, as a surgeon, I treated many patients with broken fingers simply by reducing the fracture, putting the bones back in the right place, and splinting the finger. And for most patients, that would restore adequate function. But what about the musician, what about the piano player or the guitar player who needs a better range of motion? In that case, surgery might be necessary. So I would ask, which outcome should be the basis for the decision about insurance coverage, playing the piano or routine functioning?

My point is this: taking care of patients involves much variation. Definitions of "medical necessity" have to be flexible enough to take into account the needs of each patient. One-size-fits-all outcomes make irrelevant the doctor's knowledge of the individual patient; and that is bad medicine, period.

Second, there are practical limitations on basing medical necessity on "generalized evidence" or on "guidelines," particularly as applied by HMOs.

Much of medicine is as a result of collective experience, and many basic medical treatments have not been studied rigorously. Furthermore, aside from a handful of procedures that are not explicitly covered, most care is not specifically defined in health plans because the numbers of procedures and

the circumstances of their applications are infinite.

In addition, by their very nature, many controlled clinical trial study treatments are in isolation, whereas physicians need to know the benefits of one type of treatment over another in a particular patient.

Prospective randomized comparison studies, on the other hand, are expensive. Given the enormous number of procedures and individual circumstances, if coverage is limited to only those that have scientifically sound generalized outcomes, care could be denied for almost all conditions.

Mr. Speaker, come to think of it, maybe that is why HMOs are so keen to get away from prevailing standard of care.

Third, the validity of HMO guidelines and how they are used is open to question. Medical directors of HMOs were asked to rank the sources of information they used to make medical decisions. Industry guidelines, generated by trade associations, or printed by companies like Milliman & Robertson ranked ahead of information from national experts, government documents, NIH consensus conferences.

The most highly respected source, medical journals, was used in less than 60 percent of the time. Industry guidelines are frequently done, as I mentioned, by a company by the name of Milliman & Robertson. This company is a strategy shop for the HMO industry. This is the same firm that championed drive-through deliveries and outpatient mastectomies. Many times these practice guidelines are not grounded in science but are cookbook recipes derived by actuaries to reduce health care costs.

Here are two examples of the errors of their guidelines. Remember their drive-through deliveries? Remember their outpatient mastectomies? Well, the National Cancer Institute released in June a study that found that women receiving outpatient mastectomies face significantly higher risks of being re-hospitalized and have a higher risk of surgery-related complications like infections or blood clots that could be life threatening.

A 1997 study published in the *Journal of the American Medical Association* showed that babies discharged within a day of birth faced increased risks of developing jaundice, dehydration, and dangerous infections. So much for those specific guidelines from Milliman & Robertson.

The objectivity of medical decision-making requires that the results of studies be open to peer review. Yet, much of the decision-making by HMOs is based on unpublished "proprietary" and unexamined methods and data. Such secrets and potentially biased guidelines simply cannot be called scientific.

Now, this is not to say that outcomes-based studies do not make up a part of how clinical standards of care are determined, because they do. But

we are all familiar with the ephemeral nature of new "scientific," quotes, studies such as those based on the dangers of Alar.

There has recently been a report in one of the medical journals about discharging patients from a hospital within a day or two of having a heart attack. There was also an editorial in that medical journal expressing severe reservations about that and expressly saying that HMOs and managed care companies should not use this article out of context as an excuse to send heart attack patients home within a day or two of being in the hospital.

Clinical standards of care do take into account valid and replicable studies in the peer-reviewed literature, as well as the results of professional consensus conferences, practice guidelines based on government funded studies, and even guidelines prepared by insurers that have been determined to be free of conflict of interest.

These are all things that can be considered by that independent review panel in the House bill. But they are not bound by any one of them. But most importantly, they also include the patient's individual health and medical information and the clinical judgment of the treating physician.

Well, Mr. Speaker, Congress should pass legislation defining the standard of medical necessity. Because first, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act, ERISA, shields plans from the consequences of most decisions about medical necessity. Second, under ERISA, patients generally can only recover the value of the benefits denied. And third, even this limited remedy is being eroded by insurance contracts that give insurers the authority to make decisions about medical necessity based on questionable evidence.

To ensure those protections, Congress should provide patients with a speedy external review of all coverage disputes, not merely those that insurers decide are subject to review. It is time for Congress to defuse what former HMO reviewer Linda Peno described as the smart bomb of HMOs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, for years Milliman & Robertson, the company that has created the practice guidelines of HMOs, has operated sort of in the background. I think it is time, Mr. Speaker, to shine a spotlight on Milliman & Robertson's role in setting HMO standards that are the smart bombs that this HMO reviewer described as giving her authority to kill a man.

The operating practices of this company are just becoming public because of fact-finding in a lawsuit that has been filed by two pediatricians, two pediatric doctors, Tom Cleary and Bill Riley, who charged that the company falsely credited them as coauthors of a book on pediatric utilization review.

These pediatricians are filing suit not just because they did not write the sections that Milliman & Robertson credits to them, but to get the book off the market because they consider the

length-of-stay criteria in the book to be dangerous.

Dr. Cleary said, "Milliman & Robertson limits hospital stays for serious diseases such as meningitis, that is infection of the covering of the brain and the spinal cord, and endocarditis, infection of the heart, to just 3 days, when it should be more than a week."

"I want Milliman & Robertson to get out of the business of writing pediatric guidelines," says Dr. Cleary. But the company is not budging. It has not recalled thousands of copies of those pediatric guidelines or agreed to stop publishing so-called guidelines.

□ 2130

Let me remind you what Milliman & Robertson is. That is the company that proposed one-day limits on delivery of babies. That caused such an outcry that Congress and 41 States passed laws overriding drive-through deliveries. Milliman & Robertson's guidelines are cited in class action HMO liability suits against Humana in Florida and Prudential in New York.

Why is it that Milliman & Robertson continues to write the type of rules that Linda Peno cried out against? Mr. Speaker, because they make so much money from the denial of care business. Milliman & Robertson's book *Pediatric Health Status Improvement and Management, 1998*, is part of a nine-volume set on utilization management. The company has sold more than 20,000 copies, charging \$500 for each book, while at the same time selling consultant services to help HMOs implement those guidelines. Its list of customers includes Anthems, Incorporated; Signa Health Care; Kaiser Foundation Health Plan; and Pacific Care among many others. Although Milliman & Robertson says its length of stay limits are "best case scenarios," its own promotional material maintains that they apply to fully 80 percent of hospitalized patients younger than the age of 65.

Plus, a company official told the AMA Council on Scientific Affairs that 90 percent of admissions exceed guidelines. I ask you, how can a guideline described as a best case be exceeded 90 percent of the time? The suit brought by Drs. Cleary and Riley gives us a rare glimpse into how Milliman & Robertson creates its utilization review guidelines.

The company produced the pediatrics book with the paid help of Dr. Robert Yetman, who Milliman & Robertson officials found when he agreed with their assertion that lead screenings are unnecessary in Texas because few homes have lead paint. In his deposition, Dr. Yetman said that he did not ask for written authorization from 17 department colleagues listed as coauthors. Getting written authorization is customary in academic studies. But Dr. Cleary says he never orally agreed, either, to join the study and his only relation to it was to review one page of material for Dr. Yetman. Dr. Cleary said he first learned his name was

being used as an author 10 months after publication, and he immediately asked Yetman to remove it. Dr. Yetman said the company refused until a new edition was printed. Well, this made Dr. Cleary furious. He was the only infectious disease subspecialist listed as an author for that volume on pediatric utilization management, and he felt that everyone would assume that he wrote the hospitalization limits for his subspecialty, such as endocarditis and meningitis, even though he never reviewed them.

Dr. Riley had similar concerns as the only pediatric endocrinologist listed. Dr. Riley says that the lengths of stay in his field are "so clearly outside any reasonable approach to the standard of care as to be wholly reckless." Dr. Riley says that he fears that Milliman & Robertson's length of stay goals, quote-unquote, are fast becoming standards of care, and I would add that this is exactly the problem with these HMO guidelines. They are not peer reviewed nor published in respected medical journals.

Dr. John Neff, the chair of the Hospital Care Committee of the American Academy of Pediatrics, calls guidelines such as Milliman & Robertson's "opinions." Dr. Neff points out that patients' conditions vary tremendously and that there are not enough reliable scientific studies on lengths of stay for specific conditions to form objective standards. Exactly what I was speaking about earlier in this talk.

I know that most physicians have no idea what is in this company's guidelines. They may even be cited as authors without their consent, as happened to Dr. Riley and Dr. Cleary. Here is a brief list of conditions with Milliman & Robertson's length of stay compared to commonly accepted standards for length of stay. For diabetic ketoacidosis, that is a child who goes into coma from diabetes. Milliman & Robertson says that child only needs to stay in the hospital 1 day. One day. Mr. Speaker, the standard would be 3 days. But Milliman & Robertson can save that HMO 2 days in the hospital.

