United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 146 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 6, 2000 No. 68

House of Representatives

The House met at 10:30 a.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,
June 6, 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.

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.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There being no requests for morning hour debates, pursuant to clause 12, rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 31 minutes a.m.) the House stood in recess until noon.

1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT) at noon.

PRAYER

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

God and Father of all nations, continue to guide the destiny of these United States. Bless the Members of this House. You are their Counselor and Guide. Give them satisfaction in their work, for You are the joy of those who are faith-filled, and the glory of the humble.

May all their deliberations give rise to understanding and further the cause of equal justice. May their determinations be honored and respected, and renew the hope of freedom in the heart of the world.

In You we place our trust, for we believe You have called us to serve this Nation. By Your divine inspiration we will reach the destiny You have in mind for us, for You live now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. LAMPSON 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.

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,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 30, 2000.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
The Speaker, U.S. 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, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on May 26, 2000 at 11:10 a.m.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 3293; that the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 4489; that the Senate passed without amendment H. Con. Res. 280; that the Senate passed without amendment H. Con. Res. 302.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

JEFF TRANDAHL,
Clerk of the House.

COMMUNICATION FROM STAFF MEMBER OF THE HONORABLE CHARLES F. BASS, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Darwin Cusack, Chief of Staff to the Honorable CHARLES F. BASS, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 30, 2000.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you, pursuant to rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a grand jury subpoena for documents issued by the U.S. District Court for the District of New Hampshire.

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

Sincerely,

DARWIN CUSACK,
Chief of Staff.

Printed on recycled paper.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the Speaker pro tempore signed the following enrolled bills on Thursday, June 1, 2000:

H.R. 3293, to amend the law that authorized the Vietnam Veterans Memorial to authorize the placement within the site of the Memorial of a plaque to honor those Vietnam veterans who died after their service in the Vietnam war, but as a direct result of that service;

H.R. 4489, to amend section 110 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996, and for other purposes.

TRIBUTE TO BOB HOPE

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Madam Speaker, today we honor the U.S. servicemen who participated in the invasion of Western Europe by the Allies on June 6, 1944. It is only fitting, however, that we pay special tribute to a gentleman who is admired by millions of our veterans.

Bob Hope is beloved for his tireless efforts to entertain U.S. troops around the globe, from World War II to the Persian Gulf War.

As one of the countless soldiers that he entertained during Vietnam and Desert Storm, I know personally of the positive impact that his visits made to uplift our spirits.

Last week, Americans were saddened to learn of the legendary entertainer's illness requiring a stay at the Eisenhower Medical Center, near his home, in Palm Springs.

With his devoted and loving wife, Delores, by his side, Mr. Hope is recovering, and the family has asked that everyone keep Mr. Hope in their prayers.

Mr. Hope, from those of us who were blessed by your courage and commitment to our efforts around the globe, may God bless you. And, Mr. Hope, we all hope that you get well soon, and our best wishes go out to you and your family.

INTERNATIONAL ABDUCTION

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

Mr. LAMPSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to talk about the issue of international child abduction. For 3 months now, I have been coming to the floor to tell the story of children who have been abducted abroad. I have also been holding public events and introduced a resolution with my friend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

Well, all of this work is beginning to pay off. On Tuesday, May 22, the House passed H. Con. Res. 293, urging signatories to the Hague Convention to abide by that agreement. Just within the past 3 weeks, I have heard amazing news from two different parents whose cases this Congress has brought to light.

One of those parents, Jim Rinnaman, saw his daughter 3 weeks ago for the first time in 4 years. Another, Paul Marinkovich, is bringing his son home after 3 years of searching.

Madam Speaker, these parents are being reunited with their children because of the work that Congress is doing and the pressure that these countries are feeling from our Government and from the media.

On behalf of American parents, I want to thank my colleagues for passing H. Con. Res. 293 and urge them to continue working with me on this very important issue. By continuing to take action and raise awareness, we can bring our children home.

JUSTICE DEPARTMENT CANNOT HANDLE TRUTH

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Madam Speaker, an Iranian defector said Iran was responsible for the bombing of Pan Am 103, not Libya.

No kidding, Sherlock. The whole world was told that years ago, but the Justice Department turned their back. Reports said that Iran hired the Syrians and the Syrians recruited terrorists from all around the world.

Beam me up. Those two Libyans may have been mules in general, but they are scapegoats specifically.

I yield back the fact that from Waco to Ruby Ridge to now Pan Am 103, the Justice Department just cannot handle the truth. I also yield back the fact, my colleagues, that if these two Libyans masterminded the bombing of Pan Am 103, they would have choked on a chicken bone years ago in Kadafi's cell.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

DESIGNATING WASHINGTON OPERA IN WASHINGTON, D.C., AS NATIONAL OPERA

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4542) to designate the Washington Opera in Washington, D.C., as the National Opera.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4542

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

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The Washington Opera, organized under the laws of the District of Columbia, is designated as the ''National Opera''.

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper or other record of the United States to the Washington Opera referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''National Opera''.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 4542.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4542, to designate the Washington Opera in Washington, D.C., as the National Opera.

The beginnings of the Washington Opera were unusual, as it was founded by a music critic, Day Thorpe, of the now defunct Washington Star, along with a few others who decided that the Nation's capital should have an operatic enterprise of its own.

In the early years, the Washington Opera was limited by financial and practical constraints to no more than one or two productions per year. Since that time, the Washington Opera has grown and prospered. Today, it is the resident opera company of the Kennedy Center, due primarily to the artistic excellence of the ensemble.

In addition to performances, the Washington Opera has created several education and community programs that serve a broad and diverse population. These outreach programs are dedicated to enhancing the lives and learning of the children and adults of the greater Washington region, developing future audiences, and making the experience of opera available to those who otherwise have limited access to this art form.

Through these programs, the Washington Opera has made extensive outreach to the Washington, D.C. area public schools and to the community at large. These programs have reached more than 150,000 individuals and have been driven by the idea that ''learning by doing'' is a highly effective way to spark young children's interest in the arts.

The number and scope of programming has grown to 22 programs that provide performance experiences, curriculum enhancement activities, in-school artist and docent visits, professional development opportunities for teachers and young artists, interactive family-oriented presentations, and more.

Under the stewardship of Artistic Director Placido Domingo, the Washington Opera has achieved the stature of a world-class company and plays to standing-room-only audiences at the Kennedy Center Opera House and Eisenhower Theater.

I would like to mention a personal note about this Artistic Director Placido Domingo. When my daughter, at 17, was playing the professional tour, I did not have the money to send a coach or anybody in the family, so I gave her a lot of advice about not paying too much attention to anybody, particularly men, as she moved from the Italian Open to the Swiss Open to the German Open and then to the French Open. And when she was leaving the French Open to go to the Paris Open, she apparently was standing there in tears and this gentleman asked her what was her problem? And she said, well, my luggage went the other way and I have to play the first round of the French Open as soon as I get to Paris.

The gentleman said, well, the first thing we have to do is put you in first class because you cannot be cramped up back there and then go play tennis.

Well, if the father had known that, he really would have been upset about some man moving her to first class.

When she got to Paris, the gentleman gave her a hundred dollars. And she said, Well, I cannot take that. And he said, well, how will you play? You only have your racket and your sneakers. You will have to buy clothing.

When she came back and we were sitting there as a family watching television, Placido Domingo and Johnny Denver were doing a couple of the duets that they have done, and she said, Dad, that is the man that put me in first class and that is the man who gave me the $100. And it was Placido Domingo. And I understand that is typical of him.

The Washington Opera has earned its position of leadership in the musical world without the government support typical in most world capitals. The company has been a leader through its commitment to sustain new American operas by presenting them in crucial second productions, giving these new works life beyond the short span of their premieres. It leads by championing the lesser known works of significant musical work rarely presented on today's opera stages.

It has been hailed for its work with operas on the epic scale. As the British magazine Opera Now recently stated, "The Washington Opera is carving out a new area of expertise . . . staging grand spectacles to exacting standards with precision and power not often seen even at the world's top houses." The company is also renowned for the number and quality of its new productions, its discovery and nurturing of important young talent, and the international collaboration system it has pioneered with leading foreign companies.

Since 1980, the company has grown from a total of 16 yearly performances of four operas to 80 yearly performances of eight operas, while the budget has increased from $2 million to more than $25 million per year. The company has averaged 98 percent attendance over the last fourteen seasons—a remarkable sales record. It now earns approximately 65 percent of its total budget through ticket sales, raising the remaining 35 percent through contributions from the individuals, corporations, and foundations. A sign of fiscal strength, this ratio of earned to contributed income is the highest of any opera company in the country.

The Washington Opera has requested this legislation designating it as the "National Opera." There are precedents for granting private or quasi-private entities a "national" designation. For example, the National Aquarium in Baltimore and the National Aviary in Pittsburgh both received their "national" designation through acts of Congress. Such a designation does not bring with it federal funding or a federal subsidy. Rather, it grants the entity national prominence, which may increase ticket sales and improve fundraising prospects.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and to vote "yes" on final passage.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, it is an honor to be able to rise in support of the legislation of my colleague. H.R. 4542, which would change the name of the Washington Opera to the National Opera, is a piece of legislation that our side supports wholeheartedly.

1215

This opera was born in 1956, which was the year I was born. It has moved from two performances to now over 80 performances a year with an attendance rate of 98 percent or better, and I want to compliment my chairman for offering this legislation. I think it is an appropriate designation to change the name.

It is a world-renowned opera; and to have the designation of the National Opera, I think, is most appropriate.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Northern Virginia (Mr. DAVIS), an opera buff.

(Mr. DAVIS of Virginia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to support H.R. 4542, the bill to designate the Washington Opera as the National Opera. Since its founding in 1956, the Opera has been providing enrichment and arts education to the Washington Metropolitan area.

From its humble beginnings under the stewardship of music critic Day Thorpe, when a lack of funds limited them to two performances a year, the Opera has consistently grown both in stature and in size. In 1980, the Washington Opera had a total of 16 performances of four operas with an operating budget of $2 million. Throughout the 1990s, the Opera has truly emerged as a world class institution and has grown to 80 performances of eight operas with an annual budget of more than $25 million.

The great success the company has enjoyed is a credit both to its management and the support it has received from the Washington metropolitan community. Over the last 14 seasons, the company has averaged a remarkable 98 percent attendance, with 65 percent of its revenue coming from ticket sales. The remaining 35 percent of the budget is provided by individual and corporate donations. The ratio of 65 earned to 35 contributed is evidence of the company's fiscal strength and is the highest in the Nation.

The Washington Opera has earned its position of leadership in the musical world without the crucial government support that is typical in most world capitals, in a city without the strong business base that helps fund many U.S. opera companies. The company has been a leader through its commitment to sustain new American operas by presenting them in crucial second productions, giving these new works life beyond the short span of their premiers. It leads by championing lesser-known works of significant musical worth rarely presented on today's opera stages. It has been hailed for its work with operas on the epic scale. As the British magazine Opera now recently stated, "The Washington Opera is carving out a new area of expertise, staging grand spectacles to exacting standards with precision and power not often seen at the world's top houses."

The company is also renowned for the number and quality of its productions, its discovery and nurturing of important young talent and the international collaboration system it has pioneered with leading foreign companies.

One of the greatest contributions to the D.C. metro area have come from the company's educational outreach program. Reaching out beyond the bounds of the opera community, the Washington Opera has made a concerted effort to bring the arts to students around the region. As budgets for arts education have continually shrunk, it is more important than ever that private institutions have what limited government support can be provided to reach our school-aged children. It is with that goal in mind that I strongly support the passage of H.R. 4542 and ask my colleagues to do the same. I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) for his leadership on this issue and shepherding this bill to the House floor.

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

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH) for yielding me the time. Madam Speaker, may I say that the chairman of the committee introduced the last speaker as an opera buff; the gentleman is better known in this House as a baseball buff, but we are pleased to rank the gentleman to the rank of opera lovers.

In any case, Madam Speaker, great capitals normally have great cultural institutions. I regret to say that for a very long time, the Nation's capital did not have great cultural institutions. As a fourth generation Washingtonian, I must say that growing up in the Nation's capital was like growing up in a cultural desert. The only great company was the National Symphony Orchestra, and I am pleased that now the Congress would name the Washington Opera the National Opera.

I think this is most appropriate, particularly when we consider that this is not a Nation that subsidizes the arts very greatly; and the very least, it seems to me that we can do is recognize the arts in this way.

Twenty-five million visitors come to the Nation's capital every year, many of them the constituents of Members of the House and Senate. As the Washington Opera becomes the National Opera, I believe that the national Opera will set an example for the country and will welcome millions who would otherwise not be inclined to attend the opera.

Throughout the world, the reputation of this company, particularly since Placido Domingo became the artistic director, is generally regarded as a world-class company. It plays to standing-room-only audiences. It raises its own money. Now it asks very little of us. It asks that we give it a name that will help it raise more of its own money. I would like to bring to the attention of Members something of what the Washington Opera Company does in its immediate area because it has very energetic education and community programs that serve public, private, and home-schooled students throughout the region, 31 percent Anglo, 27 percent African American, 33 percent Latino, 8 percent Asian, roughly reflecting the population of the region. 70 percent of those served by these education and community programs are between the ages of 5 and 18. Of the remaining 30 percent who are adults, 40 percent are senior citizens.

Here is an opera company which has reached to every age group, every ethnic group, and every section of the region. Now as the National Opera Company, it will welcome people to come from all over the country. Its education and community programs target adults and students throughout the grades K through 12 and particularly underserved populations. 40 percent are from the District, 35 percent are from Maryland, 25 percent are from Virginia.

It is particularly appropriate that the chairman would rise to support this bill, because this is in many ways a quintessential educational enterprise. We now know increasingly as we learn more about the brain and its functions that music can be important in the intellectual as well as the social development of students. When the Washington Opera Company comes to the Congress of the United States not with its hands out for money but to ask that it be given a name that will help it raise money, I strongly urge that the Congress give it the public recognition that will help the Washington Opera Company grow as a national opera company and will help it bring opera to increasing millions of citizens of the United States.

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

I would like to just reiterate my support for this legislation. This opera raises over $25 million annually in private support, but I do believe that the new designation as provided in this legislation hopefully will provide additional impetus for those who want to support the continuation of a great cultural institution. I want to compliment, again, the gentleman from Pennsylvania and also the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia for this legislation.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4542, a bill designating the Washington Opera in Washington, DC, as the National Opera. This opera company is known for the number and quality of new productions, discovery and nurturing of important young talent, and an international collaboration system with leading foreign companies.

The Washington Opera has achieved the stature of a world class company and plays to standing-room only audiences at the Kennedy Center Opera House and Eisenhower Theater. Like so many other institutions in Washington, the opera attracts, entertains, and educates people from all over the world.

The company has averaged 98% attendance over the last fourteen season. It now earns approximately 65% of its total budget through ticket sales, raising the remaining 35% through contributions from individuals, corporations, and foundations.

A sign of fiscal strength, this ratio of earned to contributed income is the highest of any opera company in the country. Beyond the value of music itself, increasing evidence clarifies the role of music in the intellectual and social development of our community.

The opera allows people to cross language and cultural barriers, increase understanding, and build tolerance in a multi-cultural setting.

The Washington Opera remains true to its mission of presenting the highest quality opera in the Nation's Capital, broadening public understanding and awareness of opera, and maintaining opera as a living art form.

Mr. Speaker, for over 40 years this opera company has been a beacon of light not only for the Washington, DC community, but also for the entire Nation. People from all over the United States and the world realize this opera company is a reflection of our Nation's commitment to the arts.

As a cosponsor of H.R. 4542, I stand in support of this bill to designate the Washington Opera as the National Opera and urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4542, a bill to designate the Washington Opera in Washington, DC, as the National Opera. The Washington Opera has an impressive history that has earned its position as one of opera's premier venues.

The Washington Opera continued to grow and flourish. In 1980, the company has grown from a total of 16 performances and 4 operas to 80 performances and 8 operas, while the budget has increased from $2 million to more than $25 million. In 1980, the opera did not own a single opera set; by the spring of 2000 the company had originated and built 61 new productions, becoming one of the most prolific producing companies in the United States.

The Washington Opera prides itself by providing world-class productions for its audiences. The Washington Opera became the first American Opera Company to produce a repertory season in two separate theaters. Giving performances in the 2,200 seat Opera House and the more intimate 1,100 seat Eisenhower theaters allow the company to perform in settings that reflect each opera's proper acoustical ambiance.

Along with providing quality entertainment, The Washington Opera contributes to the education and diversity of the community. The Education and Community Programs serve a diverse population of public, private and the home school students that are 31% Anglo, 27% African-American, 33% Latino, and 8% Asian. Roughly 70% of those served by Washington Opera programs are students between the ages 5 to 18 of various needs and abilities. Adults constitute the remaining 30%, of which 40% are senior citizens.

Among other programs, The Washington Opera has developed teaching methods that provide educators with tools to engage students in the learning process. At a young age, students learn about the value of the arts. There are 22 programs each providing performance experiences, curricular enhancement activities and professional development opportunities for both teachers and young artists. These programs foster enthusiasm and help enrich our youths' educational experience.

Under the jurisdiction of Artistic Director Placido Domingo, The Washington Opera's reputation continues to increase. The Washington Opera plays to standing-room-only audiences at the Kennedy Center Opera House and Eisenhower Theater. The Washington Opera has earned its position of leadership in the musical world without the critical governmental support typically offered to most world capitals, in a city without the strong business base that helps fund many U.S.. opera companies.

The Washington Opera has requested this legislation to designate The Washington Opera as the ''National Opera.'' There are precedents for granting private entities a ''national'' designation. For example, the National Aquarium in Baltimore and the National Aviary in Pittsburgh both received their ''national'' designation through acts of Congress. Such a designation does not bring with it federal funding or a federal subsidy.

This change will grant the group further prominence, which, in turn, may expand ticket

sales, improve fundraising capabilities and most importantly, broaden the opera's community programs in an effort to influence a greater breadth of individuals.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4542, a bill to designate the Washington Opera in Washington, D.C., as the National Opera.

When first approached about the redesignation by Artistic Director Placido Domingo, I thought of the Bard's famous line, ''What's in a name? That which we call a rose by any other name would smell as sweet.''

However, this ''national'' designation will aid the Washington Opera in furthering their position of leadership in the musical world. Founded in 1956, the Washington Opera has achieved the stature of a world class company and plays to standing room only audiences at the Kennedy Center Opera House and the Eisenhower Theater.

In the spring of 2000, the company had originated 61 new productions, becoming one of the most prolific producing companies in the United States. In addition, the company has averaged 98 percent attendance over the last fourteen seasons.

The Washington Opera has always recognized that their service to the nation does not end with each production. Instead, Washington Opera's Education and Community Programs department dedicates itself to enhancing the lives and learning of children and adults by making the experience of opera available to those who otherwise have limited access to the art form. The Washington Opera has made extensive outreach efforts to area public schools and to the greater Washington community at large. Through their OperAccess program, they have actively involved members of our community who are visually, physically, or audibly impaired. By devoting themselves to broadening the public's understanding and awareness of opera, the company has served as the leader in maintaining opera as a living art form in America.

The National Opera designation will serve to facilitate the company's fundraising efforts and ticket sales, as well as oblige the company, even more than in the past, to become the cradle for American opera.

I urge my colleagues to please support H.R. 4542 and to designate the Washington Opera as the National Opera.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4542.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING CONGRESSIONAL PHILHARMONIC SOCIETY

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 229) expressing the sense of Congress regarding the United States Congressional Philharmonic Society and its mission of promoting musical excellence throughout the educational system and encouraging people of all ages to commit to the love and expression of musical performance.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 229

Whereas in February 1996, several Senators and members of the House of Representatives participated in a performance of the Broadway musical ''1776'', a story depicting the signing of the Declaration of Independence;

Whereas in April 1996 several Senators and members of the House of Representatives met with Maestro Martin Piecuch, the music director of the musical ''1776'', and formed the United States Congressional Choral Society;

Whereas on May 20, 1998, the United States Congressional Choral Society debuted at St. Joseph's Church on Capitol Hill, with standing ovations following its rendition of the ''Song of Democracy'' and the ''Battle Hymn of the Republic'';

Whereas on March 13, 1999, the United States Congressional Philharmonic Orchestra String Quartet played before the Ambassador to the United States from Canada at the Embassy of Canada in the District of Columbia;

Whereas on March 19, 1999, the United States Congressional Choral Society appeared in performance at the Washington National Cathedral;

Whereas on May 13, 1999, the United States Congressional Philharmonic Orchestra String Quartet played before a gathering of Ambassadors at the Benjamin Franklin Diplomatic Reception Room of the United States Department of State;

Whereas the United States Congressional Philharmonic Society is approved as a 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization under the Internal Revenue Code and is a corporation in good standing under the laws of the State of Delaware;

Whereas the United States Congressional Philharmonic Society will offer free concerts to the public in the Washington metropolitan area;

Whereas the United States Congressional Philharmonic Society will encourage the development of young musical talent across the United States by providing educational programs for schools across the nation and establishing internships and scholarships; and

Whereas the United States Congressional Philharmonic Society envisions holding a series of concerts focusing on themes such as Celebrations of America, Salutes to the States, a Great Americans series, and an International Congressional Concert series: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the United States Congressional Philharmonic Society should be applauded—

(1) for organizing two musical groups, the United States Congressional Choral Society and the United States Congressional Philharmonic Orchestra;

(2) for having as its mission the promotion of patriotism, freedom, democracy, and understanding of American culture through sponsorship, management, and support of these groups and their derivative ensembles as they communicate through the international language of music in concerts and other multimedia performances in the District of Columbia and throughout the United States and the world; and

(3) for promoting musical excellence throughout the educational system, from pre-school through post-graduate, and encouraging people of all ages to commit to the love and expression of musical performance.

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

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

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

I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 229 expressing the sense of Congress regarding the United States Congressional Philharmonic Society and its dual mission, promoting musical excellence throughout the educational system and encouraging people of all ages to commit to the love and expression of musical performance.

In February 1996, several Members of Congress participated in the performance of the Broadway musical 1776, a story depicting the signing of the Declaration of Independence. I practiced and rehearsed and then was unable to participate. The Members of Congress so enjoyed this experience that as an outgrowth, the United States Congressional Choral Society was founded in April 1996. The Congressional Choral Society is composed of Members, staff and friends of the United States Congress. In fact, I have also performed with the choral society.

On May 20, 1998, the Congressional Choral Society debuted along with the Washington Symphony Orchestra at St. Joseph's Church on Capitol Hill with standing ovations following their rendition of the Song of Democracy and the Battle Hymn of the Republic. The marriage of the Congressional Choral Society and the Washington Symphony Orchestra gave birth to the idea and the eventual reality of a congressional Philharmonic orchestra. The United States Congressional Philharmonic Society is the institution principally responsible for the formation, development, and operation of the United States Congressional Philharmonic Orchestra and the United States Congressional Choral Society which, I might add, I have chaired in all 15 years of its existence.

The vision of the Congressional Philharmonic Society is to become the artistic voice of America through the international language of music. The society will do that by encouraging congressional Members, staff, and friends of the United States Congress to use their musical resources and talents. Given those talents and resources, the society can accept invitations to present musical programs and intends to present musical performances that will enrich lives all across America with patriotic and classical presentations.

The mission of the Congressional Philharmonic Society is to promote patriotism, freedom, democracy, understanding, and world peace through

music. That mission will be accomplished by sponsoring, managing, and supporting the Congressional Choral Society and the Congressional Symphony Orchestra as they communicate through the international language of music in concerts and other multimedia performances.