How about osteomyelitis. That is an infection in the bone. Milliman & Robertson says this child can only stay in the hospital 2 days. Mr. Speaker, do you know what the standard of care is for a child with a serious bone infection? Four to 6 weeks in the hospital on IV antibiotics. But Milliman & Robertson says 2 days is enough.

Neonatal sepsis. That is a child who has an infection that is in the blood. Milliman & Robertson's guidelines say only need to keep that child in the hospital 3 days. The standard of care is 2 to 3 weeks. How would you feel if you were a parent with a child with these diseases? How about bacterial meningitis. That is a bacterial infection of the meninges. This is the covering of the brain, the covering of the spinal cord. According to the Milliman & Robertson standards, you only need to keep that child in the hospital for 3

days. Anything over that, that is excessive. What is the standard? Ten to 14 days. How about an infection in your heart, an infection in the heart of a baby? Milliman & Robertson says only need to keep that child in the hospital 3 days. What is the standard of care? One week.

Mr. Speaker, these "guidelines" are not just scary. In my opinion, they represent malpractice. I urge my colleagues to consider this information when they deal with medical necessity in conference. And, my friends, the next time you read a Milliman & Robertson study on HMOs supplied to you by the American Association of Health Plans, or the Health Insurance Association of America, just remember that this company is a flak for the industry and has a significant financial tie to HMOs and health plans. Do you think they are going to say anything that critical of HMOs when their business depends on HMOs?

Mr. Speaker, the conferees on patient protection in the conference committee should adopt the language of the House bill. Any less on this medical necessity issue will not be worth the paper that it is printed on. I hope that my colleagues on the conference committee are listening, because the lives of a lot of people in this country are depending on how you write that section.

ILLEGAL NARCOTICS

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

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I come before the House on the floor tonight to talk once again in regard to what I consider the most serious and devastating social issue facing not only the Congress but our entire Nation and that is the problem of illegal narcotics and the heavy toll they have taken on our Nation, particularly our young people.

Tonight, I am going to try to cover some material some may have covered before but I think in light of tomorrow's action on the proposal for an emergency supplemental in the House of Representatives, I will focus some on the story of how we got to an emergency situation, particularly as it involves narcotics and the primary source of those narcotics, Colombia, the country of Colombia, and the South American region where those illegal narcotics are coming from.

Then I hope to also touch upon some of my committee work for the benefit of my colleagues and the American people as chair of the Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources Subcommittee. I know the hour is late. Many folks are tired. But I hope that they will listen tonight, because the message I have is an important one for the Congress and again for the American people. It will really detail some

of what has taken place, how we got ourselves into a situation where tomorrow the House of Representatives must bring forward a record funding emergency proposal to deal with a problem that has been festering, and I submit caused by very specific actions and policies and directives of this administration and now the American taxpayer will pay the bill.

It would not be bad enough if I just came here and talked about a price tag of \$1.5, \$1.6, \$2 billion in emergency assistance that is going to go into an effort to stop the conflict, the trafficking, the production of most of the illegal hard narcotics coming into the United States. Talking about just that cost is bad enough. I have not translated that into the human toll in which we have in the last recorded year, 1998, I do not have the 1999 figures yet, 15,973 Americans dying as the direct result of illegal narcotics.

The toll is heavy. We are probably reaching 100,000 since the beginning of this administration. And I submit our action tomorrow will be just as important in shoring up the defense of this Nation for the many deployments that have been ordered by the chief executive but also to stop the biggest threat coming into our country. No American was killed in Kosovo in fighting there. Fifteen to 16,000 were killed last year in the streets, communities and schools of our Nation. No one died in Kosovo as a result of action of this Congress.

We tried our best to deal with this administration to stop death and destruction in that region of the world. It is in some of our national interest to do it, and if that is in our national interest to do it as far away as Kosovo where we have no direct American casualties and we did have disruption of that region and killing in that region, certainly an area to the south of us that produces the death and destruction of thousands and thousands of Americans annually, and the toll continues to rise.

We have imprisoned close to 2 million Americans in our jails and prisons across the country, and 60 to 70 percent, I am told, in some areas I am told even higher, 80 percent of those individuals are incarcerated because of narcotics-related offenses and many of them there for many felonies committed and crimes committed not only while under the influence but also trafficking in illegal narcotics. So again we have an area that is of extreme importance, an issue that is of extreme importance and we must deal with that tomorrow.

□ 2145

The record, as I said, is a rather sad action of this administration. I will detail some of the time it has taken to get the supplemental from this President. I was interviewed on an NPR radio program this afternoon and they had, I believe, a Time or Newsweek reporter also on the program. They were

citing that this administration did not act until the information they had, because a poll was conducted and found that Americans are alarmed. Maybe my colleagues have read about that poll that was conducted. That poll said that the Democrats could be held accountable in the election and that this administration would pay the penalty for not attacking and taking action on the drug war.

We finally had word that a proposal was coming back in the late fall last year and again, that was delayed; and finally, not until a few weeks ago did we receive the President's budget proposal for emergency assistance to Colombia. We will deal with that matter in just a second.

Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely startling to me how the President of the United States can talk about everything except illegal narcotics and their impact on our young people. Most recently we had two incidents, and those incidents involved, first of all, a 6-year-old that killed a 6-year-old and took a gun to school; and the focus immediately was on legislation to impose trigger locks and a host of other peripheral laws to deal with the question of gun control.

What the President failed to mention, and attention was not focused by the media on it, is this 6-year-old came from a crack house. The father was in jail. The gun was stolen. He lived in a pig sty. Now, this is the family setting that this child came from. We can put all the trigger locks in the world on, and we can pass all of the additional laws in other areas; but if we do not focus on the root of the problem, illegal narcotics, and I am certain that that is what destroyed that family. Illegal narcotics in that crack house sent that father, and drug dealing, sent that family into despair and disruption, and illegal narcotics provided a stolen weapon and access and a destroyed family for that child. Where is the thinking in the leadership of this Nation?

Then, most recently, we had a 12-year-old who brought a gun into school. This was in an elementary school in Lisbon, Ohio, I believe was the town, and the child, a 12-year-old, brings a gun into the school. He brought it in school and immediately it was broadcast across the country that this child had brought that gun there and we must immediately do something about, again, gun control.

Now granted, we may need to impose some additional laws and restrictions, but a simple look, even a simple examination of the situation, and let me read from the account: The boy said before that his biological mother was in jail and he wanted to visit her. Authorities did not release information on the mother's situation, but the Akron Beacon Journal said that the mother was in prison on a drug-related charge.

Where is the media? Where is the leadership of this country in ignoring

the illegal narcotics problem? A 12-year-old taking his father's weapon into school, and it had been stored, according to this report, on a dresser top with a fully-engaged trigger lock. It was absolutely incredible to hear the Vice President of the United States commenting on this situation and then asking for more gun control.

Mr. Speaker, I have never in my life seen more diversionary tactics to get away from the root problem of 12-year-olds who have parents in jail, when they have their family disrupted, when the parent is in jail for drug trafficking, when there is no family structure to support them. When we have had a society that has become tolerant of illegal narcotics trafficking, we will have, no matter how many laws this Congress passes, these situations. I still cannot believe that the media will not focus on this, nor will the leadership of this Congress or this administration.

Mr. Speaker, I really want to also focus tonight on a tale of two cities. I have had the opportunity to spend time since I took over chairmanship of the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice and Drug Policy a little over a year and several months ago now to look at again some of the problems we hear about in the media, and focus on what different communities are doing to deal with that problem.

Once again, I was absolutely stunned by a recent article by a columnist, Judith Mann, and Judith Mann, who I believe is the columnist in the Washington Post. She did a column that absolutely caused me to come unglued last week attacking, in her liberal fashion, Mayor Rudy Guiliani, without a hint of facts, just dealing in fiction, to try to put forth liberal propaganda and unsubstantiated fiction about what Mayor Guiliani has done.

Last year, after taking over this subcommittee, I called Mayor Guiliani in to testify. There had been comments and questions about what he had done in New York City and we held an entire hearing on what was happening there. At the time we had two cases, very controversial cases. I think it was the Diallo case and another case of police brutality that got tremendous national and international attention. We also were interested in what Mayor Guiliani had done, because his community had been successful in curtailing on an unprecedented basis the murders in New York City since taking office, in stemming crime in that community, and in developing innovative programs.

The first part of Judith Mann's recent piece, which was entitled "The War on Drugs Can't Help Run Amok," which criticized New York City's mayor and the police force on their program. Again, I believe this is an affront to facts. It is manufactured fiction. In this article, in this little editorial piece, she had the audacity to try to say that murders were up in New York City under Mayor Guiliani. What she tried to do was take one comparison of 2 years, the last 2 years, and

blow that into something that the mayor's program had not worked on.

In fact, this is the record of Mayor Giuliani as far as murders are concerned: just before he took office they were in the 2,000 range; right in the 2,000 range. He has brought murders down in New York City. In 1998 and 1999, between 629 and I think about 679 the last recorded year. She took the slight increase last year and tried to make it look like crime was out of control, like the police program that he instituted and zero tolerance program he instituted somehow failed.

Now, where is the liberal mentality when Mayor Giuliani has saved, since just from coming into office in 1993, somewhere on average of 1,000 lives, every one of these years; if we average this out, how many thousands of lives he has saved with his policy. People who live in New York City can now live and work in that community and have one of the lowest crime rates in the entire Nation. What the mayor did in New York City has had so dramatic an impact, they also impact even the national statistics. The gall of the liberal media is absolutely astounding.

The facts are, since Mayor Giuliani took office, and this is murder, listen to the rest of these in the seven major crime areas in New York City: crime overall is down 57.6 percent. I would match that among any community of any size in the Nation. Murder is down 58.3 percent. Judith Mann should get a life. Rape is down 31.4 percent. Robbery down 62.1 percent. Think of the thousands and thousands of New York City residents and tourists and other people who visit from around the country and around the world. Robbery down 62.1 percent. Felony assaults are down 35.4 percent. Burglaries are down 61.7 percent. These are the facts, Judith Mann, Miss Liberal. These are the facts the American people should be paying attention to, the people in New York State should be paying attention to. Grand larceny down is 41.9 percent. Grand larceny auto is down 68.8 percent. These are some of the most dramatic figures, and rather than applauding someone who has accomplished so much, we see the liberal diatribe on Mayor Giuliani and the police of New York.

What is absolutely astounding is if there is any reason for a slight increase in murders last year, I can tie it directly to actions of this administration in failing to provide surveillance, failing to provide equipment, stopping the flow of assistance to Colombia in a repeated fashion, and helping to close down one of the most successful programs we have had in Peru, which has slashed 66 percent of the cocaine production in just a few years, and now is being sabotaged by withdrawal of U.S. surveillance information to Peruvians and a lack of equipment getting to Colombia. Even equipment we requested several years ago and appropriated several years ago still has not been adequately delivered to that country to combat the flow of illegal narcotics.

I am surprised it is not up more in New York City. In my community it is up slightly, even in central Florida, as a result of, again, this administration letting down its guard in stopping illegal narcotics at their source or interdicting them before they come to our shores is certainly a Federal responsibility.

Here is a local responsibility taken on in an unbelievable fashion. I hope every American, every Member of Congress can look at this chart and see how the policy of Mayor Giuliani, not just in this program, but in other innovative programs, has dramatically curtailed murders, robberies, rapes, every type of crime that I mentioned and the numbers that I mentioned.

Mr. Speaker, I have to again just be amazed at the liberal media and the trash that they peddle to the American people. Again, Miss Mann talks about a policy that has run amok and the drug war cannot help but run amok. Now, the facts are for Miss Mann and other die-hard liberals. Let me read from the testimony of Mayor Giuliani and just see historically where Mayor Giuliani fits in in this question of police brutality and incidents involving force or, again, violence from police officers.

□ 2200

This is the testimony from our hearing when the mayor appeared last year after the Diallo case. This is Mr. Giuliani speaking:

"First of all, I do not think you have ever listened to my voice." How prophetic for him to say that, and he could say it again. "I have said over and over again, including that—" he was responding to a question—"that was a long question. You've got to give me a chance to answer it, if you are being fair." This was a question about police brutality at that time in the city.

Listen, again, to his testimony: "The fact is that I have over and over again said that police officers have to be respectful. We have taken action against police officers who have acted improperly. One of the cases that you mention, it was my administration that fired the police officer in question, even though he had been kept on by prior administrations. We have worked very, very hard to make this police department more respectful and more restrained. In your selective use of statistics," and they did it to him last year, and people like Ms. Mann and others are doing it to him now, "you leave out the fact that incidents such as the one you are talking about have occurred in New York City for the last 20 to 35 years." Again, with some 30,000 or 40,000 police officers historically, I just add that, those are not his words, you do have incidents of police misconduct.

Back to Mayor Giuliani's statement: "That police brutality and the issue of police brutality has not been an issue just exclusively of my administration, or while I have been mayor of New

York City. You've got to start looking at, if you are interested in fairness rather than demagoguery, you have to look at the number of incidents. The number of incidents of police brutality, for example, are less in my administration," he is speaking about the Giuliani administration, "than in the administration of Ed Koch or David Dinkins."

Now, I am sure that Ms. Mann would not want to deal with the facts, and reveal to her reading public or the people out there that deserve the truth and the facts that the number of incidents of police brutality are less in the Giuliani administration than the Ed Koch or David Dinkins. She wants to say that Giuliani's war on drugs has failed.

"That is something you did not mention," again, I am quoting from the mayor, "1993 was the last year of David Dinkins' administration. I just happen to have these statistics with me." He brought the statistics, and under oath to the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy, and Human Resources of the House of Representatives, this is the testimony and the facts he submitted and we checked.

"There were 62 percent more shootings by police officers per capita in the last year of David Dinkins' administration than the last year, which was my administration." Why does she not print that, Ms. Mann and other diehard liberals?

"Where were they when there were 62 percent more shootings by police officers under David Dinkins' administration? In every year of my administration, something you left out of your statement, in every single year of my administration the police officers have grown more restrained in their use of firearms, even as we have added 10,000 police officers and given them automatic weapons."

He increased by 10,000 the number of police officers, gave them automatic weapons, and the record is one of less incidents, more constraint. Again, these are the facts that liberal reporters do not want to deal with, or those inclined to bad-mouthing the mayor's efforts and those who support zero tolerance in these types of programs. These are the exact numbers.

"In 1993, there were 212 incidents involving police officers in intentional shootings. In 1994," the mayor's first year, "there were 167." He testified, I believe, in early 1999. "In 1998, it was down to 111, just about half the incidents from the Dinkins' administration. These are incidents involving police officers and intentional shootings.

Members will not read this in Ms. Mann's liberal column or any of the other liberal trash that is pumped out by the other side. They will be telling us, well, we have to introduce more gun laws, we have to introduce more laws in the Congress, we have to put trigger locks on for kids, and this will solve the problem.

We do not hear that with even a zero tolerance policy, that they were able to

have less than half the number of incidents. Let me again continue with what Mayor Giuliani testified and the liberals will not listen to, or the media will not report.

"In 1993, David Dinkins' last year in office, there were 7.4 shooting incidents per officer." That is 62 percent less per capita with Giuliani. We have to take it on a per capita basis. Also, we have to remember, again, Rudy Giuliani increased the police by some 10,000, probably a 20 percent increase in police officers in that city.

"Yes, we do have difficulties. Yes, we do have lots of things that we have to work on. Yes, I have spoken about it a hundred times or a thousand times. I was at a police graduation last week. I said to the 800 police officers that what we expect of them is restraint, almost an inhuman ability to be restrained when they have to be."

Can Members imagine the incidents, can Members imagine the pressure on police officers in New York City, one of the most densely populated, probably the most difficult area to govern, not only in the United States but the entire world? Here is a record, and I take great offense at the trash the media pumps out, particularly Ms. Mann, who knows that Mr. Giuliani and everyone who supports a zero tolerance in a tough enforcement policy that we know works beyond a reasonable doubt.

The mayor not only had a zero tolerance policy that was successful and resulted in fewer murders, but let me just cite, and again this is part of the testimony that he submitted in February of 1999 to our subcommittee, facts that were submitted.

"In New York City in 1991, 1992, and 1993 when crime was at historic heights, narcotics arrests were at a 10-year low. In 1993, the city made just 65,043 narcotics arrests. Last year, with the city dramatically safer, that number had risen to 124,000, a 91 percent increase in arrests."

Some people are confused by this statistical correlation. This is information that was given to me by the DEA former administrator Tom Constantine. It is an interesting chart because it shows narcotics arrests and the crime index comparison in New York City.

In 1993, the figures I spoke to, 64,000, or 65,000, this is the number, I believe, and let us make sure we have this, all other commands and the narcotics division. The narcotics arrests here again are low. As Mayor Giuliani takes office and he gets up to this point that we talked about, we see the index of crime, and this is where the crimes were 432,000 crimes, almost 433,000 crimes, start to drop.

If that does not show us a correlation, that as we increase narcotics arrests, the crime goes down, I am a monkey's uncle. It is absolutely unbelievable, again, that people do not look at what has been achieved by the most outstanding mayor this Nation has

seen in this decade of death and destruction with illegal narcotics, and use this as a model.

Drug confiscations increased 166 percent between 1993 and 1998, rising from 11,470 pounds to 30,510 pounds. Surprise, Mr. Speaker. We seize illegal narcotics, we seize hard drugs, and the crimes go down. It is not a magic formula, it is a simple formula. It is just beyond me how the liberals can twist and turn. They will tell us that the war on drugs is a failure. That is their next line.

I tell the Members that the war on drugs was closed down by the Clinton administration in January of 1993, when they came into office. How can we fight a war on drugs when we first of all do not target the source or cut out the source programs, to stop drug production at their source?