House Concurrent Resolution 229 is simple and straightforward. It notes that the Congressional Philharmonic Society is approved as a 501(c)3 nonprofit organization under the Internal Revenue Code, offers free concerts to the public in the Washington metropolitan area, and encourages the development of young musical talent across the United States by providing internships, scholarships, and educational programs for schools across the Nation.

This resolution states that it is the sense of the Congress that the United States Congressional Philharmonic Society should be applauded for having as its mission the promotion of patriotism, freedom, democracy, and understanding of American culture through the international language of music; and for promoting musical excellence throughout the educational system, and encouraging people of all ages to commit to the love and expression of musical performance.

I would like to thank the gentleman from Virginia—Mr. DAVIS—for introducing this resolution, and I would urge my colleagues to support House Concurrent Resolution 229 and the Congressional Philharmonic Society.

1230

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

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

I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 229, and I am again amazed at the multitalented nature of the chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce. I was not aware that he also performed in these organizations beyond his work on the committee of setting a national education policy, but he is truly a Renaissance man.

Madam Speaker, I support the legislation and the prime sponsor of it, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS). We came to the Congress together, and I hold him in high esteem.

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

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I appreciate his efforts in bringing this bill to the floor.

I rise today as the proud sponsor of H. Con. Res. 229, which expresses the sense of Congress regarding the United States Philharmonic Society and its mission of promoting musical excellence throughout the educational system and encouraging people of all ages to commit to the joy and expression of musical performance.

I believe that all Americans should have the opportunity to participate in music and art programs. Arts education programs and, specifically, music education programs have a positive impact on the lives of our children. Music education is a valuable lesson that serves to enrich our children and our society, and the United States Congressional Philharmonic Society plays a vital role in accomplishing these goals.

The United States Congressional Philharmonic Society has created its own unique and appropriate mission which promotes patriotism, freedom, democracy, and understanding of American culture through sponsorship, management, and support of these groups and their derivative ensembles as they communicate through the international language of music in concerts and other multimedia performances in the United States and the world.

Under the organization of Maestro Martin Piecuch, the Congressional Philharmonic Society has quickly established itself as a voice of freedom and democracy through the art of music. Maestro Piecuch can be credited with planting the seed for the Congressional Philharmonic Society when he directed the Broadway musical 1776 at DAR Constitution Hall in March of 1995 in which 12 Members of Congress played roles as the Founding Fathers of this great Nation.

As the music director and conductor of the Washington Symphony Orchestra, the maestro has played a great role in the world of music for the citizens of Northern Virginia. He has served as resident conductor, orchestra manager, and chorus manager at Wolf Trap Farm Park for the Performing Arts and held the position of music director and conductor with the Alexandria Choral Society.

The United States Congressional Philharmonic Society has developed a concert series to promote democracy and peace throughout the world. Most recently, on May 13, 2000, the String Quartet of the United States Congressional Philharmonic Orchestra performed in the United States Department of State Diplomatic Reception Room before the ambassadors to America representing the South African Development countries.

I would also like to thank former United States Senator Charles Percy for his support of the Congressional Philharmonic Society. Senator Percy's leadership and guidance have played a great role in Society's formation.

Madam Speaker, the United States Congressional Philharmonic Society is a living example of how our country's principles of freedom and liberty can be showcased to the entire world through music. I urge all Members to join us in supporting this resolution.

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

I do want to mention that the Capitol Hill Choral Society which I chair was the brainchild of Betty Buchanan who has been our director for 13 years, and she is the wife of our former colleague, Congressman John Buchanan. We have given many concerts with junior high choruses throughout Washington, D.C.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 229.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLING. 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. 229.

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

There was no objection.

RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANCE OF AFRICAN-AMERICAN MUSIC

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 509) recognizing the importance of African-American music to global culture and calling on the people of the United States to study, reflect on, and celebrate African-American music, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 509

Whereas artists, songwriters, producers, engineers, educators, executives, and other professionals in the music industry provide inspiration and leadership through their creation of music, dissemination of educational information, and financial contributions to charitable and community-based organizations;

Whereas African-American music is indigenous to the United States and originates from African genres of music;

Whereas African-American genres of music such as gospel, blues, jazz, rhythm and blues, rap, the Motown sound, and hip-hop have their roots in the African-American experience;

Whereas African-American music has a pervasive influence on dance, fashion, language, art, literature, cinema, media, advertisements, and other aspects of culture;

Whereas the prominence of African-American music in the 20th century has reawakened interest in the legacy and heritage of the art form of African-American music;

Whereas African-American music embodies the strong presence of, and significant contributions made by, African-Americans in the music industry and society as a whole;

Whereas the multibillion dollar African-American music industry contributes greatly to the domestic and worldwide economy;

Whereas African-American music has a positive impact on and broad appeal to diverse groups, both nationally and internationally; and

Whereas in 1979 President Carter recognized June as African-American Music Month, and President Clinton subsequently recognized June as African-American Music Month: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the importance of the contributions of African-American music to global culture and the positive impact of African-American music on global commerce; and

(2) calls on the people of the United States to take the opportunity to study, reflect on, and celebrate the majesty, vitality, and importance of African-American music.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 509.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in support of H. Res. 509 offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH), a very important member of our Committee on Education and the Workforce. I particularly want to call to all of my colleagues' attention that the gentleman has indicated that we will have a most memorable and enjoyable meeting in the City of Brotherly Love when our convention meets there. He has assured me that the bad name that the city gets on sporting events from time to time has nothing to do with the people of the City of Brotherly Love. I think he said they come from across the river, the ones that cause the trouble. Now he is in trouble with the people across the river.

Madam Speaker, African-American music has been a part of the American and global culture for decades. From glorious gospel blues, jazz, rhythm and blues to rap and hip-hop, African-American music has influenced all aspects of our society in the form of dance, fashion, language, art, literature, cinema, media, and advertisements.

Throughout time, African-American artists, songwriters, educators, and other professionals in the music industry have provided inspiration and leadership through their creation of music, dissemination of educational information, and financial contributions to charitable and community-based organizations that had allowed African-American music to embody the strong presence of and significant contributions made by African Americans. All in all, African-American music has made a positive impact on and a broad appeal to diverse groups, both nationally and internationally.

Madam Speaker, this resolution is very simple. We want to rightly recognize and celebrate the magnificent contributions that African-American music has provided, not only in shaping the social and political fabric of our Nation, but to the global culture as well.

I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his leadership in authoring this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to vote in its support.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 509. I would like to thank the chairman of the committee for facilitating this legislation's appearance here on the floor, and I would share with him again that we look forward to welcoming the Republican National Convention in Philadelphia. It is the first time our city will be hosting a convention in the last 50 years.

Philadelphia is an appropriate place for either of our national parties to meet because it is the founding city of our country in which the document that was referred to earlier, the Declaration of Independence, was penned. Notwithstanding a few people who do not live in our city who may come to a sporting event and not act appropriately, the citizens of our city have agreed that they are going to be Republicans for a whole week when they come for the convention.

Then, on this particular legislation, Philadelphia has played and continues to play, a very important role in the development of African-American music from the Philadelphia Sound, and Marian Anderson, and a host of others. This year I have introduced this resolution, particularly in honor of the late great Grover Washington, Jr. and Curtis Mayfield who both have passed, but the contributions of African Americans in the field of music are well known; and they go through all of the different types of music, from gospel to jazz to hip-hop and the like.

Madam Speaker, I want to thank the majority, particularly the chairman, for allowing this resolution. It is important because, in this month of June under the leadership of the International African-American Music Association under the leadership of Diana Williams, there will be an important acknowledgment, and this dates back decades now from Jimmy Carter up through President Bill Clinton, acknowledging this month, and I think it is appropriate that the Congress does likewise. I want to thank all of my colleagues and hope for favorable consideration of this resolution.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Madam Speaker. I rise today to express my support for House Resolution 509 which extolls the contributions of African-American music to American culture. I would like to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Chairman GOODLING, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. FATTAH, for their fine work in crafting this resolution and also for allowing me to insert language into this bill recognizing the importance of the Motown Sound.

Motown, as many of us will remember, Madam Speaker, is the recording label started in Detroit, Michigan back in 1959.

The Motown story is the story of Berry Gordy, Jr., who was born in Detroit, Michigan on November 28, 1929. He was the seventh of eight children of Berry, Sr. and Bertha Gordy who themselves moved to Detroit from the South. After being drafted into the Army in 1951, he obtained his high school equivalency degree while in the Army. When Berry got out of the Army 1953, he opened a jazz-oriented record store called the 3–D Record Mart with his family's help. By 1955, the store had failed and Berry was working on the Ford automobile assembly line. While working on the line, Berry constantly wrote songs, submitting them to magazines, contests, and singers. His first break as a songwriter came in 1957 when Jackie Wilson recorded ''Reet Petite'', a song he, his sister Gwen and Billy Davis (under the pseudonym of Tyran Carlo) had written. ''Reet Petite'' became a modest hit and netted Berry $1,000 for the song. The rest, as they say, is history—a wonderful history of African-American contributions to American music and culture.

The list of entertainers that share their roots in Motown is long and incredibly distinguished. Their music forms an integral part of the American experience. This list includes Jackie Wilson, the Miracles, the Four Tops, Marvelettes, Martha and the Vandellas, Supremes, the Temptations, Marvin Gaye, Stevie Wonder, Mary Wells, Mickey Stevenson, Smokey Robinson, Holland-Dozier-Holland, the Funk Brothers, Gladys Knight and the Pips, the Isley Brothers, Diana Ross and the Supremes, Marvin Gaye, Michael Jackson, the Jackson 5, the Commodores, and Lionel Ritchie to name only a few. Motown afforded these and many other talented performers the opportunity to showcase their music to all of America.

In 1970 Motown established a new subsidiary label called Black Forum that released the historical speeches of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., Stokely Carmichael and black poets such as Langston Hughes and Margaret Danner. The Motown label continues to thrive today, ensuring that future generations will be able to enjoy this rich musical tradition.

For ready information about Motown I would like to express a special thank you to Mike Callahan and his web page, http://www.bsnpubs.com/motownstory.html. I would also like to recommend and thank the web site of the Recording Institute Of Detroit at http://www.recordingeq.com/motown.htm. There you can find a photo essay tour of the Motown Historical Museum guided by Robert Dennis, Former Mastering Supervisor, Motown. For the museum's excellent photos I would like to thank Nick David for REQ and the Motown Historical Museum. An in-person visit is always better. You can contact the museum at (313) 875–2264.

The Motown Historical Museum is housed in two adjacent and connected buildings at 2648 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Michigan. These are the two original buildings out of the eight West Grand Boulevard buildings that

Motown owned on the boulevard in the 1960's—before the company moved its headquarters to a ten-story office building on Woodward Avenue in downtown Detroit. The Motown Studio A remained at Hitsville, USA.

In light of Motown's historic musical contribution, I felt it necessary that we include recognition of the Motown Sound in this resolution and highlight a fantastic chapter of the Detroit area's place in history. Congratulations and thank you to Motown!

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

Mr. GOODLING. Madam Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues to support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 509, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. GOODLING. 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.

LES ASPIN POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4241) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1818 Milton Avenue in Janesville, Wisconsin, as the ''Les Aspin Post Office Building''.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4241

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

SECTION 1. LES ASPIN POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1818 Milton Avenue in Janesville, Wisconsin, shall be known and designated as the ''Les Aspin Post Office Building''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Les Aspin Post Office Building''.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Former Congressman Les Aspin faithfully served the people of Wisconsin's First Congressional District for over 20 years as their elected representative. During his time in Congress, he was a credit to this institution we now serve in. A former U.S. Army captain, Aspin served as the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services from 1985 to 1993. When the President called on him, Aspin continued his hard work to improve our Nation's security by serving as the U.S. Secretary of Defense from 1993 to 1994. This dedicated public servant passed away, unfortunately, on May 21, 1995 at the age of 56.

Wisconsinites are very proud of Congressman Aspin and all that he has done for Wisconsin's First District and the Nation. I believe that it would be appropriate to honor the late Congressman Aspin by naming the U.S. Post Office in Janesville, Wisconsin, my own hometown, as the Les Aspin Post Office Building. Aspin's former Janesville office had been housed in the old Janesville Post Office downtown, which is now the Keeley Pharmacy, for over 2 decades.

As the Congressman who currently serves the First Congressional District, and as a member of the opposite party that Congressman Aspin served from, I believe that this still would be a fitting tribute to Congressman Aspin, especially since this marks the 30th anniversary to the year he was first elected to this congressional seat.

Les Aspin embodied honest public service and his example continues to inspire Members of Congress today. I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Postal Service, and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), the chairman of the Committee on Government Reform, for their cooperation and leadership in bringing this bill to the floor today, and I would urge my colleagues to honor a great American statesman who gave much to this institution and to support H.R. 4241.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

1245

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4241, joining my colleague, the gentleman from the great State of Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

Les Aspin was a leader here in this Congress for many, many years dealing with issues related to national defense and the Armed Forces, but moreover, was a public servant who provided an extraordinary level of leadership to our Nation. He is someone who, as is obvious by the sponsorship of this bill, who enjoyed respect and support on both sides of the aisle. I would like to compliment the gentleman for the introduction.

Madam Speaker, we look forward to favorable, if not unanimous, support for this bill.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI).

Mr. PETRI. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin, for yielding time to me.

I would like to commend him for taking the leadership to bring this measure before the House today to honor a distinguished son of the State of Wisconsin and a friend of mine, Les Aspin.

While a member of the Democratic Party, Les was a person who took his responsibilities as a United States Representative, not as a party representative, seriously. He often broke party ranks to take actions that he felt were right, and his leadership influenced many others in this body, so that it ended up being quite effective.

I can remember myself wondering whether it made sense for us to get involved in military action in the Gulf at the time of that crisis, when Kuwait was invaded, or whether we should, as many counseled at the time, rely on an embargo, which is still in effect, to bring down Saddam Hussein and roll back the troops.

Les took the well of this House and repeatedly urged us to use military force, overwhelming military force, and predicted that if we marshalled that force it would not be effectively resisted, and we would have, and gasps went from the crowd, if any casualties, casualties in the hundreds, not the thousands.

At the time, people were predicting a quagmire and tens of thousands of American troops and allied troops losing their lives. While it did not seem to many that plausible at the time, Les proved to be absolutely right. His counsel by a narrow vote was followed, and we did roll back the invasion of Kuwait, and set an example that we hope will deter others from taking similar action.

He broke ranks from the military community in opposing the B–2 weapons system. He broke ranks again with party orthodoxy in supporting, but in a moderate way, the SDI, Strategic Defense Initiative, feeling that we should not try in Congress to cut it off, we should not throw money at it, but we should invest in research in that area, as we could prudently and as the defense community indicated could be absorbed.

He was well respected, a former educator, an economist at the Marquette University, and a person who has been honored by Marquette University; there is the Aspin Institute here in this city, which trains many young people who come out to learn about government. I have been pleased to have a number of Aspin Institute scholars in my own office. Others in Congress I think can say the same.

I really am very, very pleased that my colleague and the worthy successor of former Defense Secretary and former Representative Les Aspin, former chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, has chosen to honor Mr. Aspin in this way.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA).

Mrs. MORELLA. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time

to me, and for introducing this resolution to name the building for somebody with whom many of us did serve in this House of Representatives who truly was a great statesman.

He started off with a great education, certainly, having gone through the Milwaukee schools, entering higher education, and then he became a professor, serving very well. He went through the staff positions where he worked for Senator Proxmire. He also worked for Walter Heller, who was the chairman of President Kennedy's Council on Economic Advisors.

Also, he served as a captain in the United States Army. He was an economic adviser to the Secretary of Defense. Then he was elected to the House of Representatives in the 92nd Congress. Then he was reelected to the 11 succeeding Congresses, serving, therefore, from 1971 in January until he resigned in January of 1993.

While serving here in Congress, he was a member of the Committee on Armed Forces, and he was its chairman from the 99th through the 102nd Congresses. We then know he became Secretary of Defense until his resignation in 1994.

Additionally, from August, 1994, until his death at the age of 57 in 1995, he was professor of international policy, Washington Center for Government, Marquette University. He was also chair of the Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board and of the Commission on the Roles and Capabilities of the United States Intelligence Community.

I want to point out, Madam Speaker, that here is a man who, from the beginning of his career until the very end at age 57, devoted himself in so many ways to the greatness of our country. He was indeed a patriot and a public servant.

I want to congratulate our colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), sponsor of the legislation, having introduced it in recognition of his predecessor, Les Aspin, who served this Nation and his constituency for many years with great ability, dedication, and finesse. I think he is indeed deserving of having the Post Office located on 1818 Milton Avenue in Janesville, Wisconsin, named after him. I urge all our colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Just to briefly reiterate, Madam Speaker, Les Aspin served the First Congressional District for 22 years; served as Secretary of Defense, was a scholar, was a professor and academic. He was known as a good statesman, as an honest man.

Whether we agreed or disagreed on a given issue with Les Aspin, we always knew that he thought issues through, and that he was going to give good service to the First Congressional District of Wisconsin. He was a gifted statesman. His memory will live on for quite a while.

We thought it would be especially fitting that the Janesville, Wisconsin, Post Office be renamed after Les Aspin, given the fact that his own office was housed in the old Janesville Post Office for a good 20 years. I might add, Madam Speaker, that the Janesville City Council has passed a resolution affirming the designation of this Post Office.

Madam Speaker, I ask passage of this measure.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4241, legislation designating the United States Post Office in Janesville, Wisconsin as the ''Les Aspin Post Office Building.''

Les Aspin was a larger-than-life political icon who represented Wisconsin's 1st Congressional District in the U.S. House of Representatives from 1971 to 1993. After being successfully reelected in 1992, Les was appointed by President Bill Clinton to become this nation's 18th Secretary of Defense, a position he held until February 3, 1994.

Les accomplished much in his nearly 57 years. Born in Milwaukee, Les received a B.A. from Yale University in 1960, an M.A. from Oxford University in 1962 where he was a Rhodes Scholar, and earned a Ph.D. in economics from MIT in 1965. As an officer in the U.S. Army from 1966 to 1968, Les served as a systems analyst in the Pentagon under Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara. In 1970, after first contemplating running for other state offices, Les was elected to the House of Representatives, where he served for the next 22 years.

Once in the House, Les soon developed a special interest and expertise in defense matters. In 1985, as a junior member of the House Committee on Armed Services, Les leap-frogged Members much more senior to become chair of this powerful committee. As chair, Les proved to be a straight shooter, not one to always toe his party's political line. Les was a strong early supporter of the Persian Gulf War, predicting in advance that the U.S.'s military force would drive the Iraqis from Kuwait. In a paper written prior to the war, Les stated that the United States could win a quick military victory with light casualties. The accuracy of his prediction lent credence to his already strong reputation. As chair, Les' sentinel work on reshaping the Armed Forces after the demise of the Soviet Union was instrumental in the formation of post-Cold War strategies and policies for this nation.

In turn, Presidential candidate Bill Clinton relied on Les for his wisdom and once elected named him as his first defense secretary. During his tenure at the Pentagon, Les dealt with such weighty issues as base closures, a shrinking Pentagon budget, and the growing threat of regional conflicts. As Secretary, Les will always be remembered for instituting the ''bottom-up'' review which took the first hard look at the organizational structure of the military in a post-Cold War world.

After leaving the Pentagon in early 1994, Les joined the faculty of Marquette University's international affairs program in Washington, D.C. In March 1995, be became a member of the Commission on Roles and Missions. In May, President Clinton chose him as chairman of the President's Foreign Intelligence Advisory Board. In March 1995, he began work as chairman of still another study group, this on the Roles and Capabilities of the Intelligence Community. Shortly thereafter, on May 21, 1995, he died of a stroke.

Les was a brilliant man who, through his tremendous energy and work ethic, worked tirelessly to shape this nation's vision for defense policy and armed forces to meet the changing demands of the 21st century. His intellect and perspective are sorely missed.

Wisconsin has sent a number of nationally known historical leaders to represent them in Washington. Robert LaFollette, Melvin Laird, Bill Proxmire and Gaylord Nelson to name just a few. Without question, Les Aspin's name must be certainly added to this list.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my colleagues in paying tribute to former Congressman, Les Aspin.

Mr. ORTIZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4241, to rename the Janesville, Wisconsin, Post Office the Les Aspin Post Office Building.

I served with Les from 1985 until 1993, when he left to serve the Clinton Administration as Secretary of Defense. Les was an incredibly talented public servant with a mind that worked quickly and saw the complexity of problems, both near-term and long-term. He was an amazing man who never lost touch with the people he represented. He could talk to farmers and mechanics as easily as he talked to presidents and prime ministers, a trait I greatly admire. He never lost a political race and worked his entire life to make this country a better place to live.

I think he surprised us all when he challenged Mel Price for the Chairmanship of the House Armed Services Committee, but for the face of the House Representatives, it was indeed a good thing. Les brought a new mindset and new way of thinking to the different problems that we faced as a country in the aftermath of the Cold War. He served in the Army for 2 years and understood the nature of the animal.

As the Secretary of Defense, he led the efforts to address the Quadrennial Defense Review to assess the needs of our military on a regular basis. From this effort came the philosophy that the United States may well need to fight two wars in the not-too-distant future and in the course of that scenario, a rogue state could easily attack the United States or exercise acts of terrorism against us. Les dubbed the U.S. strategy scenario in this instance as ''win-hold-win.'' If the U.S. was indeed in the two-war scenario, Les devised a strategy that would win one war, hold our ground on a second war, and win the third.

Thankfully, we have not seen this worst-case scenario, fighting on two fronts and holding a third, but we have seen terrorism against the U.S. interests around the world, and despotism in Europe (again) required our military response there. Les Aspin's ideas changed the way the House Armed Services Committee operated and changed the way the United States assessed threats and disposed of resources.

Les Aspin made this a better country and was wholly dedicated to public service. I am proud that we will be naming the Janesville Post Office after this great American. I hope Les Aspin's name on the building will inspire pride in the young people in his community who did not have the opportunity to know this politically savvy, academically gifted creative thinker.

Mr. KLECZKA. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4241, legislation which will

rename the post office in Janesville, Wisconsin, as the ''Les Aspin Post Office Building.''

One of Wisconsin's favorite son's Les Aspin served his home state with distinction during his eleven terms as Congressman from the First District. He went on to serve the Clinton Administration as its first Secretary of Defense. He served his home state and his country with great honor.

Les began and ended his professional career as a professor at Marquette University in Milwaukee. The university's Washington program, which brings students to our Nation's capitol to experience firsthand the way our government works, was renamed in 1996 the Les Aspin Center for Government in his honor. I know Les would be proud to know that the institute which bears his name is building upon his legacy by teaching future generations of leaders about the values of civic involvement and public service.

Madam Speaker, throughout Les' service to his country, his love and commitment to his home state remained deep and unwavering. Today we have the opportunity to further recognize the outstanding achievements of one of our former colleagues who left us far too soon. Renaming the post office in Janesville as the Les Aspin Post Office Building is a fitting tribute to a man who served Wisconsin so well.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Madam Speaker, I rise today as an original cosponsor and strong support of H.R. 4241 which designates the facility of the U.S. Postal Service located at 1818 Milton Avenue in Janesville, Wisconsin, as the Les Aspin Post Office Building.

I had the distinguished honor of serving with Mr. Aspin. As a fellow Wisconsinite, I admired his dedication to public service that was evident throughout his tenure; not only as a Member of the House of Representatives, but as Secretary of Defense and Chairman of the President's Intelligence Advisory Board, to name just a few.

Secretary Aspin did not begin his life's devotion to the public in the political arena. He served this country in the U.S. Army from 1966 to 1968. He then entered politics and went on to served in this body from 1971 to 1993. He served as the Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee from 1985 to 1993. He was then appointed by President Clinton as his first Secretary of Defense.

Secretary Aspin was known to share his knowledge and passion for America in many circles. He continued his outreach by serving as a distinguished professor for Marquette University in Milwaukee, WI, and in Washington, DC. The naming of the Marquette University Washington program, the Les Aspin Center for Government, recognized his service to this program.

Secretary Aspin brought his love for his work and his sense of humor into her personal life as well. As an avid dog lover, my fellow Wisconsinite named his dog ''Junket,'' and Junket was equally comfortable and welcome in the office and at home.

I believe that H.R. 4241 is a fitting tribute to a man who gave tirelessly to the people he represented in Wisconsin during his tenure as Congressman and the country during his tenure as Secretary of Defense. I am honored to speak in support of H.R. 4241 and believe that the recognition it would lend to Secretary Aspin, is well deserved.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4241.

The question was taken.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. 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.

MATTHEW F. MCHUGH POST OFFICE

Mrs. MORELLA. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3030) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 757 Warren Road in Ithaca, New York, as the ''Matthew F. McHugh Post Office''.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3030

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

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 757 Warren Road in Ithaca, New York, shall be known and designated as the ''Matthew F. McHugh Post Office''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Matthew F. McHugh Post Office''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MORELLA. 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. 3030.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MORELLA. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY), has introduced the bill before us, H.R. 3030. Pursuant to the policy of the Committee on Government Reform, the entire House delegation of the State of New York has cosponsored this legislation.

The bill designates the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 757 Warren Road in Ithaca, New York, as the Matthew F. McHugh Post Office.

The Congressional Budget Office has reviewed H.R. 3030 and estimates that the enactment of the bill would have no significant impact on the Federal budget. Spending by the Postal Service is classified as off-budget, and thus is not subject to pay-as-you-go procedures.

Mr. McHugh studied at Mount St. Mary's College in Emmitsburg, Maryland, the State that I represent. He graduated Magna Cum Laude in 1960 and was the President of the student body. He then received his Juris Doctor from Villanova Law School, where he was the editor of the Law Review. He was city prosecutor in Ithaca, practiced law in Ithaca, New York, and was district attorney in Tompkins County, New York.

Matthew McHugh was the predecessor of the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) to Congress, and represented the 27th and 28th Congressional Districts of New York. Representative McHugh was elected to Congress in 1975 and he served until 1992. He served on the Committee on Appropriations, the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs, and the Subcommittee on Rural Development, Agriculture and Related Agencies from 1978 to 1992.

He served on numerous other committees and organizations while in the House, such as the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, where he was chairman of the Subcommittee on Legislation. He was acting chairman of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, and he served on the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families; the Committee on Veterans Affairs; the Committee on Agriculture; the Committee on the Interior; the Arms Control and Foreign Policy Caucus; and as the chairman of the Democratic Study Group.

After leaving the House, Mr. McHugh continued his participation in improving our Nation and the world. He is presently the counselor to the president of the World Bank in Washington, D.C., a position he assumed in 1993.

Prior to that, he was vice president, university counsel, and secretary to the Corporation of Cornell University in Ithaca, New York. He continues to serve in various capacities in organizations, such as the National Endowment for Democracy, the Central and East European Law Initiative of the American Bar Association, the International Crisis Group.

He is president of the Association of Former Members of Congress, Bread for the World, New York State Regents Commission on Higher Education, the Board of Consulters of the Villanova School of Law, and Chairman of the Board of Trustees of Mount St. Mary's College.

I had the pleasure of serving with Mr. McHugh and traveling with him internationally in pursuit of the best interests of our country with foreign affairs, and it is a great pleasure to be able to

speak on behalf of this bill to name the post office the Matthew F. McHugh Post Office.

I urge our colleagues to support H.R. 3030, honoring our former colleague by naming that postal facility at 757 Warren Road in Ithaca, New York, as the Matthew F. McHugh Post Office.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) will control the time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH).

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to speak on behalf of this initiative, which will name the postal facility in Ithaca, New York, after my dear friend, colleague, and predecessor, the Honorable Matthew F. McHugh.

It gives me particular pleasure to do so following the statements that have been just made by the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA), whose service with Mr. McHugh overlapped.

I know that Matt holds the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) in great respect and affection, as do I, and I know very well that he would be very pleased if he were in this room now to have just heard the very lovely and kind and warm remarks that she made about him, as I was just a moment ago.

1300

I want to thank the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) very much for what she has just said.

Also, I want to say that I too am honored to stand before you today to urge our support, the support of all the Members of the House, for H.R. 3030, which would rename the new post office building in Ithaca, New York, in honor of former Representative Matthew F. McHugh.

Matt was my predecessor in the House, and I know many people here who served with him. He served with distinction for nine terms as a member of the Committee on Appropriations for 14 years. Matt championed issues like hunger in Africa that brought him no particular glory and no attention. He was a passionate advocate for those who could not adequately defend themselves and a voice for meeting our international responsibilities in a humane way.

In his present position at the World Bank, and his many volunteer efforts, he remains a strong, dedicated leader in securing human rights for all.

Matt's road to Congress began like many Members, with a career in law. He first moved to Ithaca, New York, in 1968 to join a law firm in that city. Just 1 year later, he was elected as Tompkins County's district attorney, making him the first Democrat to hold a county-wide elected office there in decades.

In 1974, he was enlisted to run for the House seat which was then being vacated by former Representative Howard Robison, a very distinguished Republican who held that seat for a good many years and who was retiring at that moment. Matt McHugh won that seat and served the district admirably and well for 18 years.

When he retired from the House, he was widely praised by Members of both parties as well as in the press for his thoughtfulness, his fairness, and his integrity. A national columnist, upon the news of his retirement, wrote that Matt McHugh was an example of ''the best the House can offer.'' Our ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) said, and I quote, ''In my view, there is no Member of this House who more aptly sums up what public service ought to be all about than does Matt McHugh.''

Throughout his years in Congress, he made Ithaca his home. Ithacans continue to take pride in having sent a man of such distinction to the House of Representatives, and community leaders there have told me that they welcome such a permanent commemoration of Matt and his years of public service. Although he was never the kind of man to seek such honors, I know that he deserves recognition and this permanent commemoration of the service he gave will remind people of the fine example he set.

Naming the new Ithaca post office in his honor is one small way in which we can acknowledge his years of hard work, dedication, and commitment to the people of New York's 26th Congressional District.

I owe a special thanks also to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON), our friend and colleague, in whose district the post office lies, as well as to the gentleman from New York (Chairman MCHUGH) for his assistance in bringing this bill to the House. The gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON) served with Matt here for a number of years. They were, during that service, good friends; and they continue to be good friends to this day.

Matt still provides service for the country, as the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) has said, in his position as vice president and counsel to the president of the World Bank.

He was, in fact, a distinguished Member of this House; indeed, as many people referred to him during his service here, a man of the House. And he continues to be a strong, dedicated, faithful citizen of the United States. We all owe him a great thanks for his service to the country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE).

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

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I probably knew Matt McHugh for longer than anybody in this body, because I first met him at Villanova Law School in the early 1960s when we were both students there. Above and beyond being students together, we were counselors at that time to the undergraduate students at Villanova University. I also came to know his lovely wife, Alanna, then. They were dating at that time. And when we talk about a great human being, we have to think of two human beings, both Matt and his wonderful wife, Alanna.

From the very first day I knew him, through all of our 18 years in Congress together to today, there is no one I have ever respected more, both professionally and personally. Matt was the type of individual at law school who never had a bad word to say about anyone. If he had a bad thought, he kept it to himself. He only spoke well of others. He was a kind man, a gentle man as a law student.

Mr. Speaker, I remember the tremendous job he did when he was the district attorney in Tompkins County at the time of the uprisings at Cornell, and he handled it so judiciously, so appropriately.

He was elected to Congress in the great Watergate year, 1974. He was one of the ''Watergate Babies,'' and so was I. We were elected at the same time, and we came to Congress on the same day.

As Members, we always like to double check ourselves. Are we doing something right? Are we doing something wrong? And I always wanted to know how Matt McHugh was going to vote on an issue, because if his inclinations were the same as mine, I felt pretty secure in my conviction. And if his inclinations differed from mine, that would give me pause and concern, because I trusted his judgment and knew that he was, perhaps more than anything else, an intellectually honest person.

He was not a partisan. Sure, he was a Democrat more than Republican; he labeled himself as such. But he was not a partisan Democrat. He approached each and every issue on its merits.

There are not too many individuals we can say that of. He did not try to fool others. He tried to give the total truth, not just a half-truth that would serve his own purposes. But perhaps most importantly, he never attempted to fool himself. And the most difficult thing in the world is being honest with yourself.

So when we honor Matt McHugh, we are honoring one of the best persons who has ever served in this House. I am just grateful that he has continued to perform public service since he retired as a Member. When he and I first knew each other, we were counselors to students. Now he is the counselor to the president of the World Bank. And in that sense, he is not just affecting millions of people in the world, or billions, as we in Congress do, but virtually every person in the world in his position as counselor to the president of the World Bank.

Matt would be the first to say that having one's name carved in stone is

not a true measure of the person or of his impact on the world. But I and many others will take considerable pleasure in knowing that high above Cayuga's waters for decades to come, Matt's name will be seen by millions of Ithacans and other New Yorkers. And parents will tell their children, Matt McHugh? Oh, he is probably the best public servant this town, this county, this State has ever known.

Mr. Speaker, I hope you and all our colleagues will join me in supporting this honor for one of the best Members of Congress our institution has ever known, Matt McHugh.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from San Diego, California (Mr. FILNER).

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding me this time, and I thank him for introducing this motion for a great former Member of our body. I thank also the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON) for their support of this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I have the honor of rising in support of this measure to name the post office in Ithaca after Matthew McHugh. We have heard a lot about his legislative accomplishments, his work in the Committee on Appropriations, his work at the World Bank. I had the privilege of meeting Matt McHugh before he held any of those offices, a little after the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE) knew him.

I was a student at Cornell in 1968 when Matt McHugh was the Ithaca city prosecutor. ''Town and gown'' relations between Cornell and Ithaca were never very good, but in 1968 at the height of tensions around this country and at the Cornell campus, literally uprisings, the tensions were even worse. And yet the Ithaca city prosecutor was respected by students at Cornell, and he respected us as students.

It was that mutual respect and that mutual sense of good feeling which has characterized the career of Matt McHugh ever since that day.

At 30 years old, he was elected the first Democratic district attorney for Tompkins County, New York. Many students at Cornell, including myself, worked in that first campaign for Matt McHugh. The respect that he earned in that job, as the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE) intimated earlier, led to his election to Congress in 1974, again, as the first Democrat from that area in a very, very long time.

Now, Matt McHugh was the kind of man who kept up his relationships. He was never a man who was unfriendly; always a gracious, sharing, caring individual. I kept my relations with him as a Hill staffer in the 1970s and 80's. And what we are saying today, those who knew him and those who served with him, is that Matt McHugh saw politics as a noble profession. Everybody who knows Matt McHugh, and knew him as an elected official, learned that, in fact, politicians, elected officials, could be noble; that elected officials had not only intelligence and insight, but they had integrity and ethics, fairness, and in the case of Matt McHugh, grace.

His wife, Alanna, and his wonderful daughters, played a key role in all of his life. He was proud of them and they were proud of him, and he showed what a family in politics could do together.

Mr. Speaker, having lived in Ithaca for 10 years, and I think the only Cornell alumnus in this body at the present time, I know that all Ithacans will be proud that a post office in their city will be named after Matt McHugh.

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

Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank our friends, the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER), for their words about our dear friend, Matt McHugh. I also want to express my deep appreciation to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) for the wonderful and very thoughtful things that she said about our friend and colleague, Matt McHugh, as well.

Having followed him here to the House, I can say also without hesitation or fear of conviction that he set, while he was here, a very high standard indeed and he continues to set a high standard in his continuing public service at the World Bank.

We in New York are very, very proud of this man and the service that he has rendered to our State and to the country. It is with a great deal of pride that I offer this measure to the other Members of the House.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY) has introduced this resolution to name this post office. During my time with Matt McHugh here in the House of Representatives, I will also say that I found him to be fair, open-minded, warm, bipartisan, and a very committed professional.

I am pleased that he is continuing with his work with the World Bank, because he is helping those who are oppressed and those who need the Bank's services in other countries.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge this body to vote for H.R. 3030, to name the post office the ''Matthew F. McHugh Post Office.''

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3030.

The question was taken.

Mrs. MORELLA. 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.

1315

SHARK FINNING PROHIBITION ACT

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3535) to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to eliminate the wasteful and unsportsmanlike practice of shark finning, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3535

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 ''Shark Finning Prohibition Act''.

SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this Act is to eliminate the wasteful and unsportsmanlike practice of shark finning and to reduce the high mortality levels associated with shark finning in waters of the United States.

SEC. 3. PROHIBITION ON REMOVING SHARK FIN AND DISCARDING SHARK CARCASS AT SEA.

Section 307 of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1857) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (N) by striking ''or'' after the semicolon at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (O) by striking the period and inserting ''; or''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(P)(i) to remove any of the fins of a shark (including the tail) and discard the carcass of the shark at sea;

''(ii) to have custody, control, or possession of any such fin aboard a fishing vessel without the corresponding carcass; or

''(iii) to land any such fin without the corresponding carcass;''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) each will control 20 minutes.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHERWOOD. 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.R. 3535.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker I rise in support of H.R. 3535, the Shark Finning Prohibition Act, introduced by the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM). This legislation amends the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to prohibit the removal of shark fins, including the tail, and then discard the carcass into the sea; to prohibit having the custody, control, or possession of any such fin aboard a fishing vessel without the corresponding carcass; and to prohibit the

landing of such fins without the corresponding carcass.

The practice of shark finning is wasteful and wrong. In addition, the practice of shark finning is inconsistent with rules governing the harvest of sharks on the East Coast, in the Gulf of Mexico, and in the Caribbean. This legislation will make shark finning illegal in all U.S. waters.

The Subcommittee on Fisheries Conservation, Wildlife and Oceans reported H.R. 3535 by voice vote with one amendment on May 18, 2000. The full Committee on Resources then reported the bill without amendment by voice vote on May 24. This is a noncontroversial bill that should be supported by all Members.

Members may remember that the House reported a nonbinding resolution on this issue in October of last year which expresses the sense of Congress that the practice of shark finning is a wasteful and unsportsmanlike practice that could lead to overfishing of shark resources.

The resolution further encouraged Federal and State fishery managers to promptly and permanently end the practice of shark finning in all Federal and State waters in the Pacific. Regrettably, this has not occurred; and this legislation is, therefore, necessary.

I urge an aye vote on this important conservation legislation.

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

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the individuals from the Committee on Resources, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON), the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), and the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE).

I read in a magazine where sharks had literally been caught, the fin taken off, and then the sharks dumped back into the water still alive. I am a sportsman. I love to hunt and fish. But I also like management and preservation, and I do not like horrific practices when it comes to animals.

The committee has seen fit to bring first a resolution and now this bill, Mr. Speaker. This legislation before the House today will establish scientifically environmentally sound and responsible standards for all American fisheries in this particular issue.

The Shark Finning Prohibition Act has broad bipartisan support. It is strongly supported by Ocean Wildlife Campaign, the coalition includes Center for Marine Conservation, National Audubon Society, National Coalition of Marine Conservation, Natural Resources Defense Council, Wildlife Conservation Society, and the World Wildlife Fund. It is also supported by the State of Hawaii and the Office of Hawaiian Affairs, which had direct interest into this issue; the American Sportfishing Association; Recreational Fishing Alliance; the Sports Fishing Association of California; the Cousteau Society; Western Pacific Fisheries Coalition.

I would like to underscore, Mr. Speaker, that, according to the National Marine Fishery Service, in 1992, there was only 2,289 sharks taken. In just a short time, one can see the growth of the shark finning and the numbers that have actually been released. Over 78,000 sharks had been taken and only 982 were released.

H.R. 3535 will establish America as a worldwide leader in shark and conservation efforts.

I would like to thank my colleagues. When I came to Congress, I did not start off banning hunting and fishing and unsportsmanlike conduct on certain issues. But since then, the tuna-dolphin bill, protecting elephants, snow geese, the MSCP, which provides quarters for endangered species and such, this is good scientific basis for this particular bill. I would like to thank my colleagues for the support in a bipartisan support for this particular bill.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following letters for the RECORD, as follow:

OCEAN WILDLIFE CAMPAIGN,
Washington, DC, September 22, 1999.

Hon. RANDY CUNNINGHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CUNNINGHAM: We are writing to express serious concern regarding the management and health of shark populations in U.S. Pacific waters, specifically in areas under the jurisdiction of the Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council (WESPAC). Driven by the international demand for shark fin soup, the practice of shark finning—cutting of a shark's fins and discarding its carcass back into the ocean—is a rapidly growing problem that is directly responsible for huge increases in the number of sharks killed annually and appalling waste of this nation's living marine resources. The National Marine Fisheries Service has prohibited shark finning in the U.S. Atlantic, Gulf of Mexico, and Caribbean. It is time to ban finning in the Pacific.

Between 1991 and 1998, the number of sharks ''retained'' by the Hawaii-based swordfish and tuna longline fleet jumped from 2,289 and 60,857 annually. In 1998, over 98 percent of these sharks were killed for their fins to meet the demand for shark fin soup. Because shark fins typically comprise only one to give percent of a shark's bodyweight, 95 to 99 percent of the shark is going to waste. Sharks are particularly vulnerable to overfishing because of their ''life history characteristics''—slow growth, late sexual maturity, and the production of few young. Once depleted, a population may take decades to recover.

The National Marine Fisheries Service, conservationists, fishermen, scientists, and the public have pressured MESPAC to end the practice of shark finning. Nevertheless, WESPAC and the State of Hawaii recently failed to take action to end or control finning.

This issue of shark finning is characterized by a dangerous lack of management, rampant waste, and egregious inconsistencies with U.S. domestic and international policy stances. It is the most visible symptom of a larger problem: a lack of comprehensive management for sharks in U.S. Pacific waters. The history of poorly or unmanaged shark fisheries around the world is unequivocal: rapid decline followed by collapse. Sharks are not managed in U.S. Central and Western Pacific waters, and with increased fishing pressure there may be rapidly growing problems.

We urge your office to take whatever action is necessary to immediately end the destructive practice of shark finning in U.S. waters and encourage WESPAC to develop a comprehensive fishery management plan for sharks that will, among other things:

1. Immediately prohibit the finning of sharks;
2. Immediately reduce shark mortality levels by requiring the live release of all bycatch or ''incidentally caught'' animals brought to the boat alive;
3. Immediately reduce the bycatch of sharks;
4. Prevent overfishing by quickly establishing precautionary commercial and recreational quotas for sharks until a final comprehensive management plan is adopted that ensures the future health of the population. Given the dramatic increase in the number of sharks killed in the Hawaiian long line fishery, WESPAC should cap shark mortality at 1994 levels as a minimum interim action, pending the outcome of new population assessments.

Thank you for your attention to this urgent matter.

DAVID WILMONT, Ph.D.,
Ocean Wildlife Campaign.
CAROL SAFINA, Ph.D.,
National Audubon Society.
LISA SPEER,
Natural Resources Defense Council.
TOM GRASSO,
World Wildlife Fund.
SONJA FORDHAM,
Center for Marine Conservation.
KEN HINMAN,
National Coalition for Marine Conservation.
ELLEN PIKITCH, Ph.D.,
Wildlife Conservation Society.

STATE OF HAWAII
OFFICE OF HAWAIIAN AFFAIRS,
Honolulu, HI, February 3, 2000.

Hon. RANDY ''DUKE'' CUNNINGHAM,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CUNNINGHAM: The purpose of this letter is to strongly endorse H.R. 3535, which you recently introduced, banning shark finning in areas where the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act has jurisdiction.

As you are no doubt aware, there has been considerable outcry among the Native Hawaiian population, as well as the population at large in Hawaii, about the practice of shark finning. Currently there are five bills that have been introduced in our legislature to address a ban of Shark finning in waters in which the State has jurisdiction.

Because Hawaiian culture is integrally tied to the health, abundance, and access to indigenous natural resources, Hawaiians have always strived to play a stewardship role by sound management and protection of the natural environment on which the culture relies. Unfortunately, Hawaii is constantly endangered by the imposition of Western beliefs, customs, religions, and economic desires which do not necessarily hold similar views about the importance of the natural environment. Taking a small portion of a shark or any animal and wasting the remainder clearly runs counter to the Hawaiian stewardship views. Traditional use of sharks in Hawaiian cultural meant utilization of the entire animal.

Equally as important to Hawaiians is the cultural and spiritual significance of the shark itself. Many Hawaiian families hold the shark in special esteem as the physical manifestation (called kinolau) of their family guardian (aumakua), who was also regarded as a family ancestor. There are many other kinolau in Hawaiian culture, including the owl, lizard, dog, rocks, and clouds. Imagine the uproar that would arise if the Spotted Owl were to be taken, even as ''bycatch'' for its wings. The intensity of feeling about shark finning among Hawaiians is magnified a hundred-fold because of the special spiritual significance of the shark. To hurt or destroy the shark wantonly and intentionally is for many families equivalent to desecrating one's own ancestors and heritage. In summary, as recently noted by Hawaiian cultural practitioner Charles Kauluwehi Maxwell, the practice of shark finning is ''very offensive'' to Hawaiians.

Our Mahalo for your interest in this matter. We hope that the legislation will be reported out by the House Committee on Resources, and approved by the full House and the Senate. If we can be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me or Jerry B. Norris, our Federal Desk Officer at (808) 594–1758.

Sincerely,

COLETTE Y. MACHADO,
Chair, Committee on Legislative and Government Affairs.

AMERICAN SPORTFISHING ASSOCIATION,
Alexandria, VA, September 23, 1999.

Hon. RANDY ''DUKE'' CUNNINGHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR DUKE CUNNINGHAM: On behalf of the nearly 500 members of the American Sportfishing Association, I wish to express my strong support for your resolution to ban the wasteful practice of shark finning. I commend your initiative in tackling this important, yet easily dismissed issue.

For far too long, we have neglected to take action to stop this most unsportsmanlike fishing activity. We now know that the best shark is not a dead shark; that these oft maligned fish play critical roles in preserving balance in the marine ecosystem. Healthy shark populations help maintain robust fisheries. Your effort to ban finning will not only benefit depressed shark populations, but many other species of commercially and recreationally important fish.

Thank you for your leadership in this area.

Sincerely,

Hon. MIKE HAYDEN,
President/CEO.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3535, the Shark Finning Prohibition Act that is authored by the gentleman from California (Mr. Cunningham) who just spoke in the well.

Shark finning is currently one of the most visible and controversial conservation issues in the waters of the Pacific Ocean. While the practice of finning has already been banned in Federal waters in the Atlantic, Gulf of Mexico, and the Caribbean, as well as waters of 11 coastal States, it remains unregulated in the Pacific.

As a result, and because of the strong demand and the high price of shark fins in Asia, the harvest of shark fins in the Pacific has increased over the past 7 years by more than 2,000 percent. More than 60,000 sharks were caught and killed in 1998 alone, and 98 percent of those sharks were killed simply for their fins, or less than 5 percent of their body weight, and then the shark was dumped overboard to die. This is wrong. It is culturally wrong. It is morally wrong. It is certainly wrong in terms of the laws of conservation and maintaining this species.