It does not take a rocket scientist to figure out where narcotics are coming from. Seventy-five percent of the cocaine and heroin, back in 1993 there was almost zero cocaine grown in Colombia, almost zero poppies which produce heroin in Colombia, and today it is up over the 70 percent range grown in Colombia. Again, it does not take a rocket scientist, it is coming out of Colombia.

So where would we target? We would spend a few dollars in international programs to target Colombia.

Let me take this chart first, which deals with, and again, we know where the drugs are coming from. It is not rocket science. That is why we are going to be here talking about Colombia, because the drugs are produced in Colombia.

This is the record of the Clinton administration. They came in in 1992-1993 here, and we have to remember, we still had a Democrat-controlled Congress in this period. We did not take over until somewhere in 1995. In 1995, we have to get or we are already with the budget passed by a previous Congress.

Look what they did. This chart is Federal drug spending for international programs. That is stopping drugs at their source, and the entire program is like \$633 million back in 1999, \$660 in 1992 under President Bush.

Tomorrow we are going to be talking about two and three times that for just the mistake they made in closing down these programs in Colombia. They closed them down. They closed down the international programs, the most cost-effective. We were spending the smallest amount of money. Every time we get away from the field where that peasant is getting a couple of pesos or less than a few dollars for the coca, for the poppy, for the raw material or even processed material down there, they stop the programs.

I have to bring this chart up. I wish I had an overlay. I need to get an overlay, because this chart shows, again under the Reagan administration, developing a war against drugs. They did a real war against drugs. They put resources in the source country, they

started the Andean strategy. The Vice President's task force occurred. They went after drugs at their source, and they put some dollars behind the effort to eradicate crops there.

Do Members see what took place? Every year, and this is the long-term trend in lifetime prevalence of drug use. This is so important, because this is the measure of long-term drug involvement with our population.

We see this during the Bush administration, and we see a takeoff like a rocket with Clinton, here. If Members look back here, they will see the takeoff is a result of stopping the international programs. We have a flood, a supply.

I asked the question to somebody today, do you have an HDTV? They said, no. Most Americans do not have an HDTV. Why? Because there is not a supply and the price is high.

□ 2215

This is, again, simple economics. We have flooding into this country an unprecedented amount of cocaine, which is only grown three places in the world: Bolivia, Peru, Colombia. Only three places, and it cannot transfer to that many other areas. There are a few other Andean locations. In the bill tomorrow at the insistence of the Speaker of the House, who had that responsibility who started the successful programs in Peru and Bolivia, where we have had 55 to 66 percent reduction when we had a program in effect, until the administration also messed that program up in the last year or so, we had dramatic decreases of cocaine flowing into this country. This is an incredible record.

But what should also be looked at is the interdiction. Stop drugs at their source and then stop them before they get to our borders. Is that or is that not a Federal responsibility? We see here again gutting of the figures for interdiction. Taking the military out. They have great offense to begin with for anything military in this administration, except to deploy them around when there is a lot deployment to demand it for some reason or another distraction.

But we see here an incredible pattern of slicing the spending. This is the slowdown. This is the sabotaging. This is the destruction of the war on drugs. Again, we take this, invert it and see what has happened to our young people. Look back at this chart and we can see what this Republican Congress has done with this light blip downward in some of the programs that we have instituted, again, in Peru and Bolivia that have been so successful.

I said I would tell the "tale of two cities." We had heard the tale of New York City and we received the facts about New York City. I have talked quite a bit about the contrast in Baltimore and the liberal mayor that, thank God, they got rid of who is a disgrace to Baltimore, and what he did to Baltimore driving Baltimore into despair

with his liberal policy. We saw the figures I showed for New York City with dramatic decreases. This is the liberal Judith Mann policy that drugs are okay, and this is a health problem. Do not pay any attention to it. The police are going to be brutal and it is going to be horrible, even though the actual facts show to the contrary.

Mr. Speaker, these are the facts. These are the dead in Baltimore, 312, 1998. In 1999, it is also 310, 308 range. This is a record of a liberal policy in which they went for needle exchange. They went for all of these liberal programs. I heard the new police chief say they did not participate in the high-intensity drug trafficking area on a basis in which they had entered into an agreement on. So they basically had let up enforcement, adopted a liberal policy and the slaughter in Baltimore has been horrible.

We heard from the new mayor, and thank God there is a new mayor, a new mayor that recognized that the liberal policy, and he testified to it, was a failure. That the lack of enforcement, he showed a playground with bullet holes in the door a few months before he took office and they have already started enforcement and starting to clean up 10 drug markets. Hopefully, they will even clean up additional open air markets. But this is the policy.

The testimony is absolutely astounding on the liberal policy of what it created for this city. It created a population of addiction almost unparalleled in the history of the United States. The statistics we have are from 40,000 back here with this chart in 1996 to somewhere between 60 and 80,000 drug addicts today in Baltimore, Maryland. One of the most historic, beautiful cities. It decimated the population of that city. Who wants to live in Baltimore?

A judge, Judge Noelle, testified before our subcommittee in Baltimore that in fact his best success in rehabilitating individuals that he got into court and were involved in drugs was to get them out of Baltimore, because there is no hope there.

Who would invest? What individual, what businessperson would invest in Baltimore when we have murders and mayhem and disruption? The same thing is true in South America in Colombia. The peasants will never have jobs or opportunities and the right wing and the left wing will be killing each other down there. We have in Colombia, from that region, 20 percent of the oil supply that we have in the United States. We have 15,900-plus Americans who died from the drugs.

If we just took 75 percent of the illegal narcotics which we can trace to the fields in Colombia, we, in fact, know that those drugs are coming from there, we could attribute 75 percent of the deaths in my community, 75 percent of the deaths in Baltimore, and 75 percent of the deaths to the failed policy of this administration, which to this day still cannot get the equipment that this Congress asked for several years ago to Colombia.

This is an article, it would almost be a joke, "The Delay of Helicopters Hobbles Colombia in Stopping Drugs." We acknowledge the drugs are coming from Colombia. It is not rocket science. We have the DEA Signature program which can identify the fields where the heroin is coming from. No heroin produced there in 1993; now coming in in droves.

What do we need to stop it? Helicopters that can get in there and do eradication and assist both the national police and the military, which President Pastrana has radically reformed in going after the people who are financing the disruption of that Nation on both the right and the left by drug trafficking.

Back in 1998, the helicopters that we requested and appropriated before still were not delivered. And it is almost farcical to announce to the Congress that after we did get a handful of these Blackhawk helicopters that can do the job, they were not provided with armor so they were not usable until just a few days ago. The ammunition was delivered to the back-door loading gate of the State Department during the holidays rather than to Colombia.

Then we requested let us get our surplus material to Colombia if we are going to have a war on drugs, and the administration reacted by getting some of the equipment there and only a fraction of the equipment. Some back to 1998 still was not delivered. I held numerous behind-closed-door meetings so as not to embarrass the administration asking when is the stuff going to be there? This almost became a joke last December, Colombia turns down dilapidated U.S. trucks. They sent trucks that were being used in the Yukon Territory, not suitable to Colombia.

So that is why we are here. That is why we are here tonight. That is why the Committee on Rules is meeting to develop a rule to bring forth a bill to be discussed on the floor of this House tomorrow about Colombia. That is the inheritance that this administration has provided this Congress, the American people. And it would not be so bad if they just learned by some of their mistakes. This is not only the gang that cannot shoot straight; this is the gang that could mess up a one-car funeral.

We asked, in order again to fight a real war on drugs, one has to have intelligence. We stop drugs where they are grown, so we have to have overflights and surveillance information. Why does some reporter or liberal person like Judith Mann not say, "Mr. Vice President, I understand you moved some of the AWACS out of that area to look for oil spills in Alaska"? Why does some reporter not ask the President of the United States, "I understand you moved some of the surveillance capability over to your various deployments." The information so critical getting to Peru and Colombia and Bolivia to go after the production

of that stuff at its source, that is the most cost effective. And we do not even have to do that. All we have to do is give them the information. Give the country the information and they will do it.

Here is the latest. This is just March 23. I cannot believe this crowd. It says, it is a response from Claudio De La Puente, the Charge d'Affaires of the Embassy of Peru. It said, "In the past 4 years, Peru has decreased area production of cocaine by 66 percent." Which I stated before. This was due to a strategy to strengthen borders against drug trafficking. The Peruvian Air Force intercepted 91 aircraft involving drug trafficking between 1992 and 1997. Key to these results was the provision of monitoring of U.S. intelligence information."

Mr. Speaker, there was one period in here when Clinton came into office, they even stopped the surveillance stuff. We had to pass, Congress, and clarify the law to allow the information sharing, because some liberal attorney in one of the departments, Department of Defense or Department of Justice, had misinterpreted and said we cannot share that information. They might shoot somebody down. It was the intent of the Congress of the United States to shoot down people who were carrying death and destruction. When we gave that information to President Fujimora and to the Peruvian Air Force, they acted and shot down.

That may be tough for some people to deal with, but these people had death and destruction on those planes. They were given every warning, but they never succeeded in bringing that death and destruction to our borders.