In addition, shark finning is inconsistent with U.S. policy, both domestically and internationally. In the United States, it is contrary to the Magnuson Act which requires fisherman to reduce bycatch and the mortality of bycatch that cannot be avoided. Given that 85 percent of the sharks caught are alive when they reach the boats, prohibiting the finning of these sharks will reduce bycatch by significant amounts.

The Shark Finning Prohibition Act will not prevent U.S. fishermen from harvesting sharks, bringing them to shore, and then using the fins or any of the other parts of the shark. Instead, it would simply prevent cutting off of the fins and disposal of carcass at sea, or the transport or landing of fins harvested in this manner by another fishing vessel.

This is good legislation. The House should support it. We should put an end to these kinds of very narrow and greedy practices by some nations that devastate, in this case, the shark species, but it is rampant in other parts of the world with respect to other species. This is a good legislation. The House should support it.

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

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA).

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I do rise in strong support of H.R. 3535, the Shark Finning Prohibition Act. I do want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) for introducing this measure, and I want to thank the Committee on Resources for expeditiously approving the legislation which we have found out is certainly needed.

H.R. 3535 would bring an end to the abhorrent wasteful and unsportsmanlike practice of shark finning in American waters. The legislation will ban both the act of shark finning and the possession of shark fins without a shark carcass.

Mr. Speaker, for those who are unfamiliar with the practice, the repugnant act of shark finning is a removal of a shark's fins and subsequent dumping of the dying or dead shark back into the ocean. It is a wasteful and environmentally harmful practice. The legislation to ban shark finning is strongly supported by a coalition of environmental and recreational organizations.

U.S. law currently prohibits shark finning in the Federal waters of the U.S. Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico. However, we know that the demand for shark fins from the Pacific Ocean is dramatically increasing. According to the National Marine Fisheries Service, more than 60,000 Pacific sharks were killed in 1998. Almost 100,000 of these sharks were killed solely for their fins.

Mr. Speaker, as an original cosponsor of H.R. 3535, I urge swift passage of this legislation to immediately end repulsive shark finning.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3535, the Shark Finning Prohibition Act.

In the continental United States, there is obviously a strong feeling that shark finning is a wasteful, abhorrent practice which has no place in U.S. waters. It is seen as contrary to current effort to maintain ecological balance in our oceans, and wasteful in that less than 5% of a shark's mass is comprised of its fins, with the rest of the carcass thrown back into the water unused. Many feel that the trade-off between the loss of life for the benefit of a good-tasting soup, much of which is consumed in Asia, balanced against the amount of waste and the importance of the fishery is tipped significantly in favor of the fishery.

I understand the economic incentives which drive this activity. A small cup of shark fin soup costs $100 in parts of Asia and is considered a delicacy just as much as chocolate-covered ants, snails, and horse meat are in other cultures.

Most of the sharks caught and finned in Hawaii-area waters are a bycatch from long-line fishing boats which are targeting tuna and swordfish. But sharks are not the only bycatch or miscellaneous fish caught and then discarded as waste because they do not have the same market value as tuna or swordfish, and I do not find it particularly reassuring that we are addressing the blue shark problem and ignoring a problem of much greater magnitude with other miscellaneous fish. The killing of these fish just because they are unwanted should be of no less of concern to all of us. We should also be addressing that problem, but are not because we do not have adequate stock assessments of most stocks. Part of the blame for this lies with the National Marine Fishery Service for not requesting additional funding to carry out this research, but part of the problem lies with the Congress as well, for not funding this important work.

Obviously the United States alone cannot adequately address the problem of shark finning, as many other countries participate in this fishery as well. The United States is responsible for only a very small percentage of this industry, and I hope the Administration addresses this subject through international treaty. In the Pacific, the management commission being developed by the Multilateral High level Conference would be appropriate.

As introduced, this legislation did not address the issue of transshipment of shark fins through U.S. ports. The practice of shark finning in international waters by foreign fishing vessels, and then shipping the fins from U.S. ports to foreign countries, is significant. To partially address this problem, I offered an amendment in Subcommittee to prohibit this practice, and I want to thank the majority for accepting that amendment. I hope that our next step will be to address the issue of shark fins transshipped through U.S. ports as bonded cargo. In response to a question I asked

the Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council earlier this year, the Council reported that approximately 200 tons of dried shark fins are transported through U.S. Pacific ports as bonded cargo.

There are groups in the Pacific that support a ban on shark finning; however, the Western Pacific Fishery Management Council, the entity tasked by law with management of the fisheries in the U.S. Central and Western Pacific Ocean, has repeatedly said that there is insufficient data on which to make that decision. While I do not agree with the Western Pacific Council on this one issue, I do wish to acknowledge the Council's work in including pelagic sharks in its management of pelagic fisheries dating as far back as 1987. To its credit, the Council has also taken aggressive conservation action in many other areas since it was established.

I want to thank Congressmen CUNNINGHAM, Chairman, DON YOUNG and SAXTON, and Congressman GEORGE MILLER for the active roles they have taken in moving this legislation forward, and I look forward to seeing the passage of the bill later today.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3535, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. SHERWOOD. 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.

CARLSBAD IRRIGATION PROJECT ACQUIRED LAND TRANSFER ACT

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 291) to convey certain real property within the Carlsbad Project in New Mexico to the Carlsbad Irrigation District.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 291

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 ''Carlsbad Irrigation Project Acquired Land Transfer Act''.

SEC. 2. CONVEYANCE.

(a) LANDS AND FACILITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), and subject to subsection (c), the Secretary of the Interior (in this Act referred to as the ''Secretary'') may convey to the Carlsbad Irrigation District (a quasi-municipal corporation formed under the laws of the State of New Mexico and in this Act referred to as the ''District''), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the lands described in subsection (b) (in this Act referred to as the ''acquired lands'') and all interests the United States holds in the irrigation and drainage system of the Carlsbad Project and all related lands including ditch rider houses, maintenance shop and buildings, and Pecos River Flume.

(2) LIMITATION.—

(A) RETAINED SURFACE RIGHTS.—The Secretary shall retain title to the surface estate (but not the mineral estate) of such acquired lands which are located under the footprint of Brantley and Avalon dams or any other project dam or reservoir division structure.

(B) STORAGE AND FLOW EASEMENT.—The Secretary shall retain storage and flow easements for any tracts located under the maximum spillway elevations of Avalon and Brantley Reservoirs.

(b) ACQUIRED LANDS DESCRIBED.—The lands referred to in subsection (a) are those lands (including the surface and mineral estate) in Eddy County, New Mexico, described as the acquired lands and in section (7) of the ''Status of Lands and Title Report: Carlsbad Project'' as reported by the Bureau of Reclamation in 1978.

(c) TERMS AND CONDITIONS OF CONVEYANCE.—Any conveyance of the acquired lands under this Act shall be subject to the following terms and conditions:

(1) MANAGEMENT AND USE, GENERALLY.—The conveyed lands shall continue to be managed and used by the District for the purposes for which the Carlsbad Project was authorized, based on historic operations and consistent with the management of other adjacent project lands.

(2) ASSUMED RIGHTS AND OBLIGATIONS.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), the District shall assume all rights and obligations of the United States under—

(A) the agreement dated July 28, 1994, between the United States and the Director, New Mexico Department of Game and Fish (Document No. 2–LM–40–00640), relating to management of certain lands near Brantley Reservoir for fish and wildlife purposes; and

(B) the agreement dated March 9, 1977, between the United States and the New Mexico Department of Energy, Minerals, and Natural Resources (Contract No. 7–07–57–X0888) for the management and operation of Brantley Lake State Park.

(3) EXCEPTIONS.—In relation to agreements referred to in paragraph (2)—

(A) the District shall not be obligated for any financial support agreed to by the Secretary, or the Secretary's designee, in either agreement; and

(B) the District shall not be entitled to any receipts for revenues generated as a result of either agreement.

(d) COMPLETION OF CONVEYANCE.—If the Secretary does not complete the conveyance within 180 days from the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit a report to the Congress within 30 days after that period that includes a detailed explanation of problems that have been encountered in completing the conveyance, and specific steps that the Secretary has taken or will take to complete the conveyance.

SEC. 3. LEASE MANAGEMENT AND PAST REVENUES COLLECTED FROM THE ACQUIRED LANDS.

(a) IDENTIFICATION AND NOTIFICATION OF LEASEHOLDERS.—Within 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall—

(1) provide to the District a written identification of all mineral and grazing leases in effect on the acquired lands on the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) notify all leaseholders of the conveyance authorized by this Act.

(b) MANAGEMENT OF MINERAL AND GRAZING LEASES, LICENSES, AND PERMITS.—The District shall assume all rights and obligations of the United States for all mineral and grazing leases, licenses, and permits existing on the acquired lands conveyed under section 2, and shall be entitled to any receipts from such leases, licenses, and permits accruing after the date of conveyance. All such receipts shall be used for purposes for which the Project was authorized and for financing the portion of operations, maintenance, and replacement of the Summer Dam which, prior to conveyance, was the responsibility of the Bureau of Reclamation, with the exception of major maintenance programs in progress prior to conveyance which shall be funded through the cost share formulas in place at the time of conveyance. The District shall continue to adhere to the current Bureau of Reclamation mineral leasing stipulations for the Carlsbad Project.

(c) AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNTS PAID INTO RECLAMATION FUND.—

(1) EXISTING RECEIPTS.—Receipts in the reclamation fund on the date of enactment of this Act which exist as construction credits to the Carlsbad Project under the terms of the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands (30 U.S.C. 351–359) shall be deposited in the General Treasury and credited to deficit reduction or retirement of the Federal debt.

(2) RECEIPTS AFTER ENACTMENT.—Of the receipts from mineral and grazing leases, licenses, and permits on acquired lands to be conveyed under section 2, that are received by the United States after the date of enactment and before the date of conveyance—

(A) not to exceed $200,000 shall be available to the Secretary for the actual costs of implementing this Act with any additional costs shared equally between the Secretary and the District; and

(B) the remainder shall be deposited into the General Treasury of the United States and credited to deficit reduction or retirement of the Federal debt.

SEC. 4. VOLUNTARY WATER CONSERVATION PRACTICES.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to limit the ability of the District to voluntarily implement water conservation practices.

SEC. 5. LIABILITY.

Effective on the date of conveyance of any lands and facilities authorized by this Act, the United States shall not be held liable by any court for damages of any kind arising out of any act, omission, or occurrence relating to the conveyed property, except for damages caused by acts of negligence committed by the United States or by its employees, agents, or contractors, prior to conveyance. Nothing in this section shall be considered to increase the liability of the United States beyond that provided under chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code, popularly known as the Federal Tort Claims Act.

SEC. 6. FUTURE BENEFITS.

Effective upon transfer, the lands and facilities transferred pursuant to this Act shall not be entitled to receive any further Reclamation benefits pursuant to the Reclamation Act of June 17, 1902, and Acts supplementary thereof or amendatory thereto attributable to their status as part of a Reclamation Project.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) each will control 20 minutes.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHERWOOD. 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 S. 291.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, S. 291, the Carlsbad Irrigation Project Acquired Land Transfer Act, introduced by Senator DOMENICI of New Mexico, is the companion bill to H.R. 1019, introduced by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), my esteemed colleague, that was reported from the Committee on Resources last year.

For the last 6 years, the Subcommittee on Water and Power has pursued legislation to shrink the size and scope of the Federal Government through the defederalization of Bureau of Reclamation assets.

S. 291 continues this defederalization process by authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the Carlsbad Irrigation District all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the acquired lands and all interest the United States holds in the irrigation and drainage system of the Carlsbad project and all related land. The Carlsbad project is a paid-out, single purpose irrigation project delivering stored water to approximately 25,000 acres of farmland in southeastern New Mexico.

This bill is one of several working their way through the House and Senate. It is the expectation of the committee that the Senate will accelerate its work on the other transfer bills that currently await action in the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), the author of the House version of the Carlsbad transfer, and ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to control that time.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in enthusiastic and strong support of S. 291, the Carlsbad Irrigation Project Acquired Land Transfer Act. S. 291 was introduced by Senator DOMENICI and Senator BINGAMAN of New Mexico and is the companion bill to H.R. 1019, legislation that I introduced, which passed the Committee on Resources early last year. In fact, I have introduced a version of H.R. 1019 each of the last three Congresses only to run into some form of legislative or political brick wall each time.

Ideally, I would have preferred to be debating H.R. 1019 right now in lieu of S. 291, as I believe that H.R. 1019 is a stronger bill and will serve the interests of Congress and the Carlsbad Irrigation District best. However, discretion is the better part of valor, and I will be pleased to finally send this bill to the President for his signature.

After all, Senate 291 does continue my long-held belief that the more we can devolve the Federal rule and the local decision-making process the better the management will be.

Now, for a history and justification. In 1905, the U.S. purchased acquired lands from the Pecos Irrigation Company. The amount paid for these lands or the methodology of repayment were contained within the Carlsbad Irrigation District's repayment obligations to the United States.

1330

The district has repaid all the project costs attributed to them, which includes the acquired lands. Their obligations have been met in full. As a single-purpose project, the district received no repayment credits for flood control, recreation or other project beneficiaries.

The 1924 Fact Finders Act requires all revenues, except minerals generated from the acquired lands, to be used by the district for the project and the 1939 Minerals Leasing Act permits all mineral receipts to be used by the district for district purposes. Both of these acts apply whether the district is paid out or not.

In 1991, the district completed its repayment obligations. Almost $2.5 million has accumulated in the Reclamation Fund on behalf of CID and are currently available to offset new construction costs. Over 90 years of precedent and several Solicitor Generals reports clearly recognize the District's right to all revenues from the acquired lands.

However, and as a sign of good will to mistaken opposition, the district is waiving its justified right to the $2 million and allows it to be credited towards the national deficit or debt reduction. That ought to be interesting.

The district is also accepting the O&M costs of Sumner Dam, which is currently the taxpayers' responsibility, and is accepting full responsibility for the conveyed lands and facilities. In addition, the district can only use revenues for maintenance and improvements of the project.

The district is also waiving future eligibility for additional reclamation benefits for the conveyed lands and facilities. And simply put, the district is accepting the costs of the project and saving taxpayer dollars in the process.

The responsible approach on behalf of taxpayers is absolution of the taxpayers' future monetary obligations; and that is accomplished by passage of this legislation, which requires the district's acceptance of financial responsibility.

The State, the county, the city of Carlsbad have soundly endorsed the legislation. The administration supports the legislation. And most importantly, I support the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the district manager, Tom Davis; board chairman L.A. Johnson; Bill Ahrens; and the remainder of the board and members of the district for their patience and faith in the process.

Finally, I would like to thank the gentleman from California (Chairman DOOLITTLE), the gentleman from Alaska (Chairman YOUNG), and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY). For without each of their assistance, what has been a long road would have been considerably longer.

In closing, I would be remiss to not mention the fine work of the majority staff, Bob Faber and Josh Johnson, and minority staffer Steve Lanich. We all know and appreciate the support the staff provides.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge passage of S. 291.

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great admiration and great respect and high regard for my colleague, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN), that I rise in support of the Carlsbad Irrigation Project Acquired Lands Transfer Act.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SKEEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 291.

The question was taken.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. 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.

WELLTON-MOHAWK TRANSFER ACT

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 356) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain works, facilities, and titles of the Gila Project, and designated lands within or adjacent to the Gila Project, to the Wellton-Mohawk Irrigation and Drainage District, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 356

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 referred to as the ''Wellton-Mohawk Transfer Act''.

SEC. 2. TRANSFER.

The Secretary of the Interior (''Secretary'') is authorized to carry out the terms of the Memorandum of Agreement No. 8–AA–34–WAO14 (''Agreement'') dated July 10, 1998 between the Secretary and the Wellton-Mohawk Irrigation and Drainage District (''District'') providing for the transfer of works, facilities, and lands to the District, including conveyance of Acquired Lands, Public Lands, and Withdrawn Lands, as defined in the Agreement.

SEC. 3. WATER AND POWER CONTRACTS.

Notwithstanding the transfer, the Secretary and the Secretary of Energy shall provide for and deliver Colorado River water and Parker-Davis Project Priority Use Power to the District in accordance with the terms of existing contracts with the District, including any amendments or supplements thereto or extensions thereof and as provided under section 2 of the Agreement.

SEC. 4. SAVINGS.

Nothing in this Act shall affect any obligations under the Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Act (Public Law 93–320, 43 U.S.C. 1571).

SEC. 5. REPORT.

If transfer of works, facilities, and lands pursuant to the Agreement has not occurred by July 1, 2000, the Secretary shall report on the status of the transfer as provided in section 5 of the Agreement.

SEC. 6. AUTHORIZATION.

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) each will control 20 minutes.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHERWOOD. 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 S. 356.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Speaker, S. 356, the Wellton-Mohawk Transfer Act, introduced by Senator KYL of Arizona, is a companion bill to H.R. 841 introduced by the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) that was reported from the Committee on Resources last year.

S. 356 continues the defederalization process by conveying certain works, facilities, and titles of the Gila Project and designated lands to the Wellton-Mohawk Irrigation and Drainage District in Arizona.

Wellton-Mohawk has fully repaid its project costs. On July 10, 1998, the district and the bureau signed a memorandum of agreement that covers the details of the transfer of title. It includes transfer of lands between the Federal Government and the district, including the acquisition of additional lands for exchange.

All transfers will be at fair market value. No change in the project operation is contemplated by the transfer and the district will continue to limit irrigated acreage to 62,875 acres. The transfer would include all facilities and works for which full repayment has been made.

''The goal of Reclamation and the District is that within 180 days of the execution of the Title Transfer Contract, the Secretary shall convey to the District all right, title and interest of the United States to the Facilities, works and lands to be conveyed and transferred to the District.''

It is the expectation of the committee that the Senate will accelerate its work on other transfer bills that are currently awaiting action in the Senate. The committee expects that the Bureau of Reclamation will adhere to their memorandum of agreement with the district signed on July 10, 1998.

Mr. Speaker, I request an aye vote on the bill.

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 356, the Wellton-Mohawk Transfer Act. The Wellton-Mohawk has fully repaid its project costs. The district and the bureau signed a memorandum of agreement 2 years ago that covers the details of the transfer of title.

The project facilities that will be transferred under legislation no longer provide benefits to the United States, and it is appropriate that the local district assume full responsibility for these facilities.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 356.

The question was taken.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. 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.

CLARIFYING CERTAIN BOUNDARIES OF COASTAL BARRIER RESOURCES SYSTEM

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4435) to clarify certain boundaries on the map relating to Unit NC01 of the Coastal Barrier Resources System, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4435

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

SECTION 1. REPLACEMENT OF COASTAL BARRIER RESOURCES SYSTEM MAP.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The map described in subsection (b) is replaced, in the maps depicting the Coastal Barrier Resources System that are referred to in section 4(a) of the Coastal Barrier Resources Act (16 U.S.C. 3503(a)), by the map entitled ''Pine Island Unit NC–01'' and dated May 1, 2000.

(b) DESCRIPTION OF REPLACED MAP.—The map described in this subsection is the map that—

(1) relates to Pine Island Unit NC–01 located in Currituck and Dare Counties, North Carolina; and

(2) is included in a set of maps entitled ''Coastal Barrier Resources System'', dated October 24, 1990, revised on October 23, 1992, and referred to in section 4(a) of the Coastal Barrier Resources Act (16 U.S.C. 3503(a)).

(c) AVAILABILITY.—The Secretary of the Interior shall keep the replacement map referred to in subsection (a) on file and available for inspection in accordance with section 4(b) of the Coastal Barrier Resources Act (16 U.S.C. 3503(b)).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) each will control 20 minutes.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHERWOOD. 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.R. 4435.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4435, introduced by our colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES), corrects a mistake that was made in delineating the boundary of Coastal Barrier Resources System Unit NC01.

The Coastal Barrier Resources System consists of units located on undeveloped coastal barriers and delineated on maps adapted by Congress.

Land included in the system is not acquired by the Government, and the act does not prevent or regulate development on private lands. The act does prohibit the use of Federal developmental assistance, including Federal flood insurance, on property included in the system.

Unit NC01 was originally created in 1990 to incorporate property owned by the National Audubon Society and the surrounding associated aquatic habitat. Unfortunately, a significant amount of privately and publicly owned developed property was inadvertently, or incorrectly, included within its boundary.

In 1992, Congress directed the Secretary of the Interior to redraw the boundary to fix these problems. That new map again failed to accurately portray the boundary of the Audubon Sanctuary, and the unit continued to include privately owned development property.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4435 removes the incorrectly labeled private property and adds associated aquatic habitat that was incorrectly left out of the unit in 1992.

The Fish and Wildlife Service supports this change. I commend the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for his efforts in correcting this error and urge an aye vote on H.R. 4435.

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation to change the boundaries of the Coastal Barrier Resource System Unit established under the Coastal Barrier Resources Act known as NC01.

I believe that it is important that we contain the so-called technical corrections bills that we have seen in our committee to address those problems that are clear inaccuracies. I believe that this legislation does that. And it is also incumbent that those of us on the committee not use those technical corrections to go for unintended changes and make sure that they are held at a minimum. I think that this legislation does that.

We see a lot of efforts from time to time to use boundary changes to do more than make these technical corrections, but this legislation does not do that. I think that this is consistent with the original intent of the Congress, and I urge passage of this legislation.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4435, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. 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.

DIRECTING A STUDY TO RESTORE KEALIA POND NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE, HAWAII

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3176) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study to determine ways of restoring the natural wetlands conditions in the Kealia Pond National Wildlife Refuge, Hawaii.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3176

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

SECTION 1. STUDY OF KEALIA POND NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE, HAWAII.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service in consultation with the Director of the United States Geological Survey, shall conduct a study to determine ways of restoring the natural wetlands conditions in the Kealia Pond National Wildlife Refuge, Hawaii. The study shall include examination of hydrology, manmade impacts on wetlands, species succession, and imbalances in natural habitat in the refuge.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after amounts are first available to implement this section, the Secretary shall complete the study under subsection (a) and report to the Congress findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the study.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary $250,000 to carry out this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) each will control 20 minutes.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SHERWOOD. 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.R. 3176.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3176 addresses an ongoing water management problem at the Kealia National Wildlife Refuge on Maui, Hawaii. This bill was introduced by our colleague, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK).

The legislation directs the Secretary of Interior to study the serious water management problems that currently exist at the 700-acre refuge. The refuge was created in 1992 to conserve habitat for endangered birds and to provide a wintering sanctuary for a variety of waterfowl species.

Regrettably, the Fish and Wildlife Service has failed to provide the necessary resources to manage the water fluctuations. As a result of changes in the landscape, this refuge experiences the frequent dry-ups which result in dust storms, fish kills, and problems with nuisance insects. These problems have a negative economic and health impact on the people who live near the refuge.

1345

This bill directs the Secretary of the Interior to study the water problems at the refuge and come up with a plan for addressing the management needs within 1 year. H.R. 3176 is noncontroversial, and I urge an aye vote.

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3176, to provide for the study of the deterioration that has taken place on Kealia Pond National Wildlife Refuge on the Island of Maui.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) has properly explained the legislation. I want to commend and thank our colleague, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK), for bringing the deterioration of this refuge to the attention of the committee.

I think I and most members of the committee were very disappointed to learn the extent to which this refuge, the largest freshwater pond in the entire State of Hawaii, could have reached such a degraded condition.

I think this legislation will be important in turning that around, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3176.

I want to thank Chairman YOUNG, Ranking Member Mr. MILLER of the Resources Committee and Subcommittee Chairman SAXTON and Ranking Member Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA of the Fisheries Subcommittee for their efforts to bring the bill to the floor today.