What is absolutely stunning is that the United States, since 1998, it says, the Peruvian Air Force has not been able to continue its interdiction operations because of lack of monitoring formerly provided by the U.S. AWACS and other aircraft.

We saw in Mr. Giuliani's and my community we are having more murders, a few more murders in the past year. Here is 1998 when they stopped providing that information. Here is a report that our subcommittee asked from GAO about what was going on with DOD assets. Is there a war on drugs? They replied to me, the flying hours had declined from 1992 to last year 68 percent. The maritime tracking had gone down some 62 percent. This is the report. I did not produce it. We had GAO produce it.

So stopping drugs at their source is not a priority or interdicting drugs at their source and helping countries that are producing to deal with the problem.

Here is the United States ambassador. Let me read from this report. The United States Ambassador to Peru warned in an October 1998 letter to the State Department that the reduction in air support would have a serious impact on the price of coca. And then we see here in news reports the price of

coca has gone down. That is because the supply is up. Again, a no-brainer. And we see murders and crimes up even slightly in those areas that have tough enforcement policies.

So this is a no-brainer. With 12 minutes left, I do want to try to cover a couple of the areas that I have not in the bill. Some people may say this is just a partisan Republican coming up and commenting tonight. And I will admit to being partisan. I do not think this drug issue is a partisan issue. I have tried to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. I have tried my best, and heaven knows we have tried our best to work with this administration. Holding numerous closed door sessions so I would not embarrass them by revealing the bungling in this effort.

But we are here now on a very serious matter. This stuff is coming in. They have diverted assets. I spent 6 hours in Puerto Rico and met with DEA and Customs and other officials and all of the band that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), the Speaker of the House, set up several years ago has been dispersed. Haiti, which we will be doing a hearing on in a few more weeks, has become the Atlanta for drug trafficking in the Caribbean. This is a country in which we spent billions and billions of taxpayers dollars building the police force and so-called "nation building" and judicial system and legislative building. The legislature does not even meet. We have replaced one dictator with another and turned Haiti, with all of this money, into one of the biggest trafficking points in the Caribbean.

The situation in Puerto Rico is back to disaster level, and again heroin flooding in through Haiti, the Dominican Republic, over to Puerto Rico. Once it is in Puerto Rico, it is in the United States and it is flying to our airports.

□ 2230

Again, a record which is just incredible, a record which defies logic, but a record we are going to have to pay for with a very big price tag tomorrow as the House of Representatives considers this monumental piece of legislation to fund these programs.

Again, we know what it will take to stop illegal narcotics. We have asked GAO to look at what took place, and they tell us basically that the war on drugs is closed down.

Here is the facts. Assets DoD contributes to reducing the illegal drug supply have declined. Pretty clear. What is sad is, even those who are charged with trying to stop drugs again at their source are coming into the United States, interdicting them. In this case, it is SouthCom, the Southern United States Military Command. Again, they are not firing at anyone. They are not going after drugs. They are providing surveillance and basic information which we share with those countries.

We heard what is going on with the countries not getting the information.

In the Clinton administration these past few years, we have seen the requests in this, I am a little color blind so it is either blue or purple here depending on one's ability to detect colors. But I definitely know this is red. The red is the assets provided by DoD declined. Requested and provided by DoD.

So we know that the job has not been done. We know that the Congress must intercede at this important juncture; that we must pass this. We must not get into a debate about getting this equipment here.

Unfortunately, the bill has been added to. We have had a series of natural disasters in North Carolina and other areas. We have had problems in agriculture. Certainly nothing has been more impacted than the military.

The reason why DOD assets have declined is because we have got them off in some dozen deployments that the President has chosen as a priority. The priority, I submit, is not to Kosovo today. The priority is in our own backyard. It is in our neighborhoods. It is in our school.

When I go to areas like Sacramento, where the gentleman from California (Mr. OSE) lives and his family resides, and hear the stories of illegal narcotics and how parents in a community of 200,000, 600 abandon their children, there is a program to restore their children back to their families. Less than 5 out of 35 take their children back because drugs have so destroyed their minds and their lives and their capability even to care for their offspring. There is something wrong.

But we are going to take this message to the floor tomorrow. We are going to take this message to the American people during this campaign. I am going to conduct hearings across the country from now until the last day of my term in office this year.

We will get some results. We will make a difference. If Rudy Giuliani can do it in New York, if one wants to say a tough town, New York is a tough town with tough people. We can have a mayor with the success that he has had. But how disappointing it must be, how deflating it must be to him, he who has worked so hard, had made so many tremendous improvements, when we went to Baltimore, what did we use as a drug treatment example? The people from Baltimore asked to hear what they were doing in New York City in drug treatments. So not only was there success in stopping the murders, but in treating the individuals and successful programs they developed.

But it is not found on the liberal pages of the Washington Post and the other publications that want to demean the mayor of New York and others who are on the frontline who have successful programs. But they will not ask any questions to those who have left us behind and who have destroyed real war on drugs, who have dismantled any efforts to stop most cost effectively, before they ever get to the

streets of our communities, illegal narcotics.

Well, we can have a Baltimore or we can have a New York City. We can have a nation. If we had 80,000 drug addicts in Baltimore with 600,000, a declining population, we can certainly have one out of eight Americans. Certainly that has a tremendous toll.

We can have people, like in California we heard in testimony at field hearings in the district of the gentleman from California (Mr. OSE), abandon their children. Is that what we want?

Well, the choice will be ours tomorrow. The choice will be ours in the next few months. Some serious mistakes have been made. If we do not learn by those mistakes, they will be the cries of the families and mothers and sisters and brothers and relatives of more than the 15,973 that were lost in 1998. They will be the cries and sadness of a whole nation.

We must move together on this. We must learn by the mistakes of the past. I know we can do a better job. Certainly that is our responsibility.

SUPPORT FIRE AND EMS COMMUNITY WITH AMENDMENT TO EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening in an unanticipated move to rally the support of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle and the constituents of our colleagues on both side of the aisle who are involved in the Nation's fire and emergency services and those who support those brave men and women who protect our communities, our cities, and our counties all across America.

Mr. Speaker, there are 32,000 organized departments in this country, 85 percent of whom are totally volunteer, who every day across this Nation, respond to every conceivable disaster that the American people face, not just fires, floods, hurricanes, tornados, missing children, problems in the community. They are there. Incidents involving chemical plants, oil refineries, people who are there when there are problems on our waters.

The Nation's 1.2 million men and women who serve as our domestic defenders have an opportunity this week that they have not had in the 250 year history of this body and this country. Tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, when the supplemental appropriation bill comes to the floor, I expect that an amendment will be offered by myself, by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH), the chairman of the appropriate subcommittee from the Committee on Science, by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), by

the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL) who has a major piece of legislation pending, all of us coming together, along with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the Majority Leader, and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the Majority Whip, to support the first major comprehensive appropriation for the Nation's emergency response community.

Mr. Speaker, I have been in this body for 14 years. Before coming to this body, I was the mayor of my town; and before that, I was the volunteer fire chief and spent a good part of my life working as a volunteer fire fighter, fire instructor, trainer for 80 fire companies as a volunteer in southeastern Pennsylvania.

It was 13 years ago that I helped organize what is today the largest caucus in this body and the other body, and that is the Congressional Fire and EMS Caucus. Our role has been to raise the awareness of these brave Americans who every day of every year have protected our country from domestic tragedies.

Mr. Speaker, there is no other group of people largely volunteer who, each year, lose 100 of their members who are killed while responding to disasters, because that is what happens in America every year. On average, 100 fire and EMS personnel are wiped out either in fires, in accidents, hazmat incidents, floods, tornados, responding to emergency situations, who are just doing their job. There is no other profession where 85 percent of the people are volunteers and yet 100 of them are killed each year.

We have an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to recognize these people on the House floor tomorrow. Our bipartisan amendment will put forth \$100 million of emergency supplemental funds to help these men and women better prepare to serve their communities.

Now, a cynic might ask, why would the Federal Government want to help what is basically a local responsibility? We are not trying to federalize the fire service. But we are asking the fire and EMS people across this country to do more and more every day.

We are asking them to respond to incidents of terrorism involving chemical or biological weapons. We are asking them to respond to large natural disasters like earthquakes, floods, and tornados. Yet the bulk of the money to buy the equipment and do the training of these people comes from chicken dinners, tag days, and suppers in the fire halls.

We have an opportunity tomorrow, Democrats and Republicans, to come together with an overwhelming vote in support of our American heroes. These brave men and women who, for 250 years, have protected America's towns and cities, a unique aspect of this group, Mr. Speaker, is they protect our inner city urban areas and they protect our rural farming districts. They are all over America.

We have missed the boat. We created the AmeriCorps program, a great idea

to promote volunteerism. Do my colleagues know, Mr. Speaker, the volunteer fire service cannot even qualify for the hundreds of millions of dollars that AmeriCorps gets each year?

We support the law enforcement, the police departments in AmeriCorps, in fact about \$3 billion a year. We even use Federal funds to help buy the police vests for the local police officers. But we have done nothing for the fire and EMS community.