I introduced H.R. 3176 on October 28, 1999. The legislation requires the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study to determine ways of restoring the natural wetlands conditions in Kealia Pond National Wildlife Refuge. The study would include an examination of hydrology, manmade impacts on wetlands, species succession and imbalances in natural habitat in the refuge. The legislation authorizes $250,000 to conduct the study. The study would be reported to Congress not later than one year after funds for the study are made available.

The Refuge is located on the island of Maui and is part of the Mai Nui National Wildlife Refuge Complex. It was established in 1992 and consists of 691 acres. The pond itself is the largest natural pond in Hawaii, and covers between 400 and 500 acres at its greatest extent during the wet season. The pond is home of two endangered native Hawaiian birds, the Hawaiian stilt and the Hawaiian coot. The pond also provides food and shelter for numerous migratory waterfowl and shorebirds.

Human activity over the years has significantly changed the nature of the pond. In the early 1900's the pond had a depth of between six and eight feet. Over the years grazing and agricultural use of the land above the pond increased the runoff of sedimentation. Between 1925 and 1930 the pond was used as a rubbish dump, further reducing the depth of the pond. In 1970 twenty-five acres of land north of the pond were converted to a commercial aquaculture operation. Dikes were built, water impounded and a well dug.

All these activities have had a deleterious effect on the natural habitat of the pond.

Now the pond has an average depth of only one foot. As the depth of the pond decreased the pond increasingly lost the ability to carry off sediments. Sand carried into the pond from adjacent dunes that otherwise would have been flushed away now stays in the pond further reducing the depth.

The shallow depth of the pond permits it to dry up quickly. The natural trade winds of the area then cause great clouds of dust to arise. The dust blows into the homes, eyes and lungs of nearby residents. The dust causes burning eyes and residents worry that the cause may be that the dust contains fertilizer and chemical residue from agricultural runoff and unknown chemicals from materials deposited during the period the pond was used as a dump.

The introduction of non-native species has also changed the ecology of the pond. The spotted wing midge was first identified in Hawaii in 1945. The midge has found the pond to be an extremely attractive habitat. A study by Ducks Unlimited estimated that on any given day during the wet season there may be as many as 200 million adult and near-adult midges During midge season the uninitiated visitor may think the refuge is on fire at dawn or dusk, with smoldering fires throwing up swirling clouds of smoke. But it is not smoke. It is clouds of midges swarming.

The midge swarms invade surrounding residences. The midges are small enough to go through screens and some residents have been reduced to keeping their lights out in a vain effort to keep the invaders away. Motorists report that their cars are covered with squashed midges when driving in the area.

Kealia Pond is also home to non-native tilapia. These fish make up 90 percent of the fish population of the pond. They do more damage than good for the wetlands. When the pond dries up there are massive fish die offs. In 1996 Maui correctional inmates, working under the direction of the pond's on-site manager, removed 14 tons of dead and rotting fish from the refuge.

There have been studies of aspects of the ecology of the pond done over the years, both in the public and private sector. However, the studies have frequently concentrated on one aspect of the problem or another. There has been no study directed at restoring Kealia Pond to its natural state.

H.R. 3176 requires a study to identify ways of dealing with these man-made plagues of dust, bugs and rotting fish. My constituents recognize the value of the pond and its contribution to preserving native Hawaiian endangered species. They want to see Kealia Pond restored to its natural state with its native fauna.

Passage of H.R. 3176 will get the answers needed to restore Kealia Pond.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3176.

The question was taken.

Mr. SHERWOOD. 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.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 6 p.m.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 6 p.m.

1800

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. OSE) at 6 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 first four motions to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today in the order in which those motions were entertained.

Votes will be taken in the following order: House Resolution 509, by the yeas and nays; H.R. 4241, by the yeas and nays; H.R. 3030, by the yeas and nays; and H.R. 3535, by the yeas and nays.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first such vote in this series.

The remaining four votes will be postponed until tomorrow.

RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANCE OF AFRICAN-AMERICAN MUSIC

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, House Resolution 509, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 509, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 382, nays 0, not voting 52, as follows:

[Roll No. 234]

YEAS—382

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
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chenoweth-Hage
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
John
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
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
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Paul
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—52

Bliley
Brady (TX)
Campbell
Chambliss
Coburn
Condit

Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Doyle
English
Ford
Franks (NJ)
Greenwood
Hilleary
Hilliard
Houghton
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Jones (OH)
Lofgren
Markey
McCollum
McIntosh
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Metcalf
Neal
Norwood
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pitts
Price (NC)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanchez
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Sweeney
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Udall (NM)
Vento
Vitter
Waxman
Wise

1822

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

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

Stated for:

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained during rollcall Vote 234. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSE). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device may be taken on each additional motion to suspend the rules on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

LES ASPIN POST OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 4241.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4241, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 378, nays 6, not voting 50, as follows:

[Roll No. 235]

YEAS—378

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
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Combest
Conyers
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Forbes
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
John
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
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
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Paul
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Walden
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—6

Chenoweth-Hage
Collins
Cunningham
Sanford
Scarborough
Walsh

NOT VOTING—50

Bliley
Burton
Chambliss
Coburn
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Doyle
English
Foley
Ford
Franks (NJ)
Greenwood
Hilleary
Hilliard
Houghton
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Jones (OH)
Markey
McCollum
McIntosh
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Metcalf
Morella
Neal
Norwood
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pitts
Price (NC)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanchez
Sherwood
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Sweeney
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Udall (NM)
Vento
Vitter
Waxman

1830

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.

Stated for:

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 235 had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

MATTHEW F. MCHUGH POST OFFICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSE). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 3030.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3030, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 385, nays 2, not voting 47, as follows:

[Roll No. 236]

YEAS—385

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Collins

Combest
Conyers
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
John
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
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
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Paul
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—2

Chenoweth-Hage
Sanford

NOT VOTING—47

Bateman
Bliley
Chambliss
Coburn
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Doyle
English
Ford
Franks (NJ)
Greenwood
Hilleary
Hilliard
Houghton
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Jones (OH)
Markey
McCollum
McIntosh
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Morella
Murtha
Neal
Norwood
Nussle
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pitts
Roukema
Royce
Salmon
Sanchez
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Sweeney
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Udall (NM)
Vento
Vitter
Waxman

1838

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.

SHARK FINNING PROHIBITION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 3535, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3535, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 390, nays 1, not voting 43, as follows:

[Roll No. 237]

YEAS—390

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
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chenoweth-Hage
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Conyers
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—1

Paul

NOT VOTING—43

Bliley	Jefferson	Roybal-Allard
Chambliss	Jones (OH)	Royce
Coburn	Leach	Salmon
Condit	Markey	Sanchez
Cook	McCollum	Skelton
Cooksey	McIntosh	Smith (MI)
Costello	McNulty	Sweeney
Doyle	Meek (FL)	Tauzin
English	Menendez	Taylor (MS)
Ford	Norwood	Udall (NM)
Franks (NJ)	Pascrell	Vento
Greenwood	Pastor	Vitter
Hilleary	Payne	Waxman
Hilliard	Pitts	
Houghton	Roukema	

1845

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall votes Nos. 234, 235, 236, and 237, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye'' on all four votes.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 4006

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 4006.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

FREEDOM TO E-FILE ACT

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 777) to require the Department of Agriculture to establish an electronic filing and retrieval system to enable the public to file all required paperwork electronically with the Department and to have access to public information on farm programs, quarterly trade, economic, and production reports, and other similar information, with a Senate amendment to the House amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment to the House amendments, as follows:

Senate amendment to House amendments:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment to the text of the bill, insert:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Freedom to E-File Act''.

SEC. 2. ELECTRONIC FILING AND RETRIEVAL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, in accordance with subsection (c), the Secretary of Agriculture (referred to in this Act as the ''Secretary'') shall, to the maximum extent practicable, establish an Internet-based system that enables agricultural producers to access all forms of the agencies of the Department of Agriculture (referred to in this Act as the ''Department'') specified in subsection (b).

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The agencies referred to in subsection (a) are the following:

(1) The Farm Service Agency.

(2) The Natural Resources Conservation Service.

(3) The rural development components of the Department included in the Secretary's service center initiative regarding State and field office collocation implemented pursuant to section 215 of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 6915).

(4) The agricultural producer programs component of the Commodity Credit Corporation administered by the Farm Service Agency and the Natural Resources Conservation Service.

(c) IMPLEMENTATION.—In carrying out subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) provide a method by which agricultural producers may—

(A) download from the Internet the forms of the agencies specified in subsection (b); and

(B) submit completed forms via electronic facsimile, mail, or similar means;

(2) redesign the forms by incorporating into the forms user-friendly formats and self-help guidance materials; and

(3) ensure that the agencies specified in subsection (b)—

(A) use computer hardware and software that is compatible among the agencies and will operate in a common computing environment; and

(B) develop common Internet user-interface locations and applications to consolidate the agencies' news, information, and program materials.

(d) PROGRESS REPORTS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report that describes the progress made toward implementing the Internet-based system required under this section.

SEC. 3. ACCESSING INFORMATION AND FILING OVER THE INTERNET.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, in accordance with subsection (b), the Secretary shall expand implementation of the Internet-based system established under section 2 by enabling agricultural producers to access and file all forms and, at the option of the Secretary, selected records and information of the agencies of the Department specified in section 2(b).

(b) IMPLEMENTATION.—In carrying out subsection (a), the Secretary shall ensure that an agricultural producer is able—

(1) to file electronically or in paper form, at the option of the agricultural producer, all forms required by agencies of the Department specified in section 2(b);

(2) to file electronically or in paper form, at the option of the agricultural producer, all documentation required by agencies of the Department specified in section 2(b) and determined appropriate by the Secretary; and

(3) to access information of the Department concerning farm programs, quarterly trade, economic, and production reports, and other similar production agriculture information that is readily available to the public in paper form.

SEC. 4. AVAILABILITY OF AGENCY INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY FUNDS.

(a) RESERVATION OF FUNDS.—From funds made available for agencies of the Department specified in section 2(b) for information technology or information resource management, the Secretary shall reserve from those agencies' applicable accounts a total amount equal to not more than the following:

(1) For fiscal year 2001, $3,000,000.

(2) For each subsequent fiscal year, $2,000,000.

(b) TIME FOR RESERVATION.—The Secretary shall notify Congress of the amount to be reserved under subsection (a) for a fiscal year not later than December 1 of that fiscal year.

(c) USE OF FUNDS.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—Funds reserved under subsection (a) shall be used to establish the Internet-based system required under section 2 and to expand the system as required by section 3.

(2) MAINTENANCE.—Once the system is established and operational, reserved amounts shall be used for maintenance and improvement of the system.

(d) RETURN OF FUNDS.—Funds reserved under subsection (a) and unobligated at the end of the fiscal year shall be returned to the agency from which the funds were reserved, to remain available until expended.

SEC. 5. FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION AND RISK MANAGEMENT AGENCY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than December 1, 2000, the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation and the Risk Management Agency shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a plan, that is consistent with this Act, to allow agricultural producers to—

(1) obtain, over the Internet, from approved insurance providers all forms and other information concerning the program under the jurisdiction of the Corporation and Agency in which the agricultural producer is a participant; and

(2) file electronically all paperwork required for participation in the program.

(b) ADMINISTRATION.—The plan shall—

(1) conform to sections 2(c) and 3(b); and

(2) prescribe—

(A) the location and type of data to be made available to agricultural producers;

(B) the location where agricultural producers can electronically file their paperwork; and

(C) the responsibilities of the applicable parties, including agricultural producers, the Risk Management Agency, the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, approved insurance providers, crop insurance agents, and brokers.

(c) IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than December 1, 2001, the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation and the Risk Management Agency shall complete implementation of the plan submitted under subsection (a).

SEC. 6. CONFIDENTIALITY.

In carrying out this Act, the Secretary—

(1) may not make available any information over the Internet that would otherwise not be available for release under section 552 or 552a of title 5, United States Code; and

(2) shall ensure, to the maximum extent practicable, that the confidentiality of persons is maintained.

Mr. LAHOOD (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate amendment to the House amendments be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the House in concurring with the Senate amendment and passing S. 777, otherwise known as, the Freedom to E-File bill.

I have long been a proponent of initiatives at USDA to provide better service to farmers and ranchers through streamlining and the use of new technologies, while at the same time saving taxpayer dollars.

Growing numbers of farmers and ranchers are using home computers. This fact, coupled with budget demands, is putting enormous pressure on USDA's field service employees. It is therefore imperative that USDA take advantage of the internet for the efficiencies it

can offer. Doing so will benefit overworked field service staff, save taxpayer dollars, and allow farmers and ranchers to spend more time on their operations and less time visiting USDA offices.

For these reasons, I believe USDA must improve electronic access to its programs and services. Consequently, I support S. 777, the Freedom to E-File bill.

While I support the goals of this bill, I would prefer a more comprehensive look at USDA reorganization and modernization. Unfortunately, it appears that changes at USDA are only going to be made on an incremental basis.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

There was no objection.

The motion to reconsider is laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on S. 777.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING PRESIDENT TO AWARD GOLD MEDAL ON BEHALF OF CONGRESS TO CHARLES M. SCHULZ

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 3642) to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to Charles M. Schulz in recognition of his lasting artistic contributions to the Nation and the world, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Senate amendments:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) Charles M. Schulz was born on November 26, 1922, in St. Paul, Minnesota, the son of Carl and Dena Schulz.

(2) Charles M. Schulz served his country in World War II, working his way up from infantryman to staff sergeant and eventually leading a machine gun squad. He kept morale high by decorating fellow soldiers' letters home with cartoons of barracks life.

(3) After returning from the war, Charles M. Schulz returned to his love for illustration, and took a job with ''Timeless Topix''. He also took a second job as an art instructor. Eventually, his hard work paid off when the Saturday Evening Post began purchasing a number of his single comic panels.

(4) It was in his first weekly comic strip, ''L'il Folks'', that Charlie Brown was born. That comic strip, which was eventually renamed ''Peanuts'', became the sole focus of Charles M. Schulz's career.

(5) Charles M. Schulz drew every frame of the ''Peanuts'' strip, which ran 7 days a week, since it was created in October 1950. This is rare dedication in the field of comic illustration.

(6) The ''Peanuts'' comic strip appeared in 2,600 newspapers around the world daily until January 3, 2000, and on Sundays until February 13, 2000, and reached approximately 335,000,000 readers every day in 20 different languages, making Charles M. Schulz the most successful comic illustrator in the world.

(7) Charles M. Schulz's television special, ''A Charlie Brown Christmas'', has run for 34 consecutive years. In all, more than 60 animated specials have been created based on ''Peanuts'' characters. Four feature films, 1,400 books, and a hit Broadway musical about the ''Peanuts'' characters have also been produced.

(8) Charles M. Schulz was a leader in the field of comic illustration and in his community. He paved the way for other artists in this field over the last 50 years and continues to be praised for his outstanding achievements.

(9) Charles M. Schulz gave back to his community in many ways, including owning and operating Redwood Empire Ice Arena in Santa Rosa, California. The arena has become a favorite gathering spot for people of all ages. Charles M. Schulz also financed a yearly ice show that drew crowds from all over the San Francisco Bay Area.

(10) Charles M. Schulz gave the Nation a unique sense of optimism, purpose, and pride. Whether through the Great Pumpkin Patch, the Kite Eating Tree, Lucy's Psychiatric Help Stand, or Snoopy's adventures with the Red Baron, ''Peanuts'' embodied human vulnerabilities, emotions, and potential.

(11) Charles M. Schulz's lifetime of work linked generations of Americans and became a part of the fabric of our national culture.

SEC. 2. CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL.

(a) AWARD AUTHORIZED.—The President is authorized to award posthumously, on behalf of the Congress, a gold medal of appropriate design to Charles M. Schulz in recognition of his lasting artistic contributions to the Nation and the world.

(b) DESIGN AND STRIKING.—For the purpose of the award referred to in subsection (a), the Secretary of the Treasury (hereafter in this Act referred to as the ''Secretary'') shall strike a gold medal with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions, to be determined by the Secretary.

SEC. 3. DUPLICATE MEDALS.

Under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, the Secretary may strike and sell duplicates in bronze of the gold medal struck under section 2 at a price sufficient to cover the costs of the medals, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, overhead expenses, and the cost of the gold medal.

SEC. 4. NATIONAL MEDALS.

The medals struck under this Act are national medals for purposes of chapter 51 of title 31, United States Code.

SEC. 5. FUNDING AND PROCEEDS OF SALE.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—There is authorized to be charged against the United States Mint Public Enterprise Fund an amount not to exceed $30,000 to pay for the cost of the medals authorized by this Act.

(b) PROCEEDS OF SALE.—Amounts received from the sale of duplicate bronze medals under section 3 shall be deposited in the United States Mint Public Enterprise Fund.

Amend the title so as to read: ''An Act to authorize the President to award posthumously a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to Charles M. Schulz in recognition of his lasting artistic contributions to the Nation and the world, and for other purposes.''.

Mr. LEACH (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate amendments be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LEACH. 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. 3642.

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

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM STAFF ASSISTANT OF HON. GEORGE RADANOVICH, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Michelle Giannetta, Staff Assistant of the Honorable GEORGE RADANOVICH, Member of Congress:

May 26, 2000.

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

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

Afer consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I will make the determinations required by Rule VIII.

Sincerely,

MICHELLE GIANNETTA,
Staff Assistant.

SPECIAL ORDERS

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

DISTURBING TRENDS IN THE MIDDLE EAST

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about some disturbing trends in the Middle East. I admire enormously the commitment of Prime Minister Barak of Israel to try to find a peaceful solution to many of the disputes that have troubled the region. I believe historically the record is very clear that Israel sought it first to live in peace with its neighbors. It was forced to resort to armed conflict to defend itself.

Prime Minister Barak to his credit has been willing now after 50 years and

more of conflict to take some risks for peace. That is not always unanimously agreed upon within Israel. Israel is, as we know, the only genuine democracy in this part of the world. The people of Israel are contentious in some ways as befits people in a democracy when important issues are at stake. And Prime Minister Barak to me is an admirable example of an elected official who is trying to lead in the direction that he thinks is important.

And in so doing, he has espoused some positions that he believes and I believe will lead to a lasting peace if they meet with an appropriate response from those with whom he seeks to negotiate. What is especially troubling to me has been the negative responses his initiatives have drawn.

His offer to withdraw from the Golan Heights is really by historical standards an extraordinarily generous one. Very few nations which have won this sort of strategic territory and battle have voluntarily given it up, even in the face of the kind of hostility that Syria has evinced towards Israel. But Prime Minister Barak, taking a request politically based on his military judgment, which obviously everyone who knows him respects, was willing to make a deal with the Syrians in which Israel would have given up that very large strategic amount of territory with some safeguards, and essentially, President Assad of Syria refused any kind of reasonable deal.

Interestingly, had Assad agreed to the deal, it would have been controversial within, as real as having given too much to Syria, but Syria would not accept that. For years, people have been urging Israel to withdraw from Lebanon. There is a U.N. resolution that says Israel should withdraw from Lebanon. When the negotiations with Assad ended, because I believe of Assad's unreasonable hostility, Prime Minister Barak again courageously said, I will withdraw unilaterally from Israel; and one of the most extraordinarily depressing reactions I have seen people who had for years had been pressing Israel to withdraw then began to attack Israel for withdrawing unilaterally, as if they needed permission to do what people had been berating them for not doing.

And what happened when Israel withdrew was an outburst of hostility and of inappropriate behavior in much of Lebanon which can only strengthen the hands of those who believe within Israel that Prime Minister Barak has been making a mistake. So in these two important areas with regard to Syria and to Lebanon, you have an elected official, a democratic leader of his country, taking some risks for peace and being met with an extraordinarily hostile reaction; and then, finally, we had a few weeks ago violence on the part of many in the Palestinian areas, including gunfire between the Palestinian authority in Israel.

Again, I want to stress Israel has in the past couple of decades beginning with Prime Minister Begin in the Sinai, engaged in more withdrawal from territory it had been forced to fight to conquer than almost any nation I can think of. And I am talking now about turning it over to the enemies, not with a period of demilitarization. It is not like America, the allies keeping Germany in a very subordinate position for a long time that was not being occupied. It was simply turned over in many cases, and to see the negative reactions from Syria, from people in the south of Lebanon, the more extremists there and within the Palestinian community, is very troubling to me.

I admire the willingness of Prime Minister Barak to persevere. I believe he does this because he understands what is truly in his country's long-term interests. I hope the United States Government will continue to be a strong supporter and partner of Israel and, in particular, make it clear to the extent that Israel does withdraw from some of these areas, potentially exposing itself to some of the problems that might come up that the United States will continue to be a reliable partner. But it has to be noted that the kind of negativism, the kind of extreme hostility which Prime Minister Barak's openness has called from on the part of many Arabs cannot be helpful.

I admire, as I said, Prime Minister Barak for not being deterred by this. He is not allowing the extremists to undermine his efforts, but they ought to understand and people elsewhere ought to understand that there is a price to be paid for this. So I hope, Mr. Speaker, that as Prime Minister Barak goes forward in partnership with the U.S., we will begin to see responsible leaders in the Arab world exercise the kind of reciprocal approach that the prime minister's courage deserves.

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

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

CONDEMNING A BOUNTY OFFERED FOR BORDER PATROL AGENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under ordinary circumstances, I would not rise to the floor of the House to discuss as delicate an issue as this if we had been briefed by law enforcement officials, the Department of Justice or the Border Patrol, for the issue is so troubling that I do not even think Americans would want this kind of terrible proposal to be promoted.

1900

But the fact that article was in the Houston Chronicle today brings me to the necessity of addressing this question publicly. ''Bounty Offered for Killing Agent of Border Patrol,'' Houston Chronicle, today, Tuesday, June 6, 2000.

The reason I come to the floor of the House is to condemn any such attempt to put a bounty or to ask for an assassination of any of America's law enforcement officers or, for that matter, anyone in the United States who are lawfully performing their duties.

This request for a bounty on a Border Patrol agent has been asked for by Mexican activist Carlos Ibarra Perez. Certainly, the border between the State of Texas and the other border States and Mexico has had some troubling times. Yes, there has been an infusion of illegal immigrants. There have been acts that have been acted upon by citizens illegally trying to protect their properties. But I think that it is important for those of us who have responsibility and oversight over law enforcement personnel throughout this Nation to condemn this heinous request, to indicate that there is no reason that anyone should call for a bounty and for an act to assassinate or kill another human being and particularly in this instance.

This also calls for this Congress to act expeditiously to provide the extra funding that will necessitate or provide for extra Border Patrol along that border.

In addition, I will be asking the Department of Justice to provide more FBI agents in that area to ensure that this may be what I believe it is, an idle threat. But no life should be taken for granted. And though we have much to do at the border to protect all the individuals who are there, Border Patrol, those who see the necessity to come into this country illegally, and that is wrong, but to protect the area and the people who live there and the lives of people who are in the midst of that, if you will, confusion.

But to be able to sit idly by while someone calls for the assassination of a Border Patrol agent, any Border Patrol agent, is intolerable and should not be accepted.

I am asking that we continue to monitor that area, that the Department of Justice keeps a watchful eye, that more funds are provided for Border Patrol agents, along with more training, and that increased law enforcement is added to that area to ensure the protection of the protectors.

There is no excuse that we should stand idly by, as I have indicated, while these kinds of threats are made whether or not this is a citizen of Mexico. And let me applaud the leadership of Mexico and the foreign policy representatives of Mexico who have, likewise, condemned this travesty.