The President wants 100,000 new teachers. He wants 100,000 new police officers, not a mention of the fire and EMS personnel departments and people across America.

Tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, in this body, our colleagues can have a chance to support the first major appropriation of real dollars to help these brave men and women: \$10 million to fully fund the rural fire protection program, for small rural departments, \$10 million for burn research, and \$80 million for a national grant program to be competitively based, where every fire department in America can compete for a dollar-for-dollar match for funds to provide communications, training, equipment, to help them better protect their towns.

Finally, we will change the provision of one of the largest Federal block grant programs to our cities and counties across America, the Community Development Block Grant Program, to allow that money to be used if the local leaders so choose for fire and EMS. That could mean the availability of up to \$4.8 billion this year of money already going out to our cities and counties across America.

I would ask our colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to respond affirmatively. I would ask our constituents all across America to make those phones ring tomorrow morning from 8 o'clock on to make sure that all of our colleagues are aware that it is time that this body step up and support these brave American heroes, people who every year have fought to keep our towns and our cities safe.

The supplemental bill is important. It will put more money into defense. It will put more money into FEMA. But for the first time, we have an opportunity to put money into those organizations that have been there in each of our towns protecting our citizens. Each congressional district has, on average, 80 fire and EMS departments, ambulance organizations, organizations involving rescue and fire departments. Tomorrow is our chance in this body to support that legislation.

So, Mr. Speaker, in closing I ask our colleagues to support the amendment that will be offered by myself, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH) with the support of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the support of peo-

ple like the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. BOEHLERT), as we come together in a bipartisan message of support for these brave and true American patriots, the men and women we call our domestic defenders.

I urge our colleagues and our constituents again to make sure that we hear that message loudly and clearly tomorrow. Get on the phone. Make those calls. Be heard so that this government responds with a token amount of money to allow these people to continue to serve America most of them being volunteers.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 0108

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DREIER) at 1 o'clock and 8 minutes a.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3908, 2000 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT

Mr. GOSS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-549) on the resolution (H. Res. 450) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3908) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. ArmeY) for today and the balance of the week on account of a death in the family.

Mr. METCALF (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of illness.

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. GREEN of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GREEN of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SHERMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BILIRAKIS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BILIRAKIS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, today and March 29.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, April 4.

Mr. FOSSELLA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DELAY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GILMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1731. An act to amend the Clean Air Act to provide that certain environmental reports shall continue to be required to be submitted; to the Committee on Commerce.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1000. To amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize programs of the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 9 minutes a.m.), the House adjourned until today, Wednesday, March 29, 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:

6816. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting requests for FY 2000 supplemental appropriations for the Department of Health and Human Services, Labor, and Transportation; the Social Security Administration; and, the Presidential Advisory Commission on Holocaust Assets in the United States; (H. Doc. No. 106-218); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

6817. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition and Technology, Department of Defense, transmitting A report identifying the percentage of funds that were expended during the two preceding fiscal year for performance of depot-level maintenance and repair workloads, pursuant to Public Law 105-85 section 358 (111 Stat. 1696); to the Committee on Armed Services.

6818. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Pension and Welfare Benefits Ad-

ministration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule—Interim Rule for the Assessment of Civil Penalties Under Section 502(c)(5) or ERISA (RIN: 1210-AA54) received February 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6819. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Pension and Welfare Benefits Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule—Interim Rule Governing Procedures for Administrative Hearings Regarding the Assessment of Civil Penalties under Section 502(c)(5) of ERISA (RIN: 1210-AA54) received February 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6820. A letter from the Legal Advisor, Cable Services Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Implementation of Section 11(c) of the Cable Television Consumer Protection and Competition Act of 1992; Horizontal Ownership Limits [MM Docket No. 92-264] received March 8, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

6821. A letter from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Paxton, Nebraska) [MM Docket No. 99-159 RM-9616] (Overton, Nebraska) [MM Docket No. 99-160 RM-9617] (Hershey, Nebraska) [MM Docket No. 99-161 RM-9565] (Sutherland, Nebraska) [MM Docket No. 99-162 RM-9566] (Ravenna, Nebraska) [MM Docket No. 99-192 RM-9633] received March 8, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

6822. A letter from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Colony and Weatherford, Oklahoma) [MM Docket No. 99-190 RM-9631 RM-9689] received March 8, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

6823. A letter from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Denmark and Kaukauna, Wisconsin) [MM Docket No. 99-36 RM-9372] received March 8, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

6824. A letter from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), FM Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Pleasanton, Bandera Hondo, and Schertz, Texas) [MM Docket No. 98-55 RM-9255 RM-9327] received March 8, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

6825. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to Russia [Transmittal No. DTC 014-00], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

6826. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition and Technology, Department of Defense, transmitting a report to describe the extent to which commercial and industrial type functions were performed by DOD contractors during the preceding fiscal year, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2461; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6827. A letter from the Benefits Manager, CoBank, transmitting the annual report of the Comptrollers' ACB Retirement Plan for the year ending December 31, 1998, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9503(a)(1)(B); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6828. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the FY 1999 Inventory of Commercial Activities; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6829. A letter from the Administrative Officer, Office of Independent Counsel, transmitting the annual report on Audit & Investigative Activities, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6830. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Office of Inspector General, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6831. A letter from the Public Printer, Government Printing Office, transmitting a copy of the Biennial Report to Congress on the Status of GPO Access, an online information service of the Government Printing Office, pursuant to Public Law 103-40, section 3 (107 Stat. 113); to the Committee on House Administration.

6832. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Fishery Management Plan for the Summer Flounder, Scup, and Black Sea Bass Fisheries; Extension of the Interim Rule [Docket No. 990422103-9209-02; 031099B] (RIN: 0648-AL75) received March 14, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6833. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule—Child; Educational Institution (RIN: 2900-AJ54) received March 6, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

6834. A letter from the Director, Holocaust Memorial Museum, transmitting a report entitled, "A Study of Governance and Management"; jointly to the Committees on Resources and Ways and Means.

6835. A letter from the Administrator's of Federal Aviation Administration and National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting an amendment to the joint report to Congress on the progress being made under the Subsonic Noise Reduction Technology Program, Fiscal Year 1998, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. app. 1353 nt.; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Science.

6836. A letter from the Administrator's of Federal Aviation Administration and National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a joint report to Congress on the progress being made under the Subsonic Noise Reduction Technology Program, Fiscal Year 1998, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. app. 1353 nt.; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Science.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

Mr. LEACH: Committee on Banking and Financial Services. H.R. 3519. A bill to provide for negotiations for the creation of a trust fund to be administered by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development of the International Development

Association to combat the AIDS epidemic; with an amendment (Rept. 106-548). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOSS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 450. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3908) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes (Rept. 106-549). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut (for herself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. STARK, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. COYNE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. BECERRA, Mrs. THURMAN, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. QUINN, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. NEY, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. HORN, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. LEACH, Mr. FORBES, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BALDACCIO, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. FATTAH, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MCHUGH, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. WALSH, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. FARR of California, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. PASTOR, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. WEINER, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. DIXON, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. FROST, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. BACA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. WEYGAND, Ms. WATERS, Mr. OWENS, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Ms. NORTON, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. STRICKLAND, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. CARSON, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. HOYER, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. REYES, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. WU, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. McGOVERN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. McINTYRE, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. POMEROY, and Ms. BERKLEY):

H.R. 4094. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the incentives for the construction and renovation of public schools; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on 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 Mr. MCINNIS:

H.R. 4095. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Great Sand Dunes National Park and the Great Sand Dunes National Park Preserve in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. BACHUS:

H.R. 4096. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to produce currency, postage stamps, and other security documents at the request of foreign governments, and security documents at the request of the individual States or any political subdivision thereof, on a reimbursable basis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. BACHUS:

H.R. 4097. A bill to define the value of items that are used in the production of securities by the Bureau of Engraving and Printing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOEKSTRA (for himself, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. KIND, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. FORD, Mr. SCHAFER, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. WOLF, Mr. GUTKNECHT, and Mr. BASS):

H.R. 4098. A bill to require the Secretary of Labor to issue regulations specifying the application of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 to home office employment to foster 21st Century telework opportunities, to maximize public participation in the formulation of such regulations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. NORTON (for herself, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. HOYER, Mrs. MORELLA, and Mr. WYNN):

H.R. 4099. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Retirement Protection Act of 1997 to include certain service longevity payments in the amount of Federal benefit payments made under such Act to officers and members of the Metropolitan Police Department; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. PITTS (for himself, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. GOODE, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. KINGSTON, and Mr. DEAL of Georgia):

H.R. 4100. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income gain on the sale or exchange of certain farmland the use of which is restricted in perpetuity to use as farmland; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PITTS (for himself, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. GOODE, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. KINGSTON, and Mr. DEAL of Georgia):

H.R. 4101. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from estate taxes the value of certain farmland the use of which is restricted in perpetuity to use as farmland; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAXTON:

H.R. 4102. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to instruct the United States Executive Director at the International Monetary Fund to oppose any new loan by the International Monetary Fund to any country that is acting to restrict oil production to the detriment of the United States economy, except in emergency circumstances; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. SESSIONS (for himself and Mr. DUNCAN):

H.R. 4103. A bill to amend the Federal Activities Inventory Reform Act of 1998 to improve the process for identifying the func-

tions of the Federal Government that are not inherently governmental functions, for determining the appropriate organizations for the performance of such functions on the basis of competition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi:

H.R. 4104. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize funding to carry out certain water quality and barrier island restoration projects for the Mississippi Sound, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

H.R. 4105. A bill to establish the Fair Justice Agency as an independent agency for investigating and prosecuting alleged misconduct, criminal activity, corruption, or fraud by an officer or employee of the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PITTS (for himself, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. KASICH, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. SOUDER, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. CAMP, Mr. LARSON, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. TANNER, and Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin):

H.R. 4106. A bill to provide for the establishment of Individual Development Accounts (IDAs) that will allow individuals and families with limited means an opportunity to accumulate assets, to access education, to own their own homes and businesses, and ultimately to achieve economic self-sufficiency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 4107. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage of a program of coordinated lifestyle changes to reverse individuals at significant clinical risk for a heart attack under part B of the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ROTHMAN (for himself, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. HYDE, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. WEINER, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. BONO, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas):

H.R. 4108. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to make grants to improve security at schools, including the placement and use of metal detectors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAYNE:

H. Con. Res. 294. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the Parthenon Marbles should be returned to Greece; to the Committee on International Relations.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 49: Mr. WEXLER, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. MCHUGH.

H.R. 175: Mr. LINDER.

H.R. 225: Mr. BACA.

H.R. 252: Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 254: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 303: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. EWING, Mr. KANJORSKI, and Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 306: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 372: Mr. FOLEY.

H.R. 374: Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. PALLONE.

- H.R. 394: Mr. BAIRD.
H.R. 395: Mr. BAIRD.
H.R. 397: Mr. BAIRD.
H.R. 403: Mr. LAFALCE and Mr. CANNON.
H.R. 515: Mr. BORSKI, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. UNDERWOOD.
H.R. 568: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.
H.R. 583: Ms. KILPATRICK.
H.R. 612: Mr. BACA and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 701: Mr. EDWARDS.
H.R. 710: Mr. ISAKSON.
H.R. 730: Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H.R. 783: Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 803: Mr. SAXTON.
H.R. 827: Mr. BACA.
H.R. 828: Mr. WELLER.
H.R. 840: Ms. MCKINNEY.
H.R. 879: Ms. BERKLEY.
H.R. 894: Mr. SANDLIN.
H.R. 904: Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 1041: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. OXLEY, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.
H.R. 1055: Mr. ROGAN, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. ROHRBACHER, and Mr. GIBBONS.
H.R. 1082: Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 1168: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. POMEROY, and Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 1194: Mr. FOLEY.
H.R. 1217: Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. KING, Mr. PETRI, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, and Mr. BOEHLERT.
H.R. 1304: Mr. BACA.
H.R. 1337: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 1387: Mr. LAHOOD, Mrs. BIGGERT, and Mr. BARTON of Texas.
H.R. 1413: Mr. CAMP.
H.R. 1592: Mr. BRADY of Texas.
H.R. 1660: Mr. BACA.
H.R. 1776: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 1816: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. BACHUS, and Mr. MOORE.
H.R. 1885: Mr. HEFLEY and Mr. BACA.
H.R. 2059: Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 2129: Mr. GILCHREST and Mr. WHITFIELD.
H.R. 2136: Mr. SANDLIN.
H.R. 2141: Mr. TANCREDO and Mr. OWENS.
H.R. 2149: Mr. MOORE.
H.R. 2166: Mr. SANDERS, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. GEJDENSON, and Mr. WEYGAND.
H.R. 2265: Mr. GONZALEZ and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 2298: Mr. BACA.
H.R. 2308: Mr. ENGEL and Mr. DEUTSCH.
H.R. 2341: Mr. HUTCHINSON, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. DIXON, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. SABO, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. HOEKSTRA.
H.R. 2382: Mr. GILCHREST and Mr. SHAYS.
H.R. 2397: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. DIXON, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. REYES, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 2402: Mr. DICKEY, Mr. BRYANT, and Mr. ROGERS.
H.R. 2457: Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 2511: Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. SHADEGG, Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE, and Mr. STEARNS.
H.R. 2588: Mr. DELAHUNT and Ms. MCKINNEY.
H.R. 2749: Mr. WELLER and Mr. DEAL of Georgia.
H.R. 2776: Mr. KUCINICH and Mr. HINCHEY.
H.R. 2788: Mrs. EMERSON.
H.R. 2789: Mr. ENGEL and Ms. MCKINNEY.
H.R. 2790: Mr. LANTOS.
H.R. 2810: Mr. BLAGOJEVICH.
H.R. 2814: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, and Mr. BAIRD.
H.R. 2825: Mr. CANNON.
H.R. 2832: Mr. DELAHUNT.
H.R. 2867: Mrs. MYRICK.
H.R. 2870: Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. WALSH, and Mrs. MORELLA.
H.R. 2883: Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 2892: Mrs. WILSON, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and Mr. KLECZKA.
H.R. 2907: Mr. FORBES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. BACA.
H.R. 2939: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 2953: Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 2973: Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. ENGLISH, and Ms. MCKINNEY.
H.R. 3043: Mr. MINGE.
H.R. 3084: Mr. SOUDER.
H.R. 3102: Mr. MANZULLO.
H.R. 3113: Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. WELLER, and Mr. MOORE.
H.R. 3294: Mr. BONILLA.
H.R. 3301: Mr. GILMAN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. WEYGAND.
H.R. 3315: Mr. LAFALCE.
H.R. 3327: Mr. HILL of Montana.
H.R. 3377: Ms. CARSON and Mr. ANDREWS.
H.R. 3392: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 3439: Mr. HILLEARY, Ms. DUNN, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. FLETCHER, and Mr. NUSSLE.
H.R. 3519: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 3558: Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 3565: Mr. METCALF and Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 3571: Mr. NADLER, Mr. CROWLEY, and Ms. PELOSI.
H.R. 3572: Mr. CONYERS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 3573: Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. OXLEY.
H.R. 3575: Ms. CARSON.
H.R. 3590: Mr. HERGER.
H.R. 3593: Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. METCALF, and Mr. MCHUGH.
H.R. 3608: Mr. STUPAK and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 3621: Mr. SPRATT and Mr. GONZALEZ.
H.R. 3634: Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. STARK, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. MINGE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. INSLEE, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. HORN, Mr. BENTSEN, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. FARR of California, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. GEJDENSON.
H.R. 3660: Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. THUNE, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. STENHOLM.
H.R. 3680: Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. CAMPBELL, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SALMON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PETRI, and Mr. BOUCHER.
H.R. 3694: Mr. DOOLITTLE.
H.R. 3695: Mr. DUNCAN.
H.R. 3698: Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. BOUCHER.
H.R. 3705: Mr. PASTOR, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. BENTSEN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. EVANS, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. RUSH, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 3707: Mr. BROWN of Ohio.
H.R. 3710: Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. SANDLIN, and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.
H.R. 3766: Mr. MINGE, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. WEINER, and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.
H.R. 3767: Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Ms. MCKINNEY.
H.R. 3806: Mr. GUTIERREZ and Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO.
H.R. 3826: Mr. HINOJOSA and Mr. FROST.
H.R. 3831: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 3842: Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. GORDON.
H.R. 3844: Mr. OSE.
H.R. 3863: Mr. SANDERS.
H.R. 3864: Mr. SANDERS.
H.R. 3873: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. WU.
H.R. 3883: Mr. BONIOR.
H.R. 3889: Ms. PELOSI, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. KLECZKA, and Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 3916: Mr. WATKINS, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. BLUNT.
H.R. 3980: Mr. SOUDER, Mr. BRYANT, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mrs. MYRICK.
H.R. 3981: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 4003: Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mr. SWEENEY.
H.R. 4018: Mr. MCHUGH.
H.R. 4021: Mr. HERGER.
H.R. 4025: Mr. EHLERS and Mr. BAKER.
H.R. 4033: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. MENDENEZ, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. STARK, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. DICKS, Mr. REYES, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. RILEY, Mr. DIXON, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. TANNER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. COOK, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. LAMPSON.
H.R. 4057: Mr. BERMAN, Mr. COYNE, Mr. WALSH, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Ms. CARSON, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 4059: Mr. LARSON and Mrs. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 4066: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. CROWLEY.
H.R. 4067: Mr. KANJORSKI and Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.
H.R. 4069: Ms. GRANGER, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. UPTON, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. ENGLISH, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. FORBES, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. RILEY, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mrs. NORTHUP, and Mr. NETHERCUTT.
H.R. 4082: Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. PICKERING, and Mr. BOUCHER.
H.R. 4085: Mr. DOOLITTLE.
H.R. 4093: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
H.J. Res. 64: Ms. STABENOW, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. BACA.
H.J. Res. 90: Mr. COBURN.
H. Con. Res. 74: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H. Con. Res. 114: Mr. LAMPSON.
H. Con. Res. 229: Mr. OWENS.
H. Con. Res. 249: Ms. PELOSI, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.
H. Con. Res. 260: Mr. SHIMKUS, Mrs. CUBIN, and Mr. THUNE.
H. Con. Res. 266: Mr. DOYLE, Mr. FILNER, Mr. PAUL, Mr. LEACH, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. TERRY, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. SANDLIN, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.
H. Con. Res. 167: Mr. CAMPBELL.
H. Con. Res. 269: Mr. GIBBONS and Mr. LANTOS.
H. Con. Res. 271: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. GALLEGLY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. DIXON, Mr. FROST, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. GREEN of Texas.
H. Con. Res. 273: Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.
H. Con. Res. 285: Mr. SHERWOOD and Mr. ISAKSON.
H. Con. Res. 292: Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. TERRY, Mr. THUNE, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. LAZIO, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. ORTIZ, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. HAYES, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. BASS, Mr. RILEY, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. SWEENEY, and Mr. DEUTSCH.