But this kind of public display of disrespect for the law and disrespect for human life is not to be tolerated; and I, for one, will not tolerate this kind of bounty being set upon law enforcement officers who are doing their job.

I am shamed that this has even happened. I ask for Carlos Ibarra Perez to

withdraw such a request. I ask for those who even may be thinking of it to not even dare. And I ask the law enforcement of this country to provide the necessary protection and support for these law enforcement officers, the U.S. Border Patrol, who are doing simply their job.

CLEAR ACT OF 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Citizen Legislators Caucus and on behalf of many of my colleagues in the Caucus, I am proud to introduce today the Citizen Legislature Empowerment through Access to Resources bill, or, more simply, the CLEAR Act of 2000.

The Citizen Legislators Caucus was established to enhance the effectiveness of term-limited Members of Congress through a positive and constructive agenda. One of the priorities of our Members is working with other Members of Congress to advance legislation that encourages citizen representation and citizen involvement in Government.

Citizen legislators are the lifeblood of a representative democracy. I am honored to serve with so many honorable men and women in this body who have put aside successful careers in other areas of life to come here for a short time to represent their districts and serve their country. Doctors, lawyers, farmers, teachers, small businessmen, people from all walks of life come here for a time to help secure the future of our country and then return home to move on to other areas of service.

I believe such an attitude of service and representation is in keeping with the best examples of our Founding Fathers, as embodied most profoundly in the life of George Washington. President Washington held his positions of leadership in our country, including the presidency, as something with which he was entrusted for a limited time, not for a lifetime.

Our country is a democracy, and a well-informed citizenry is the most important asset of any democracy. Over the past few years, we have worked to put in place a number of important reforms that have changed the way Congress works, giving greater information, access, and control to the people. We have cut committee sizes, we have imposed term limits on committee chairman, and made common sense decisions, such as Congress abiding by the same laws as the rest of the country must live under.

As we move into the 21st century, the Internet provides an incredible opportunity for Congress to continue our reform agenda. We must open the door to Congress for the citizens to see more of what we do and why we do it. The CLEAR Act allows for the posting of reports and issue briefs prepared by the Congressional Research Service for Members of Congress on Member and committee Web sites. The American people, students, teachers, small businessmen, farmers should be able to get this information and facts on which we as Congress base our decisions.

As we work to secure the future of our country, it is important to provide the people with the greatest information possible about their Government. This is a common sense next step in reforming our Government and returning decisions and freedom to the people.

This in no way changes the primary purpose of the Congressional Research Service, which is to serve Congress; but it gives an additional window to the citizens to understand the workings of their Government and see some of the resources we have available.

There is an entire library of resources we could be making available to citizens, information we have at our fingertips and often mail out to our constituents on a regular basis; and yet these resources cannot now be made available to American citizens in the same timely and complete manner on the Web.

This legislation that I am introducing today moves such sharing of information by Members to the public into the next century. I am pleased that many of my colleagues are taking advantage of the Internet with their committees and often Web pages to provide citizens with hearing transcripts and testimonies and copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

As we move into the 21st century, I believe reports prepared by the Congressional Research Service should be included, as well.

We live in an a democracy, a government of the people, by the people, and for the people; and we must give a clear view of what is going on in the Government to the people. That is why we are introducing the CLEAR Act today.

I look forward to working with the Congressional Research Service, the gentleman from California (Chairman THOMAS), and the Committee on House Administration and other interested Members of Congress to make what we do a lot clearer to our voters and continue to reform our Congress as we move into the new millennium.

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

(Mr. VITTER 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 gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Idaho (Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE 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 Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

REVISIONS TO ALLOCATION FOR HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

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

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Sec. 314 of the Congressional Budget Act, I hereby submit for printing in the Congressional Record revisions to the allocation for the House Committee on Appropriations pursuant to House Report 106–623 totaling $1,271,000,000 in additional new budget authority and $723,000,000 in additional outlays. This will change the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations to $601,681,000,000 in budget authority and $625,915,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2001. Budgetary aggregates will increase to $1,529,886,000,000 in budget authority and $1,495,136,000,000 in outlays for fiscal year 2001.

As reported to the House, H.R. 4577, the bill making fiscal year 2001 appropriations for the Department of Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies, includes $801,000,000 in budget authority and $315,000,000 in outlays for emergencies; $450,000,000 in budget authority and $396,000,000 in outlays for continuing disability reviews; and, $20,000,000 in budget authority and $12,000,000 in outlays for adoption incentive payments.

These adjustments shall apply while the legislation is under consideration and shall take effect upon final enactment of the legislation. Questions may be directed to Dan Kowalski or Jim Bates at 67270.

HEALTH CARE FOR CHILDREN IN TEXAS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, for the 60 minutes, we plan to address the House on health care for children in Texas. I will be joined by several Members.

My colleagues can see, Mr. Speaker, that this ad has a child that has on boxing gloves. Our children should not have to fight to get health care coverage that they truly deserve.

A child born in the year 2000 is far more likely to grow up healthy and to reach adulthood than a child that was born in 1900. Over the past 100 years, our Nation's scientific, technological, and financial resources have built the most advanced health care system in the world. But the doors of health care still remain shut to some.

Millions of children have inadequate medical care. Ensuring that every child in our Nation receives the best possible health care, we must have a top priority in this Nation. To a large extent, health status is still determined by race, language, culture, geography, and economics.

In general, children in low-income communities get sick more often from preventable acute and infectious illnesses, such as measles, conjunctivitis, and ear infections. Low-income children and teens are also more likely to suffer from chronic medical conditions, such as diabetes and asthma. These are the leading causes of school absences.

In fact, the sharpest increases in asthma rates are among the urban youth. Very prevalent. Despite the tremendous advances in medical technology and public health, millions of children have less of a chance to grow up healthy and strong because of unequal access to health care.

Texas is a perfect example. Children without health insurance or a regular source of health care are more likely to seek care from emergency rooms and clinics, which have long waits to see a provider, limited follow-up, and little to no health education about preventive strategies or ways to manage a chronic illness.

Compared with insured children, uninsured children are up to eight times less likely to have a regular source of care, four times more likely to delay seeking care, nearly three times less likely to have seen a provider in the last past year, and five times more likely to use emergency room as a regular place of care.

There is no question that insurance is key to maintaining health. When Medicaid was initiated in 1965, infant mortality rates began to decrease, and that continues today.

The health insurance status of children through age 18 in Texas compared to that of the rest of the country. On this next chart, imagine 100 children from Texas standing in front of us, 54 of these children are insured through private employer-based policies; 24 percent are uninsured; 22 percent are covered through Medicaid. This equals to about 1.4 million of the 6 million children in Texas without health insurance.

On our next chart, just imagine 100 children from all over the country standing in front of us. Sixty-four percent of these children are insured through private employer-based programs; 21 are covered through Medicare; 15 are uninsured.

Why is it that Texas's percentage of uninsured children is higher than the Nation's average? The reason is due to a Texas Government that chooses not to take advantage of the government funding that will allow many children to be insured.

I just read a news clipping here talking about the millions of dollars that is turned back or unused in the Federal Government simply because we have not enrolled these children. It is unfortunate that we have a Government so benign in Texas that will not enroll the children.

1915

As a matter of fact, Texas can expand its Medicaid coverage to the age of 18 and cover those whose income is up to 300 percent of the Federal poverty level. Presently, Texas only covers children up to age 18 and whose income is 100 percent of the Federal poverty level with title XXI funds. There is something grossly inadequate about how we take care of our children and their health care in Texas. Over half of all States have expanded the coverage to 200 percent and beyond.

The next chart shows income eligibility levels for children 1 and older in Medicaid and separate State programs. This chart shows that most States have expanded health care coverage to children in title XXI funds. This coverage is provided through Medicaid expansions and/or separate insurance programs. Why, then, Texas? Ten States offer Medicaid to those with incomes up to 150 percent of the Federal poverty level. Texas falls within that category. Texas falls at the bottom. Our children fall at the bottom.

There are several colleagues that I have here, Mr. Speaker, who will also make comments on whether or not our children are being treated fairly if they have to simply fight for the health care they deserve.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) for the work that she is doing, and I agree with her opening remarks that our children should not have to fight to get the health care coverage that they deserve.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to announce that for the first time, a Children's Health Insurance Program, or CHIP, is available in South Texas. CHIP is low-cost health insurance provided under a State-subsidized insurance program. Any Texas uninsured children, newborns through age 18, are eligible. All costs are flexible and based on family income. For example, a family of four qualifies if the household income is $34,000 or less. If they make more than that, they can qualify for greatly reduced insurance through another program, Texas Healthy Kids.

The CHIP operates like a health maintenance organization, or HMO. It is run by the TexCare Partnership which partners with all 254 Texas counties to sponsor services through one of three different plans. One is CHIP, two is Medicaid, and three is the Texas Healthy Kids. CHIP provides services such as hospital care, surgery, x-rays, therapies, prescription drugs, mental health and substance abuse treatment, emergency services, eye tests and glasses, dental care and regular health care checkups and vaccinations.

For Texas, CHIP is funded from the proceeds of our tobacco settlement with the tobacco companies a couple of years ago. It is critically important in our State because Texas has the highest rate of uninsured in the country. Unfortunately, Texas has the Nation's second highest number of uninsured children. The worst problem we have is that not enough parents are using this great program.

South Texas, in particular, has carried the burden of uninsured children for many years. About 1.4 million of Texas' 5.8 million children lack health insurance, but 470,000 of them are now eligible for coverage under CHIP. Almost one-fourth, or 109,000, of the newly-eligible kids live on the Texas-Mexico border. When children do not have the health insurance, they have to rely on costly medical treatment at the last minute. This threatens the child's future well-being. But now we have a true opportunity to change that. CHIP will give a lot of children the opportunity to lead healthy lives without the fear of getting sick.

Let me share a quote from a lady from my district who recently went through the enrollment process. She said: ''My husband and I are hard-working middle-income people who were disqualified from Medicaid because I became employed. We have two incomes, and we can't afford insurance. Now we are told by the TexCare Partnership we will have insurance for our children with low premiums and low copayments that we can afford. My children have health care when they need it.''

CHIP was first implemented in 1998 to address a national crisis, almost 12 million children that were without insurance. In Texas, we are now able to offer insurance to approximately half a million children that otherwise would have none. While we can make this offer, it is up to each parent or guardian to enroll or at least inquire about getting their children in this program.

Believe it or not, the hardest part of the CHIP program is getting parents to enroll their children. Most parents need to take advantage of this genuinely great program. I want to stress that even if a parent has never qualified for health insurance for their children before, now they can. CHIP solves the cost problem for many Texas families. In CHIP, many families will only pay an annual fee of $15 to cover all their children in this plan. Some higher-income families will pay monthly premiums of $15 or maybe $18 which covers all children in the family. Most families will also have copayments for doctor/dental visits, prescription drugs, and emergency care. And families must reenroll their children once a year.

Mr. Speaker, children can only get this insurance if their parents apply. I hope all parents listening will take the initiative and make certain their children are enrolled. The application process is simple and straightforward. Any Texan can call my office in McAllen or in Beeville to get the number for the CHIP hotline. If parents want local assistance or information in my congressional district, they can call my office for that number or visit any public library in Hidalgo County or in Bee County to pick up a bilingual brochure and application.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Could the gentleman tell me why we are just beginning to talk about this information since this has been available for a while?

Mr. HINOJOSA. It has been a fight to get the Texas leadership in the legislature to move the decision-makers to get this enrollment process going. I know that in my office we have been fighting on this for at least 18 months. I can assure the gentlewoman that I am delighted to see it finally get started, because it will stop the suffering of many of the working families that I represent in the 15th District.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON).

Mr. LAMPSON. I thank the gentlewoman from Texas for yielding. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address this issue of children's health insurance. I want to commend the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) for the work that she is doing in this regard, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA), and the other Members that we are going to be hearing from. As a government worker, I am guaranteed that my children will have access to quality health care. This knowledge brings me some peace of mind. As it stands, many parents in my home State of Texas do not have this same peace of mind. In fact, many children who are eligible for State or Federal programs are needlessly foregoing quality health care or receiving care in expensive emergency situations only.

As a Member of Congress and as a father, I believe that every family deserves to share the peace of mind that I have today. That is why I am working to reform the current children's health care insurance system. Medicaid and the new State Children's Health Insurance Program, S–CHIP, are the two key publicly funded health insurance programs that offer coverage for low-income adolescents in Texas today. Medicaid provides health insurance coverage for more than 40 million individuals, mostly women, children and adolescents, at an annual cost of about $154 billion in combined Federal and State funds.

In addition to these funds, S–CHIP made available approximately $48 billion in Federal funds over 10 years to help States expand health insurance coverage to low-income children and youth. S–CHIP works to subsidize families with income levels not covered by the Medicaid program. Funded with Federal block grant dollars and State matching dollars, S–CHIP is a health insurance program for children in families who make too much money to be eligible for Medicaid but who cannot afford other private insurance options.

Mr. Speaker, Texas gained a major victory during the 1999 legislative session when it passed S–CHIP. This State program will help affordable health insurance for families earning up to 200 percent of the Federal poverty level. The Federal Government currently allows coverage to children as high as 300 percent. Together, these programs provide many uninsured children in Texas with quality health care.

While the combination of S–CHIP and Medicaid offers powerful opportunities to reduce the percentage of uninsured children in the United States, we can do more. Despite the recently passed S–CHIP program, my home State still has the second highest rate of uninsured children in the country. At the present time, there is a pressing and undisputable need for eligibility reforms and aggressive outreach to low-income families in Texas. Statistics show that Texas is ineffective in retaining low-income kids on Medicaid. Part of this failure can be attributed to the red tape that unnecessarily burdens the neediest families in Texas. The bureaucratic hurdles that must be overcome to receive Medicaid eligibility in Texas include a face-to-face interview, an assets test, no continuous eligibility, and no presumptive eligibility.

Fortunately, Texas has been given the opportunity to adopt less restrictive methods for counting income and assets for family Medicaid. Without these changes, enrollment will continue to be difficult and complex for applicant families that are referred to Medicaid, many of whom will have a child eligible for CHIP and another one eligible for Medicaid.

Texas can make the system more navigable by implementing a few simple changes. These changes include eliminating the assets test for children's Medicaid, ending the requirement for face-to-face application, adopting uniform statewide documentation and verification options for Medicaid and Texas CHIP, and, finally, adopting 12-month continuous eligibility for children's Medicaid.

At a time of unprecedented prosperity, it is untenable for children to not have access to basic health care. Even more absurd is the fact that many of these sick children are eligible for State and Federal health insurance programs. The time to act is now. We cannot sit idly by and watch our children suffer needlessly. The solution is in our hands.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this has been available now for at least 2 years. We have already talked about the fact that when people have a language problem or they live a long ways from where they might be able to get health care relief, it is usually the lowest income which means usually the least well educated.

Has Texas taken on any leadership or responsibility to try to be sure that we can spread the word to the persons who are eligible?

Mr. LAMPSON. We certainly should be. We need to spread that word, because what it is doing it is encouraging people to go into the most expensive areas to seek the care that they need. That may be a hospital emergency room. A hospital in my hometown and other hospitals within my district are grossly strapped right now because of the closing of so many, just as an example, rural health care facilities that have lost their ability to continue to offer services across this country.

As this group of people, the children about which we are speaking right now, also find their way into these same facilities, we are driving the cost of health care up to the point where it is causing others not to have access. Where we can do something about it and help fix this problem and make it easier for those to gain the access that they so richly deserve and that we want them to have so that their health does not have an adverse effect on the rest of us in society, then certainly we ought to be taking the opportunity to do it.

1930

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, according to the New York Times, on Sunday, May 21 of this year, Texas had not spent any of the dollars allocated to take care of these children that are poor.

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman will yield, that is obviously very, very, very wrong. We have the opportunity to help children, we have the opportunity to help people, and if we cannot reach out and let them know, and make certain that they know about the programs that can provide a better quality of life, then we make serious mistakes. That is why I commend the gentlewoman for the work that she is doing in trying to accomplish just that task.

We can make a difference in people's lives if the word can reach them, if we can do the things that help make their task a little bit easier in getting the quality of care that they need and deserve. I thank the gentlewoman for doing that, and I thank her for sharing the time this evening.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for this emphasis on a very important issue. To even begin to think of the great need of children with respect to health care and not respond to their need seems to be a travesty and a tragedy.

I could not help but listen to the dialogue that the gentlewoman had with our colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON). It seems certainly that there has been a problem with the leadership from the executive of the State of Texas and particularly the Texas Department of Health. Although there may be other issues that they have excelled on, this is one that has seen a great vacuum in leadership.

I remember following the work of the State legislature, and many of the legislators from the urban centers had to work very hard to ensure that the funding for the CHIPs program included children beyond the age of 12. The initial effort by the Texas Department of Health and the governor's office was to only provide these CHIP monies for children up to 12, and many of them with the encouragement of many of us in Congress and the questioning of many of us in Congress, asked the question: Do you mean a child does not get sick after age 13?

It seems to me an outrage. I want to applaud those legislators who took the leadership and demanded that they address the question of the needs of good health care, like Sylvester Turner and Rodney Ellis and Garnett Coleman and I am sure that I am leaving out many others around the State, who were actively involved in pressing the point that we needed to have this kind of funding for children beyond the age of children.

Mr. Speaker, it has already been said that Texas is at the bottom of retaining low-income kids on Medicaid since welfare reform in 1996. It also has been noted that Texas has the highest rate of uninsured in the country, and Texas has the second highest rate of uninsured children in the Nation. But what also needs to be noted is that right now in the State of Texas, some 500,000 children qualify for CHIP, and that means, that symbol that the gentlewoman has, the picture of that baby that says, do our children have to really fight, or should our children have to really fight to get good health care. With 500,000 children already qualifying for CHIP, it seems that we are behind the times in moving forward to ensure that this program works. It is well known that Texas has been slow compared to other States in implementing CHIP.

This is not to say that we do not have some very committed health professionals in our own local communities who have been begging for the CHIP program to be implemented. Children enrolled in Texas CHIP can get a comprehensive benefits package which include eye exams and glasses, prescription drugs and limited dental checkups and therapy, all of the items that provide for a healthy child.

Just last week in my district, Senator PAUL WELLSTONE and myself held hearings on mental health. I know we do not have mental health parity, but to hear the parents of children come forward and cry out for needed services in mental health for diagnostic services, for counseling services, knowing full well that we need to keep working toward parity, that is also health care that parents need.

So we can see that the CHIPS program is long overdue in our community. To avoid a logistical nightmare for both the State and parents, Texas should act as quickly as possible to implement changes in children's Medicare eligibility. To reinforce what has been said, we need to eliminate the access test for children's Medicaid. Texas now makes parents of Medicaid-eligible children document not just income, but also the value of savings, IRAs, automobiles, and valuables. There is a lot better way to do it, and we can utilize the Federal law that is used by the Federal Government in 40 States, plus the District of Columbia.

It is important to drop the requirement for face-to-face applications, recertification interviews, because we realize that parents are very busy. We should allow mail-in applications. This is not required by Federal law. Thirty-eight States, plus the District of Columbia, allow mail-ins. So it is important that as we deal with the elimination of assets which are not required by the Federal Government, nor required by 40 States, we can then make more easier, if you will, the ability for these parents to apply and become eligible for CHIP.

The main point that I think we are trying to impress upon our State and the focus of this Special Order that I think is so very important is our children are voiceless. Their parents are fighting for them, but they are the ones who every time a ballot is cast, a child cannot vote, yet they are in need of the good health care that this CHIPS program would allow.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the State of Texas would see the value of responding to the needs of our children and quickly eliminate the complicated process that keeps this CHIPS program from being implemented. I think it is important that we get leadership from the State, and I think it is most important that the Texas Department of Health establish a focus that says in a certain period of time, we will ensure that the CHIPS program is working throughout the entire State, and that that needs to be done now.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, statistics tell us that more and more children are being absent from school because of asthma, and yet, it has been determined that we have one of the worst environments in the Nation, so bad that Oklahoma is complaining that we are polluting parts of Oklahoma. If we have this available and not making any effort to cover the children while we are also providing an environment that is conducive to making them even more unhealthy, what does this tell us? Is there any compassion in Texas?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman will yield, it seems like we are lacking a great deal of compassion, and the gentlewoman has hit the nail on the head. Healthy children make healthy adults. Children are apt to get all manner of childhood diseases and ailments. Asthma is one of the most devastating childhood diseases that lead into adult asthma. We do have a problem in our respective communities with air quality. We are fighting that problem well now. In fact, as the gentlewoman well knows, she was one of the supporters, and I continue to support, the Mickey Leland Toxic Center that is located in the Texas Medical Center that deals with air quality standards and does the research on respiratory diseases. We find that many children have them.

I believe that there is no compassion in this State if we cannot get the CHIPS program implemented to provide for the children of this State when the program has been passed by this Congress under the Balanced Budget Act since 1997. This is now the year 2000. Why does not the State of Texas, 43rd, if you will, in the care of mental health and some very low number, I know, in the care of health period having the highest number of uninsured cannot provide the CHIPS program for their children. I think that we need to show a great deal more compassion on behalf of Texas children and the Nation's children and ensure that these children do have insurance to make them healthy children and then healthy adults.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to rise in support of our nation's increased investment in childcare in the form of insurance coverage. A serious oversight has occurred when studies and statistics show a large portion of children that are not covered by medical insurance.

Nationally, over 11 million of our nation's children—one in seven of those children living in the United States are uninsured. Two-thirds of these children live in families with income below 200 percent of the poverty level ($33,400 for a family of four in 1999).

Many escape through the cracks simply because they do not fit the description policy makers have in regards to poverty. Low-income uninsured children typically live in two-parent, working households and have little contact with the welfare system.

In the same instance, families who are below standard income have the misfortune of being undereducated regarding the health benefits they and their children have access to through their entitled aide. Forty-one percent of parents of these eligible uninsured children postponed seeking medical care for their offspring because they could not afford it.

A much-needed solution for adolescents who need insurance comes in the form of Medicaid and the new State Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP). These two key organizations are publicly funded health insurance programs that offer coverage for low-income adolescents.

These programs enacted by Congress more than thirty years apart, both augment and complement each other. While each has distinctly different characteristics, together they offer a powerful opportunity to reduce the percentage of uninsured adolescents in the

United States and to increase adolescents' access to health care.

I must ask that as my colleagues deliberate this week on the real and necessary benefits of the defense appropriations to our nation's security, that they also consider the benefit to domestic security, which is created by their support of health care for all of our nation's youth.

Medicaid provides health insurance coverage for more than 40 million individuals—most are women, children, and adolescents—at an annual cost of about $154 billion in combined federal and state funds.

Eligibility for Medicaid is determined by each state according to its specific guidelines. However, the federal government specifies the mandatory eligibility categories and the optional eligibility categories.

Medicaid is significantly affected by several of the mandatory and optional eligibility categories.

The State Children's Health Insurance Program made available approximately $48 billion in federal funds over ten years to help states expand health insurance coverage to low-income children and youth.

Federal law permits states to use CHIP funds to expand coverage in three ways: through Medicaid expansions; state-designed, non-Medicaid programs; or a combination of these two approaches.

SCHIP, is funded with federal block grant dollars and state matching dollars, as a health insurance program for children in families who make too much money for Medicaid, but who cannot afford other private insurance options.

SCHIP has extended coverage to an additional 2 million children who do not qualify for Medicaid. Yet millions of children are believed to be eligible for these programs, but remain uninsured.

Uninsured youth will benefit from Medicaid and CHIP only if the states in which they live chose to extend eligibility and if states then work to enroll them. This requires more than working with funding for these programs. It entails communicating to the community that needs the service that something is available.

SCHIP benefits depend heavily on program design and state discretion. States currently cover children whose family incomes range generally from below the Federal poverty level (FPL) to as high as 300 percent of poverty.

Even when adolescents are enrolled in insurance programs that provide comprehensive benefits, a number of other factors influenced whether adolescents actually receive the services they need. These include affordability, confidentiality, and availability of providers with expertise and experience in caring for adolescents.

In Texas the rate of uninsured is higher than any other state in the country. In particular Texas has the second highest rate of uninsured children in the nation. In an attempt to combat this high rating the state of Texas has combined the options available to states in order to expand health insurance coverage. This combination includes expansion of Medicaid and state-designed, non-Medicaid programs.

Texas covers children whose family incomes range from below the FPL to 200 percent of poverty. The Federal government allows coverage to children as high as 300 percent.

TEXAS—STATISTICS

Texas has the highest rate of uninsured in the country.

Texas has the second highest rate of uninsured children in the nation.

There are 1.4 million uninsured children in Texas—600,000 are eligible for, but not in Medicaid; nearly 500,000 qualify for CHIP.

Texas attempt to combats the number of uninsured children by combining the options available to states in order to expand health insurance coverage. Texas' combination includes the expansion of Medicaid and state-designed, non-Medicaid programs.

At present time, there is a need for eligibility reforms and aggressive outreach for low-income health programs in Texas.

Texas is at the bottom of retaining low-income kids on Medicaid since welfare reform in 1996.

193,400 Texas children fell off the Medicaid rolls during the past three years, a 14.2 percent decline.

Medicaid data collected finds an increase in the number of people enrolled in Medicaid in June 1999 compared to June 1998, but the magnitude of this success rate is dampened due to the decline of Medicaid in nine states—one of them was Texas.

The status quo in Texas is that children (up to age 19) in families with incomes at or under 100 percent of the federal poverty income level (FPL, $14,140 for a family of 3) can qualify for Medicaid.

Drop the requirement for face-to-face application/re-certification interviews for children's Medicaid. (Allow mail-in applications.) This is not required by federal law, and 38 states plus the District of Columbia allow mail-in application for children. Three states also allow community-based enrollment outside the welfare office.

Adopt and publicize for children's Medicaid the same simple, flexible documentation and verification options used for Texas CHIP. To make a joint mail-in application feasible, children's Medicaid and CHIP must accept the same documents for income and other required verifications. Children's Medicaid documentation should be identical statewide, to make a true joint CHIP-Medicaid mail-in application possible. Federal law allows states to reduce income documentation for children's Medicaid in any way, or even to eliminate it in favor of using third-party verification. Seven states require no income documentation for children's Medicaid.

To avoid a logistical nightmare for both the state and parents, Texas should as quickly as possible implement changes in children's Medicaid eligibility. Without these critical changes, enrollment will be difficult and complex for the many applicant families that are referred to Medicaid—many of whom will have one child eligible for CHIP, and another eligible for Medicaid. States already implementing CHIP report that large proportions of applicants end up in Medicaid. The changes needed are as follows:

Eliminate the assets test for children's Medicaid. Texas now makes parents of Medicaid-eligible children document not just income, but also the value of savings, IRAs, automobiles, and valuables, etc. The test is not required by federal law, and 40 states plus the District of Columbia have already dropped in for children.

Recent federal law changes allow states to cover parents in families with children up to any income limit the state chooses.

Texas has been given the choice to adopt less restrictive methods for counting income and assets for family Medicaid; for example, states can increase earned income disregards, and alter or eliminate asset tests.

Texas has been slow compared to other states in implementing CHIP.

Children enrolled in Texas CHIP will get a comprehensive benefits package—includes eye exams and glasses, prescription drugs, and limited dental check-ups, and therapy.

CHIP does not serve as an alternative to Medicaid for those families, who based on their income, are eligible for Medicaid.

Adopt 12-month continuous eligibility for children's Medicaid. Children enrolled in Texas CHIP stay enrolled for 12 months, regardless of any changes in income during that period. In Texas Medicaid, parents must report any income change within 10 days, and Medicaid is cut off the next month if the new family income is too high for Medicaid. Twelve-month eligibility for Children's Medicaid is a state option Congress created when it passed CHIP. This was done in an effort to allow for identical policies in Medicaid and CHIP, and promote continuity of health care. Fifteen states have adopted continuous eligibility for Children's Medicaid, and Ohio will begin the policy July 2000.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman very much.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN).

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Let me first start out by commending the gentlewoman for having this Special Order to talk about the CHIPs program and the need for greater access to health care for children in this country. As the gentlewoman knows, back in 1997, we were part of an effort to start the CHIPs program, this was a Federal effort. I was pleased to be a member of the House Committee on the Budget when the 1997 Balanced Budget Act, the reconciliation bill, was crafted and ultimately passed and signed by the President. I think there is a certain amount of credit that is due the President as well for his steadfast support for this program.

It is correct that unfortunately, our State, and as a proud Texan I have to say it is unfortunate that our State was a little late in getting a CHIPs program up and running. The legislature, which meets biennially, did not get a chance to take this up or did not choose to take this up until 1999.

I think it is a little ironic when some of us were saying that the legislature should move on this, that the governor perhaps should call a special session to address this very popular bipartisan program, that with fear that Texas might ultimately lose some funds, we now see that the other body has decided to borrow from some of the funds that Congress set aside back in 1997 from the tobacco tax for this. We do know that Congresses have a way sometimes of borrowing and failing to repay those funds. So I am a little nervous that Texas might lose out as a result of that.

Mr. Speaker, I watched with great interest when our legislature had the debate over whether to cover at 150 percent or 200 percent of the poverty level.

I think the legislature, under the leadership of Speaker Pete Laney, did the right thing in going to 200 percent, and that will begin to address what is really a health care crisis in Texas and a health care crisis across the country with uninsured children.

When we were doing the 1997 act, we estimated that there were 10 million children across the country without insurance; about 3 million of those are Medicaid-eligible children and the rest are children of working families who make too much money to be in the Medicaid program but do not get health insurance through the workforce or choose not to take it but cannot afford to buy it on their own.

Now, with respect to that, as my colleague from Houston just talked about, in terms of the Medicaid program, there is no question that we could do a much better job of enrolling children in Medicaid. I have offered, and I think the gentlewoman is a cosponsor, a bill, H.R. 1298, that would give schools the ability to grant presumptive eligibility for children who might be eligible, who are eligible for Medicaid, in the same way that the 1997 act gave that to Federal health care workers.

Our colleague, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) has a bill that would extend that same ability to grant presumptive eligibility to what are called SCHIP workers, State Children'S Health Insurance workers as well, so that we would have the ability of not only enrolling children in the CHIPs program, but also enrolling those children who are Medicaid eligible in the Medicaid program.

One of the unfortunate facts of our home State of Texas is that we lead the Nation in the number of Medicaid-eligible children who are not enrolled in the program, about 800,000 kids in Texas who should be in the Medicaid program.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, there has been a whole legislative session that has come and gone since these dollars have been available, and as of May 21 of this year, we had not used any of the dollars allocated for Texas. Can the gentleman think of any reason why we have denied these children the right to health care when there is nothing standing in the way between them and health care enrollment?

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman would yield, we hear from some that we should not be passing new laws, we ought to be enforcing the laws that we have, but sometimes we find from some of the people who say that they are not enforcing the laws that are on their books, and this is one that ought to be enforced.

That gets to the point that I was making on Medicaid, why this is important. I represent the largest medical center in the world, has the largest children's hospital, Texas Children's Hospital, in my district. They have an emergency room that was built I think for something along the lines of 20,000 emergency room visits a year. They get about 60,000. Why do they get so many? They get so many because they have a lot of children who do not have health insurance who are getting ambulatory care, who are getting primary care in the emergency room.

What is wrong about that? Well, one, it overwhelms the system, but the other problem is the cost structure. As the gentlewoman well knows from her professional career before Congress, the cost structure is much higher in the emergency room. A lot of these kids who could have gotten more preventive care if they had been receiving regular primary care, and from the Federal standpoint, and this is something that those of us in the Congress, as stewards of the Federal taxpayer and the budget, should be concerned about is the way that is funded are two ways.

One, it is funded by the hospitals picking up the cost any way they can, and the other is the Federal Government picks up 100 percent of the tab through the disproportionate share program.

1945

This becomes a big problem, because the States share the Medicaid program with the Federal government, as the gentlewoman knows, and at least they could be picking up 40 percent of the tab for these 800,000 kids in Texas who ought to be in the program, rather than having the Federal government pick up the entire tab.

As the gentlewoman knows, we reduced the Medicaid DSH program in the 1997 Act. We were able to hold the line in Texas because of the good work she did and others in the delegation. But it only makes sense that we ought to enroll these kids in the Medicaid program, we ought to get full enrollment in the CHIP program. In the long run, it will be cheaper than having to continue to fund huge dollars through the DSH program.

Beyond the bottom line aspect, it is the right thing to do, because we want to have healthy kids in Texas, we want to have healthy kids across this country. It is the compassionate conservative thing to do, but it is not enough to care. It is to care enough to do it.

The gentlewoman is on the right track with her special order. We have much more work to do in this area. We need the leadership to get this done, to get these kids enrolled, to make the changes in the Medicaid law so that we can get more kids in there, and we will have a healthier and a stronger society by it. I commend the gentlewoman for having this special order.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) could not be here, but he left a statement. I notice in the statement, in his congressional district, which is also in the Houston area, at least 70 percent of the children in the Aldine School District rely on the school nurse for primary health care services, or as their initial health care provider. That does not have to be, and it should not have to be.

We have too many children who are not getting any kind of attention in Texas. We cannot allow this to continue. It is ironic that we talk about how great we are, this big, wonderful State, with the greatest prosperity in the history of the State. We have all of these children starting out, without the availability of health care, a full life perhaps with chronic illnesses because they do not have access to the care that they deserve, and they can have it. They would have it if we had a Texas government that had enough compassion to enroll them in the program.

Nobody wishes to be poor, no one wishes to be uneducated, no one wishes to be a long ways from various health care outlets. But when that happens, the entire State ought to have access to that care. They need to be informed and they need to be enrolled. This is simply not the time to turn our heads and pretend this is not going on. It is not the time to simply say to poor kids, get back, be quiet, you might make us look bad.

We have got to give attention to these poor kids who are kids of working parents, low-income parents, who do not have access to health care that taxpayers are willing to pay for. The money is available. Texas has access to the money and refuses to use it. Is that compassion, I ask the Members? Is this America? This is not what we stand here and fight for, and what we fund each day.

We tried to be very sure that when welfare reform came, that our poor kids would not fall through the cracks. We did our part at this level. It is time for the State of Texas to look up and acknowledge that though we have much wealth, we have the largest number of poor kids being neglected. In a State where you can hardly breathe the air, we have kids who are getting their lungs injured every day simply because they do not have access to care that has been paid for. We simply refuse to use it.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon all of my colleagues to join me in making a plea to the State of Texas, my home State. I was born in the State and I know the State. I served there in the House and in the Senate. This callousness must not continue, and certainly we must not allow it to spread in this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the statement of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

The statement referred to is as follows:

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is hard to believe that, here in the world's richest country, one in seven American children does not have health insurance.

Yet, in the midst of our Nation's longest and strongest economic expansion, the health of over 11 million of our children is being jeopardized.

In the Houston region, over a quarter million children are uninsured.

In my Congressional district, at least 70% of children in the Aldine Independent School District rely on the school nurse for primary healthcare services or as their initial healthcare provider.

Our children deserve better.

Congress created Medicaid, and later the new Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP), to offer coverage for low-income children.

These two programs are an investment in good health—an investment that pays dividends in the long term because prevention saves taxpayers money.

They have reduced the percentage of uninsured children and parents in the United States. And, they have increased access to quality health care services.

Medicaid provides health insurance coverage for more than 40 million individuals—mostly women, children, and adolescents—at an annual cost of about $154 billion in combined federal and state funds.

Eligibility for Medicaid is determined by each state according to its specific guidelines.

States have wide discrepancy in determining what optional benefits will be given, who will be eligible for those benefits and the procedure used to grant the benefits.

While Medicaid has benefited the poorest of the poor, it has not been able to address a second group of uninsured—the working poor.

In 1997, Congress passed the Children's Health Insurance Program or CHIP, which made available approximately $48 billion in federal funds over ten years to help states expand health insurance coverage to low-income children and youth.

Federal law permits states to use CHIP funds to expand coverage in three ways: through Medicaid expansions; state-designed, non-Medicaid programs; or a combination of these two approaches.

CHIP, funded with federal block grant dollars and state matching dollars, is a health insurance program for children in families who make too much money for Medicaid, but who cannot afford other private insurance options.

CHIP has extended coverage to an additional 2 million children who do not qualify for Medicaid. Yet millions of children are believed to be eligible for these programs, but remain uninsured.

Uninsured children will benefit from Medicaid and CHIP only if the states in which they live chose to extend eligibility and if states then work to enroll them.

States currently cover children whose family incomes range generally from below the Federal poverty level (FPL) to as high as 300% of poverty.

While some states moved very quickly to insure low-income children, Texas did not. In the first year in which funds were available, the State of Texas expanded Medicaid coverage for children at or below 100 percent of the federal poverty line.

This resulted in 58,286 children ages 15–18 having insurance. More than 102,000 remained uninsured, even though they were eligible for coverage under the old federal Medicaid rules. This was a very slow start.

However, thanks to the efforts of the Texas Legislature during the 76th Legislative Session, our state is making progress.

Because of the efforts of Senator John Whitmore and Representative Kevin Bailey, Texas created a separate children's health insurance program for children at or below 200 percent of the federal poverty line.

This will provide health insurance for 500,124 Texas children through age 18. In my region, this means 90,802 children will have health insurance.

While this is a good development, we still have a long way to go.

Other states are further along in providing health coverage for children. In the first year of the program, Texas expanded coverage for 58,286 children. By comparison, Alabama enrolled 38,980 children; California enrolled 222,351 children; Florida enrolled 154,594 children; Georgia enrolled 47,581 children; Massachusetts enrolled 67,852 children; Missouri enrolled 49,529 children; New Jersey enrolled 75,652 children; New York 521,301 children; North Carolina enrolled 57,300 children; Ohio enrolled 83,688 children; and South Carolina enrolled 45,737 children.

Of the states that chose to create a separate children's health program, many are extending coverage to more children than is Texas, including California at 250 percent; Connecticut at 300 percent; New Jersey at 350 percent; Vermont at 300 percent; and Washington at 250 percent.

Texas can do more. And we should do more. We have the highest rate of uninsured persons in the country.

And, Texas has the second highest rate of uninsured children in the nation. Over 41% of parents of eligible uninsured children postponed seeking medical care for their child because they could not afford it.

There are 1.4 million uninsured children in Texas—600,000 are eligible for, but not in Medicaid; nearly 500,000 qualify for CHIP.

Texas covers children whose family incomes range from below the federal poverty level to 200% of the federal poverty level. Yet the Federal government allows coverage to children as high as 300%.

Texas, like the rest of the nation, could do more to conduct an aggressive outreach to ensure that eligible children receive the services they need.

New outreach is clearly needed—now, more than ever. Like many states, after federal welfare reform was enacted in 1996, we saw a huge drop in the number of persons applying for and participating in Medicaid. 193,400 Texas children fell off the Medicaid rolls during the past three years, a 14.2% decline.

Because these two programs are no longer linked, many lower-income persons do not realize that they are eligible for health insurance.

Unfortunately, Texas is the worst state in the Nation in terms of retaining low-income kids on Medicaid.

And, a recent New York Times article shows that Texas has used none of the federal funds it is entitled to for outreach. We can do better.

Why are so many persons not receiving the Medicaid and CHIP services they're entitled to?

Red tape burdens the neediest families in Texas.

Medicaid program eligibility requirements in Texas include:

A Face-to-face interview

An Asset test

No continuous eligibility—families must periodically re-enroll

No presumptive eligibility—even if families have proven that they are eligible for another program with the same income guidelines, they must go seven states (Texas included) expanded coverage to only 100 percent of the as quickly as possible implement changes in Children's Medicaid eligibility.

Texas can take steps now to reduce it's state government bureaucracy. For example, the state could:

Eliminate the assets test for children's Medicaid. Texas now makes parents of Medicaid-eligible children document not just income, but also the value of savings, IRAs, automobiles, and valuables.

The test is not required by federal law, and 40 states plus the District to Columbia have already dropped it for children.

Texas could also drop the requirement for face-to-face application/recertification interviews for children's Medicaid and allow mail-in applications.

Thirty-eight states plus the District of Columbia allow mail-in application for children. Three states also allow community-based enrollment outside the welfare office.

Texas could adopt for children's Medicaid the same simple, flexible documentation and verification options used for Texas CHIP. To make a joint mail-in application feasible, children's Medicaid and CHIP must accept the same documents for income and other required verifications.

Federal law allows states to reduce income documentation for children's Medicaid in any way, or even to eliminate it in favor of using third-party verification. Seven states require no income documentation for children's Medicaid.

The state could adopt 12-month continuous eligibility for children's Medicaid. Children enrolled in Texas CHIP stay enrolled for 12 months, regardless of any changes in income during that period.

In Texas Medicaid, parents must report any income change within 10 days, and Medicaid is cut off the next month if the new family income is too high for Medicaid.

Texas could also adopt twelve-month eligibility for Children's Medicaid—this continuous eligibility is a state option Congress created when it passed CHIP. Fifteen states have adopted continuous eligibility for Children's Medicaid, and Ohio will begin the policy in July 2000.

Hopefully, my colleagues in the state legislature will consider some of these ideas as they continue their push to expand health care to the uninsured.

Thanks to their efforts, Texas has done many good things in the past year to reduce the number of uninsured children. We can certainly do more. I am hopeful that successful state partnerships like Medicaid and CHIP will be used by the state to their full potential.

EDUCATION IN AMERICA AND PUBLIC SCHOOL REFORM

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

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I intend to be joined here in a few minutes by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) and possibly some other Members of the House as well.

Mr. Speaker, we had the occasion today of holding a field hearing in St.

Paul, Minnesota, and I want to talk a little bit about the content of that hearing, and also some other issues that are critical with respect to education in America in and public school reform in general.

Mr. Speaker, the hearing was held, as I mentioned, in St. Paul this morning. It was conducted by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA). The subcommittee that conducted the hearing was the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, the committee that deals with most of the investigations not only that we have conducted with respect to waste, fraud, and abuse in the Department of Education, but also focusing on research and investigation into different innovative activities in public schools; finding out what works, for example, and what does not work; finding out and learning more and witnessing firsthand some of the innovative ideas that are taking place throughout the fifty States under the leadership of Governors and State legislators and other more local leaders.

Today we met with the Superintendent of Schools and some State legislators and some others who are leading the way in education reform and providing some great examples in the State of Minnesota. That just adds, Mr. Speaker, to the collection of data and information that we have been assembling from throughout the country. The subcommittee has been now to 21 different States analyzing the various education reform efforts that are taking place in those States.

One of the topics that was discussed at great length this morning at the hearing was charter schools. Charter schools really got their start in the State of Minnesota. The idea had been discussed and had been bantered around in the halls of State legislatures throughout the country from time to time prior to that. I think it was in 1991 that Minnesota became the first State to pass charter school legislation.

Charter schools are public schools. They are still funded by the government, run by the government. In fact, they are owned by the government, but they are managed and operated often in different ways, largely defined by a specific contract or a charter, as it is called; hence the name ''charter schools.''

That contract is one that is usually proposed by a group of parents, sometimes a group of teachers, sometimes an organization of some sort. In many cases, charter schools are established by existing public education institutions that find particular difficulty with the policies, rules, regulations, or funding mechanisms of the State they are in or the district that they fall under. That usually constitutes the need or the origin of the charter.

What motivates these groups and these operations or individuals and parents to venture off on their own and try a new way of educating, trying to, for example, break the mold of education delivery in a community, it is often motivated by test scores that are insufficient to meet the needs of the parents that consider charter schools.

Sometimes it is a management-related issue. In many cases we have heard, for example, there is a strong desire to treat teachers like real professionals. Too often the union wage scale that is at play in most States around the country prevents teachers from being treated like real professionals. Consequently, most teachers are paid in a way where the absolute best teacher in a district is compensated on the same basis as the absolute worst teacher in a district.

So often we find education professionals and parents who believe that their children learn best in a professional learning environment, where teachers are treated like professionals rather than all treated the same, as though there is no distinction between them.

2000

Charter schools are flourishing throughout the country. We are seeing more and more of them. That is certainly the case in Minnesota, as provided in the testimony to the committee today. I think they said there are somewhere on the order of 60 or 70 charter schools, somewhere in that neighborhood, I do not remember the number exactly, charter schools that exist now in Minnesota. Some have closed, which is something that we should actually focus on a little bit tonight.

These charters, these contracts, are usually for a limited duration and period of time, at the end of which the contract ends or expires and must be renewed between the charter applicant and the school district. If the charter has met all of the objectives and the goals that it outlined in the original application, then the charters presumably will be continued. Sometimes there are political battles that prevent that from occurring, but for all intents and purposes they are generally approved if they met the objectives that they initially set out to achieve.

But if a charter school fails to meet those objectives, they frequently find themselves shut down, put out of business. Often it does not even take that long for the renewal question to be raised. Often it comes down to a matter of cash flow. If charter schools cannot satisfy customers, in other words if they cannot satisfy the parents of those children, who care about them the most, in a way that convinces those parents that the education of their child is being accomplished, well, then they simply go somewhere else and the cash flow dwindles and the charter school cannot survive.

It is always unfortunate to see a school fail, but it is important that it occur. And that competitive notion, that level of accountability placed in the hands of parents, rather than the hands of government workers, is what makes all the difference in this particular venue of education reform; and it is why charter schools work well generally throughout the country, and why almost every charter school in America has a substantial waiting list of customers that would like to be educated in those schools.

That is the case in Minnesota as well. When a charter school fails or does not meet those objectives, the doors close. So the question ought to be for all of us here, if we look at charter schools as these microcosms of education research, of experimentation at some times certainly, but as laboratories of sorts where different educational methods are tested, we ought to also consider the customer-driven impacts that charter schools are subject to and ask ourselves when will we ever start applying the same kind of standards to the rest of government-owned schools in general?

Mr. Speaker, what I mean by that is that when a regular government-owned or public school fails to meet the needs of local parents and raise the academic standards and the opportunity for children, those are kind of handled administratively. But the children who are in those schools are frequently trapped there, their parents having virtually no opportunity or no choice to go somewhere else or leave. Consequently, there really is no recourse for those parents; no consequence for a school that is not meeting the needs of its community.

So we ought to ask ourselves why, if charter schools and the presence of competition and parent-driven measurements of quality results in about 4 percent of charter schools failing, why is there no equivalent measurement with the regular government-owned schools? And that is something we ought to explore and we ought to perhaps provide. Because what really drives the agenda in regular community schools and government-owned institutions and neighborhoods, regular public schools as we know them, is the particular attributes that are assembled there: the principal that was assigned there by the district and the teachers that were hired there by a school district. Then the parents of the children who happen to live in a particular neighborhood pick these school for a variety of reasons.

The school curriculum, the way it is managed, the way it is organized, and the way it is funded frequently have little to do with why a family decided to live in a neighborhood, let alone be enrolled in a particular education establishment and education institution.

So it was an interesting hearing because the message that was given to members of the subcommittee was that Washington ought to go slow when it comes to charter schools. Charter schools were created at the State level. They were inspired by local initiative. They were a response to the demands

of customers and the responsiveness of State legislators, primarily, in Minnesota, California, and Colorado and in other States since then, those early days in the early 1990s.