H. Res. 107: Mr. SCOTT, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.

H. Res. 213: Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. SKELTON, and Ms. PELOSI.

H. Res. 237: Mr. MATSUI.

H. Res. 415: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. FARR of California, and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.

H. Res. 420: Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mr. FILER.

H. Res. 437: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mr. MCNULTY.

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.R. 3252: Mrs. MYRICK.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 7

OFFERED BY: MR. GALLEGLY

AMENDMENT NO. 1: At the end of the bill insert the following new section:

SEC. 10. INCREASED LIFETIME LEARNING CREDIT FOR ADDITIONAL TRAINING FOR SECONDARY TEACHERS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (c) of section 25A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to lifetime learning credit) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) SPECIAL RULE FOR FIELD OF STUDY TRAINING FOR CERTAIN TEACHERS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If any portion of the qualified tuition and related expenses to which this subsection applies—

“(i) is paid or incurred by an individual who is a full-time teacher in the classroom in a secondary school and is certified or licensed to teach by the State in which the individual is teaching, and

“(ii) is incurred for the enrollment or attendance of such individual in a course of instruction directly relevant to the subject matter currently taught by such individual that is offered for credit by an eligible educational institution,

paragraph (1) shall be applied with respect to such portion by substituting ‘40 percent’ for ‘20 percent’.

“(B) ELIGIBLE EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term ‘eligible educational institution’ has the meaning given to such term by subsection (f)(2), except that such term includes a public institution that provides a 2-year educational program which is acceptable for full credit toward a bachelor’s degree.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to expenses paid after December 31, 1999, for education furnished in academic periods beginning after such date.

H.R. 3908

OFFERED BY: MR. CAMPBELL

AMENDMENT NO. 3: Page 80, after line 11, insert the following:

SEC. 5109. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by title I of this Act may be made available for military or police assistance for Colombia.

H.R. 3908

OFFERED BY: MR. CAMPBELL

AMENDMENT NO. 4: Page 80, after line 11, insert the following:

SEC. 5109. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by title I of this Act may be made available for military or police assistance for any foreign country.

H.R. 3908

OFFERED BY: MR. PAUL

AMENDMENT NO. 5: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. ____ (a) The amounts otherwise provided in title I for the following accounts are hereby reduced by the following amounts:

(1) “DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE—Drug Enforcement Administration—Salaries and Expenses”, \$293,048,000.

(2) “DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY—OTHER DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROGRAMS—Drug Interdiction and Counter-Drug Activities, Defense”, \$185,800,000.

(3) “BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE—Funds Appropriated to the President—Department of State—Assistance for Plan Colombia and for Andean Regional Counternarcotics Activities”, \$1,099,000,000.

(b) None of the funds made available in title I for “Military Construction, Defense-Wide” may be used for construction outside of the United States or any of its territories or possessions.

(c) None of the funds made available in title II may be used for operations in Kosovo or East Timor, other than the return of United States personnel and property to the United States.

H.R. 3908

OFFERED BY: MR. RAMSTAD

AMENDMENT NO. 6: Page 2, strike line 1 and all that follows through page 9, line 4.

H.R. 3908

OFFERED BY: MR. RAMSTAD

AMENDMENT NO. 7: Page 55, after line 21, insert the following:

SUBSTANCE ABUSE AND MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

SUBSTANCE ABUSE AND MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

For an additional amount for “Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services” for additional grants under section 1921 of the Public Health Service Act, \$700,000,000: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985: *Provided further*, That the entire amount is available only to the extent that an official budget request for a specific dollar amount that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 is transmitted by the President to the Congress: *Provided further*, That of such amount, \$233,100,000 shall be for such additional grants for fiscal year 2000, and \$466,900,000 shall be for such additional grants for fiscal year 2001.

H.R. 3908

OFFERED BY: MR. SANFORD

AMENDMENT NO. 8: Page 2, strike lines 3 through 21 (and redesignate the subsequent chapters and sections accordingly).

Page 3, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(reduced by \$87,400,000)”.

Page 5, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(reduced by \$281,000,000)”.

Page 8, lines 18 and 25, after each dollar amount, insert the following: “(reduced by \$77,923,000)”.

Page 11, strike line 8 and all that follows through page 13, line 21.

Page 44, strike line 19 and all that follows through page 46, line 3.

Page 46, strike lines 5 through 22 (and redesignate the subsequent sections accordingly).

Page 49, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(reduced by \$8,100,000)”.

Page 52, strike lines 7 through 17.

Page 52, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(reduced by \$59,000,000)”.

Page 56, strike line 14 and all that follows through page 57, line 15.

Page 62, strike line 11 and all that follows through page 64, line 6.

Page 79, strike lines 9 through 14 and insert the following:

SEC. 5104. (a) INAPPLICABILITY OF EMERGENCY DESIGNATIONS.—A proviso in this Act shall not have effect if the proviso—

(1) designates an amount as an emergency requirement pursuant to the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985; or

(2) makes the availability of an amount contingent on such a designation by the President.

(b) EXEMPTION OF DEFENSE FUNDS FROM SEQUESTRATION.—Accounts for which amounts are made available in title III of this Act, and accounts previously within the defense category of discretionary appropriations under the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, shall be exempt from any sequestration that is required under section 251(a)(6) of such Act to eliminate any fiscal year 2000 breach caused by the appropriations or other provisions of this Act.

H.R. 3908

OFFERED BY: MR. TAYLOR OF MISSISSIPPI

AMENDMENT NO. 9: Page 5, after line 7, insert the following new section:

SEC. 1202. (a) LIMITATION ON NUMBER OF MILITARY PERSONNEL IN COLOMBIA.—The number of members of the Armed Forces of the United States in Colombia at any time may not exceed 300.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—(1) The limitation in subsection (a) does not apply to members of the Armed Forces of the United States in Colombia for the purpose of rescuing or retrieving United States military or civilian Government personnel. The period for which a member of the Armed Forces of the United States may be in Colombia under this paragraph may not exceed 30 days unless expressly authorized by law.

(2) The limitation in subsection (a) does not apply to a member of the Armed Forces assigned to the United States Embassy in Colombia as an attache or as a member of the Marine Corps security detachment.

H.R. 3908

OFFERED BY: MS. WATERS

AMENDMENT NO. 10: Page 46, after line 3, insert the following:

MULTILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE DEBT RELIEF

CONTRIBUTION TO THE HIPC TRUST FUND

SEC. ____ (a) For payment to the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries Trust Fund of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, but only for purposes of debt relief, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for fiscal years 2000 through 2004, for payment by the Secretary of the Treasury.

(b) For an additional amount for payment to the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries Trust Fund of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, but only for purposes of debt relief, \$210,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the entire amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to

section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended: *Provided further*, That the entire amount shall be available only to the extent an official budget request, that includes designation of the entire amount of the request as an emergency requirement as defined in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, is transmitted by the President to the Congress.

H.R. 3908

OFFERED BY: MR. WU

AMENDMENT NO. 11: Page 49, after line 20, insert the following:

WEST COAST GROUND FISH FISHERIES DISASTER

In addition to the other amounts appropriated by this Act, there are appropriated \$14,200,000, to remain available until ex-

ended, for use for the disaster in the West Coast groundfish fisheries: *Provided*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985. Of such amount—

(1) \$1,000,000 shall be available to the Secretary of Commerce for providing assistance under section 209 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3147);

(2) \$2,500,000 shall be available to the Secretary of Commerce for providing grants under such section;

(3) \$3,500,000 shall be available to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration for a vessel buyback program;

(4) \$7,200,000 shall be available to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration operations, research and facilities—

(A) of which \$2,000,000 shall be available to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to improve biological studies and stock assessments;

(B) \$4,500,000 shall be available to the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission to plan and implement a coast wide observer program; and

(C) \$700,000 shall be available to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration for making grants to States to adjust and improve monitoring of landings, biological sampling, and aging work.