Mr. Speaker, it is a response that is working and is providing a remarkable education opportunity for many, many children across the country.

''Keep your hands off of these schools for a while,'' is the way I would summarize today's message on charter schools. There are efforts here in Washington to try to address some of the problems that charter schools are confronting, namely start-up costs and getting themselves off the ground. Finding a way to organize an education institution from scratch is a very difficult endeavor indeed. Finding a building to house a charter school is a critical challenge as well.

So there is a temptation on behalf of those of us here in Washington who want to see charter schools succeed to reach into the Federal coffers and find ways to get funds from Washington, D.C., to help these local problems; and that is a good problem to be concerned about. That is a sentiment that I find gratifying; and I am encouraged by it, that there are people here who want to help charter schools.

But the concern voiced today on behalf of those who actually run those schools was one of appreciation for Federal concern, but a well-placed fear of the mandates that typically follow the Federal funds that come out of Washington.

I say a ''well-placed fear'' because that is the history, in fact, of the Federal involvement in education. Every time something good happens in education, people here in Washington want to celebrate it and then become a part of it, and politicians just cannot resist the temptation for claiming credit for it. The best way people have in Washington, it seems, to show compassion and concern for something that works well is by dishing out lots of cash. Ultimately, the cash gets attached to Federal rules, Federal guidelines, Federal regulations and pretty soon that enterprise that was a good idea, that started out as a remarkable reform, perhaps a transformation of education, becomes co-opted by the Federal Government.

That was the concern voiced by some of the most forceful charter school advocates that we heard from this morning in our hearing in Minneapolis.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), my colleague, has joined me on the floor. He has heard a little bit of the discussion, and I yield the floor to him.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER) for his leadership on education in the Committee on Education and the Workforce. He is one of the bright, shining stars in Congress on pushing for education reform. I just wanted to come down and join him in this discussion about education. Specifically, about the kinds of unfunded Federal mandates that we are imposing on our local school districts.

This week, Mr. Speaker, we are going to be considering the Labor-HHS-Education bill. That is the bill that funds all the Federal Government education programs. Well, what I find is unique and interesting is that for the last 30 years we have been doing this, and then some, is that in 1975 Congress passed a law, a good law, the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act. Everybody calls this IDEA. Well, what that law basically did was to say that all children with disabilities should receive a quality education.

That is a very prudent measure, and a law that I think the gentleman from Colorado and I both support. But what they did in that law was say that the Federal Government would fund 40 percent of IDEA spending in our local schools and that the State government would then fund the remaining 60 percent. So a local school district would not have to pay for the educational mandate being imposed on local school districts.

Mr. Speaker, that was 1975. That just is not the case today. Today, in the First District of Wisconsin, Janesville, Beloit, Racine, Kenosha, they are getting about 7 percent of the funding for IDEA. Now, nationwide, the average is about 12 percent, because this Congress and a couple before have doubled the commitment to IDEA under the new majority in Congress. But that is just not enough.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to give a quick illustration of what this unfunded mandate does to our local schools. Many of us, and I know the gentleman from Colorado is a leader in this, are advocates for local control. I, and many others, believe that the educational decisions should best be left to those who know our children the best: teachers, parents, administrators.

As a former Secretary of Education, Bill Bennett, once said: ''Education is the moral obligation and responsibility of the parent, the ethical responsibility of the teacher, and the constitutional responsibility of the State.''

But an education with respect to IDEA, it specifically is a Federal mandate that forces our local schools to pay for this. But when the local school districts come in and have to pay for this, where is Washington? In my case, where is Madison, the State government? They are nowhere to be found. Local school districts are being stuck with the bill.

What this means is that local control is atrophying. Local control is being sucked out of our schools because our local school boards or property taxes are being driven toward chasing unfunded mandates from Washington.

In a State like Wisconsin where we have a revenue cap on education spending and our education budget, it is even felt more. So when we have a revenue cap on what we can spend on education, on how high property taxes can go, and then Washington comes along, as it is doing, and imposes this mandate, a very costly one, a prudent one, but a very costly one, and does not live up to its end of the bargain, what we do is take every dollar out of those local education needs and put it towards chasing an unfunded Federal mandate.

So every time Madison and Washington impose this mandate on our schools on a year-to-year basis, every time a school board in Janesville, Wisconsin, wants to come up with a new innovative program, a new innovative idea to treat the unique needs and problems of our schools in Janesville or Beloit or Kenosha or Colorado, every dollar we send is a dollar taken out of local control, a dollar taken out of that local resource decision-making.

By imposing these unfunded mandates, as we are doing in IDEA, on our local school districts, we are taking money away from local decision-making.

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

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, that was the second point I wanted to get into, because we also heard today at that subcommittee hearing in St. Paul from State Representative Alice Seagren of the Minnesota House of Representatives. Alice was a very articulate spokeswoman for not only the charter school movement, but when it came to the discussion of whether the Federal Government ought to provide additional funding for school construction at the local level.

She said, ''That is a nice thought and we appreciate the sentiment, but if you really want to help our schools, fully fund the mandate under the IDEA.''

Going back to the 1970s, the gentleman is right. This is a mandate that was really handed down by the Supreme Court. And for those of us who are conservatives, and we are now joined by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA), as the three of us here are, we believe that the role of the U.S. Department of Education ought to be minimal when it comes to managing our local schools. The IDEA program is probably the one Federal program where we have an obligation to put the cash forward for it, primarily because the Supreme Court has interpreted the Constitution in a way that suggests we have to.

But the gentleman is right. What started out as a program where the Federal Government promised to fund 40 percent of the total cost of implementing the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act, under the Clinton and Gore administration that percentage was dropped all the way down to 6 percent. We fought for the last 5 or 6 years here as a Republican majority in the House and in the Senate to bump that up. We have got it up to I think it was 12 last year. It is scheduled to go up to about 15 this year. But it is still far short of the 40 percent.

Mr. Speaker, getting us up to 40 percent ought to be our top priority, and

I know we are all united in our agreement on that point.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. If the gentleman would yield, so when the gentleman is saying that the President, the Clinton administration dropped the commitment to the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act, did general Federal education spending drop at the same time?

Mr. SCHAFFER. Not at all. General education funding has increased dramatically. But the priority of this one mandate that the Supreme Court has tasked this body with funding has gone in the opposite direction and has actually been reduced in funding.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. What we have been seeing with this administration, and the gentleman should correct me if I am wrong, is the fact that they have lessened our commitment. They have gone away from funding the unfunded mandate we are imposing on local schools, to funding more Federal education programs that have even more strings attached to them, which tie the hands of local education decision-makers, and give us even more unfunded mandates in our schools?

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is precisely right. One of the expert witnesses we heard from today, Dr. Karen Effrem, who is an M.D., a pediatrician, put that figure at about 70 percent Federal mandate percentage. She said, paraphrasing her words: essentially, what Washington is doing to States is providing somewhere around 6 to 7 percent of the total funding that actually gets to a classroom, and in exchange for that is attaching about 75 percent of all the rules, regulations, and mandates that a local school has to deal with.

2015

So the effect of the Clinton-Gore administration in Washington on education is just as the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) has described. It has been one to pump more cash into the Department of Education, not to classrooms, but to the Department, the bureaucracy, to spread that bureaucracy wider and to more and more Federal programs, none of which work very well. I might add that the end result at the end of the day is that the few important legitimate programs that Washington ought to be concerned about, Individuals with Disabilities Education Act being primary, is diffused in this morass of waste, fraud, and abuse of bureaucratic expenditures. The taxpayers are getting very little for their education funding when we talk about dollars that come to Washington.

Our goal is to try to shrink the size of the Federal government, reduce its influence on managing the day-to-day activities in classrooms, and give the resources to where the local leaders tell us they need it most, Individuals with Disabilities Education Act being paramount.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I see we have been joined by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA), another education reformer. And I would like to include the gentleman from Michigan in the conversation, but I would like to inform my colleagues of an amendment that I have pending in the Committee on Rules right now that recognizes the fact that Washington has been creating new programs, growing new programs, putting new strings on these programs, and diminishing the commitment to IDEA. I have an amendment which seeks to try and put some more money within the existing appropriations bill into Individuals with Disabilities Education Act to try and help toward funding that unfunded mandate.

What I found is if one looks at the 21st Century Learning Centers, it is a new program that started in 1995. In tracking this program, it was a program conceived of, authored by, and passed by a Republican Congressman from Wisconsin where I come from, Steve Gunderson, who is no longer serving in Congress.

He passed that program at that time to do this, to open up schools, specifically high schools, to rural areas who do not have those kinds of facilities from other means. Meaning if one is in rural western Wisconsin, one does not have a YMCA, one does not have a library or village hall, allow the community as a large to use the swimming pool of a high school, the library of a high school, the computer lab of a high school after schools, during summers. That program was funded with $750,000 to basically keep the schools open for these purposes. Guess what that is funded at now in this bill, $600 million. We have seen an 800 percent increase in the funding for the 21st Century Learning Centers.

The other point is this, Congressman Gunderson, who actually offered this, came to the committee fairly recently and said, This program does not look anything like the program I wrote when I passed it into law. This program has gone well beyond its scope and intent. This program has nothing to do with its original intent. It is overfunded. Its mandate is much, much larger. Now it is duplicating other Federal programs we have in the Federal Government from the Department of Education.

So we have another duplicative program from the Department of Education. It has gone beyond its original mandate. It has grown 800 percent in the last 6 years when we are still sending this unfunded mandate on our local school districts, and we still have kids with disabilities who are being educated, and one is almost pitting those kinds of kids against all other kids in schools when Washington continues to send this unfunded mandate to our school districts.

What my amendment would do is take half of the money from this new growing program that duplicates other programs and put it into Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, and simply say that, if we are going to be increasing programs from the Department of Education which already duplicates other programs by 800 percent, why do not we first take care of the unfunded mandates we have right now. Why do we not first pay our bills and tell our local school districts, we want you to at indicate the resources. We want you to make the decisions in our schools, in our classrooms, in our school districts.

That is why I am hoping that this amendment will be made in order by the Committee on Rules so we can have a demonstration of our commitment on the floor of Congress for trying to get to this unfunded mandate, for saying no to growing new programs, duplicative programs by the tune of 800 percent, and getting to this unfunded mandate.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Will the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER) yield?

Mr. SCHAFFER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I, along with three of our other colleagues, had a great hearing in Minnesota today. It really builds on what we have learned. I think today was the 21st State that we have gone to, the 23rd field hearing that we have gone to people at the local and at the State level. We have asked them what is working in education and then really, and we should maybe do this in future hearings, to give us a grade as to how Washington is either helping them or assisting them in getting them and enabling them to get done what they want to get done at the local level.

I think one of the witnesses that we had today, I do not remember exactly which one it was, maybe the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER) does, who said when one takes a look at the system that we have created here in Washington, of hundreds of different programs, hundreds of different mandates, and the number that we have heard today was, we get 6 percent of the money from Washington, we get 70 percent of the rules and the regulations.

That is not outlandish. I mean, consistently when we go from one State to the next, Ohio, they have documented it. They said we get 7 percent of our money from Washington, we get 50 percent of the mandates, 50 percent of the paperwork. So that is consistent from all the States that we have talked to.

But one of the people said, ''Only you in Washington could come up with a system that looks like this. If you are actually focused on kids, if you were focused on results, which is kids learning, you would have a very different set of programs and requirements. Only a system that is focused on process, you know, that this is what we want to have happen and this funding stream and a system that measures process rather than kids learning is what we have created here in Washington.''

Again, we heard it in Minnesota today. We have heard it at every single

State that we have gone to; that is, the formula for kids' learning, parental involvement, number one. That is the key. A focus on basic academics.

Again, we have got a charter school today talking, traditional public schools talking about a focus on basic academics. You have to provide a safe and a drug-free school. You cannot have learning go on where kids are concerned about their safety or they are concerned about what their colleagues or their peers are doing in the classroom or in the hallways. You have to focus on getting dollars into the classroom. That consistently is the formula.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) is talking about we have got this program, we have got that program, what have we learned? We learned that, when one has got hundreds of education programs, one has got streams of paperwork of bureaucracy; that every time Wisconsin, Michigan, or Minnesota sends dollars to Washington for education they have got to come back to us begging to get some of their money back.

We then give it to them. We give it to them with a whole string of mandates so they end up spending it on things they do not necessarily believe are their priorities. Instead of getting a dollar back for every dollar that they send here, when one calculates all the paperwork, all of the bureaucracy, all these types of things, we believe that at most they get 60 cents back.

Maybe sometime later as we go through the process there are some other things that we can talk about. We can talk about exactly how effective the bureaucracy is here in Washington.

This is a Department that now, for 2 years in a row, has failed its audit, meaning that it cannot come back to Congress, it cannot come back to the American people, the people that fund this agency, and say we have been very careful in managing your money and we can tell you exactly where it goes. We know for 2 years they failed their audit. We know that for at least 3 more years, they will not be able to get a clean audit.

We all know that, in that kind of environment, there have been a number of opportunities for waste, fraud, and abuse. We can maybe outline what some of those are later on as we go through this process. Then we can also talk about what some of our priorities are for addressing this issue.

My colleagues have already mentioned one, which is let us fully fund and meet the commitments that we have made to local school districts by increasing and meeting our commitment on IDEA.

We can talk about eliminating bureaucracy and red tape through the Ed-Flex program, giving school districts more flexibility through the State, the straight A's program where we give them the money and say you decide whether you want to hire teachers, train teachers, reduce class size, or whatever, and also we want to focus on getting 95 cents of every Federal education dollar into the classroom. So there is a whole series of things that we can talk about as we continue through this hour.

I yield back to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER) to either build on some of these thoughts or on some other ideas that he may have.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Minnesota (Chairman HOEKSTRA) for holding that hearing in Minnesota. I, as a member of the subcommittee, have benefited greatly just by having the chance to travel to many communities throughout the country and hear the various ideas that have been invented in States with respect to school reform, but to also have the opportunity to hear the frequency and the consistency of the message my colleagues just described.

It does not matter whether we are in Minnesota, in Florida, in Colorado, or in California, the message never really changes with respect to the Federal involvement in education; that is, we really appreciate all you folks back there in Washington caring about schools, but stop trying to run them from out there. You do not know the names of our kids. You do not even know the names of the schools that we have here much less know about the specific qualities of a neighborhood or the needs of a specific community.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. HOEKSTRA).

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I think the best example today was we know that most States or many States, I think it is over 30, 33, 35 States, have embarked on a charter school initiative. We have gone around and we have heard and we recognize each State is different. This week we are going to embark here in Congress on a program to help charter schools. Part of that is going to be a school construction program. The State representative from Minnesota.

Mr. SCHAFFER. That was representative Alice Seagren was her name.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Ms. Seagren said, Before you go off on this construction program, giving us construction money, let me tell you what we are doing here in Minnesota. We do not build schools. We do lease plans. So if you come up with a construction program for charter schools in Washington, D.C., I am telling you right now that here is one State where this only does not work, it flies directly in the face of the strategy that we have put in place for charter schools in our State. So what is going to happen is people from Minnesota are sending money to Washington, and we are not going to be able to get any of it back unless we let you in Washington change our strategy for funding charter schools. We think we have got a pretty good system. We think it makes sense. It is not perfect, but this works for us, and this is what we want to do. Now, all of a sudden, to get our money back, we are going to have to change our program. Well, up until today, we did not even know that Minnesota had that kind of a strategy in place.

Mr. SCHAFFER. That is precisely right. I want to go back to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) and his proposal because I assure him, he is going to have lots of support here on the floor for an amendment that moves to fully fund IDEA at the expense of lower priorities that are funded or proposed to be funded in the education budget.

I think there will be other proposals like that, because we are a long, long way from being just up to the 40 percent. When we say full funding, we are only talking about 40 percent of the total cost of the program. This is expensive.

I do not think any of us deny that those who suffer from various, whether it is behavioral disorder or learning disability of some other case or so on, that those individuals, those students deserve an equal opportunity and access to quality education. We think that is important. That ought to be a national priority. The Supreme Court has certainly established it as a national priority.

Our point, though, is if we really believe that, if we really are sincere in our belief that all children deserve to learn, and no child should be left behind, then we cannot just come up with the rules and expect somebody else to pay. That is what is going on in America today. So we just want to get up to our commitment to pay 40 percent of the cost associated with these Federal mandates. We are not even close. We are at about 15 percent today.

But the direction of the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) is really the ultimate local control, because the tremendous cost associated with complying with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act steals dollars from every other important priority that might exist in the State of Wisconsin, the State of Michigan, my State of Colorado, and all States. If we just focus on getting the dollars to the one priority we know we have to deal with through the concept of fungibility, that frees up funds for everything that is important.

So for those States, the gentleman mentioned the 21st Century Learning Centers earlier, for those States that believe 21st Century Learning Centers are what they want and important in that State, paying for IDEA frees up the cash to buy 21st Century Learning Centers. But in my State, it might be something else. It might be teacher pay in my State which is a high priority for us.

2030

Funding IDEA is a way to provide better pay for teachers. And other States they want to lower the property taxes to make it more business friendly, and fully funding IDEA frees up

funds to lower the property taxes in other States.

So the key and the strength of the argument that I think the gentleman has in his favor when he comes to the floor with that amendment is that fully funding IDEA really is at the heart of local control in Washington, and it ought to be. It seems counterintuitive to some. Here we are as conservatives talking about pouring money into a program. The reason it works and the reason it is a conservative idea is because it does have a liberating effect on States. It focuses our emphasis here on Washington more narrowly than what the Clinton/Gore administration has tried to do by diffusing dollars to so many programs that do not work, and it ultimately results in more dollars getting to children, which is what we are for.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman has interpreted my amendment precisely correct. I have had the opportunity as a freshman Member to have many, many, many meetings with school board members, superintendents, teachers, administrators, all the different school districts in the district I represent. I have an educational advisory board with these types of people on there, including parents and home schoolers, to talk about these issues. I get the same thing over and over, let us do our job.

Just in the district I represent, they have vastly different needs, vastly different problems. In one end, in Kenosha, you have different problems; in the other end, in Janesville you have far different problems, let alone the problems that may exist in Harlem or East L.A. or Sante Fe, New Mexico. The point is we have a very vast and different country.

We have a priority of educating our children, but the problems we are experiencing in our school districts are so different. There are so many different ideas out there, so many different solutions out there. By funding IDEA, you free up that decision-making power. So when I bring an amendment to the floor, which I am hoping the Committee on Rules will allow me to do, by funding IDEA or getting closer to meeting that mandate, you are not just voting against one program to put money into another, you are voting for all those programs out there that could be created, if school districts did not have to chase these unfunded mandates.

You are voting for freeing up the hands of parents, teachers, and administrators to get involved in their school districts, to tackle problems, to address the needs that we have in our individual school districts. As a Member of Congress, when you vote to fund IDEA, to free up those local resources, reduce property taxes, find the problems and address them. My school districts that I represent right now cannot do that. They do not have the resources to do the things they think are necessary. And you know why? It is because they are chasing unfunded Federal mandates. That is really the crux of the matter.

I noticed that all of these new programs that are coming up here in Washington through the administration and the Department of Education look pretty good to a politician in Washington. You do not get a lot of political kudos when you simply say let us put more money on unfunded Federal mandates that has been around since 1975. You get more press, you get more notoriety, you sound more proeducation, when you stand up here and have a press conference saying I have this brand new program or this new program or this new program. But what actually ends up happening is each of these new programs takes on a life of their own. They put new mandates on our local school districts; they tell the administrators how to dot every I, how to cross every T. It is a cookie-cutter, one-size-fits-all mandate on all of our schools, regardless of the uniqueness, regardless of the individual problems they may have; and it comes at the expense of funding a mandate that the Supreme Court said we have to fund, that current law says we have to fund, a mandate that we should fund.

That is why I think it is important that as we look at our spending priorities in any budget in Congress, you prioritize; and that is why I am trying to pass an amendment to prioritize this unfunded mandate before going down the road of creating new programs or expedientially increasing new programs that are actually duplicative of other programs. If we fund unfunded mandates like IDEA, you can have a safe drug-free program in every district if you wanted. You could have 21st century learning centers in every school district if you want it.

But guess what, the decision would not be made by politicians in Washington who can take credit for it. It would be made by local decision-makers, school board members, administrators, parents, teachers. That is what the whole debate is about, whether we want Washington to micromanage education or we want our local people, those who know our kids the best, the names of our schools, to manage education. That is what it is really all about.

I just want to say it is a pleasure to be here on the floor of Congress with two of the leaders in education reform, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA). They have really set the trend, set the way for education reform in America. They have wakened up the call for reform for education in America, and they have really done this country a great service by highlighting some of the waste, fraud, and abuse that is occurring at our Department of Education. I just really applaud the gentlemen for that.

Mr. SCHAFFER. I thank the gentleman for the nice comments. I appreciate that. The theme of local control is really at the core of our reform efforts that we are pushing here. I want to yield back to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA), and I am hoping I can persuade him to reflect a little bit and share with the Members here and those that are monitoring tonight's proceedings about the testimony of John Scribante, who is the businessman who was at the hearing this morning, who started out in his testimony, I know he referred to the Minnesota State constitution which talks about the responsibility of the State of Minnesota for educating all of the children in Minnesota in order to preserve their liberty and by focusing on their intelligence. He focused on that word and underscored the word intelligence; and he said that is not skills, it is intelligence.

He spoke of the importance of the intellect and the training of the young minds of Minnesota, how critical it is to maintain their liberty, that is not an idea he thought of; but it is one that he saw fit to reference from Minnesota's State constitution. And I was moved by his patriotic compassion at one point in his testimony in which he spoke about the devastating impact that the Federal Government is having in preventing Minnesota from achieving its constitutional objectives.

I am wondering if the gentleman from Michigan can comment further on that. Go ahead.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I also wanted to build on the comments of our colleague from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) because he said some very nice things about us in awakening the call for educational reform. I do not think we have done that. What we have done is we have kind of provided an echo chamber for what people at the local level are demanding. They want their schools back. They know the names of their kids. They know what is best for their kids. Governor Carlson today talked about going back into his public school in the Bronx. We have been to the Bronx. We have had hearings there.

I do not know if we went through the litany with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) of the places where we have been; but it was almost every place that he outlined, we have been there. I mean, we have been in to Albuquerque. We have been into L.A. We have been to the Bronx. We have been to Chicago, Milwaukee, Minneapolis. We have been all over the place.

The response we continually get is from local officials and local parents, and they do not exactly say it this way; but what they do say in so many words is Washington has gotten to the point where you want to build our schools, you are going to give us 6 percent of what it takes to build a school, but we will give you the regulations to tell you exactly how to build the whole thing. You want to hire our teachers. You want to train our teachers. You want to develop our curriculum; you want to teach our kids history, set history standards; you want to teach

them about art. You want to have school health clinics. You want to buy our technology. You want to feed our kids breakfast. You want to feed our kids lunch. You want to do after-school programs. You want to develop safe and drug free programs, and this is just a small litany of the programs. But after you give us 6 percent of each of the dollars required for each of these programs and you burden on a whole set of rules and regulations, then you step back and say, but other than that, it is your school.

I think, again, one of the witnesses today said that, and we were talking about the school-to-work program, it is like we have received $16 million from Washington to conduct our school-to-work program, but receiving that $16 million has really driven about a half a billion dollars of State spending, State spending that came from the Minnesota taxpayers and went to the State government. And I think this is what Mr. Scribante was talking about saying, we love our kids. We want control of our schools, and we want our schools to be focused on developing the skills of each and every child in our community. And the quote that he had from Winston Churchill, I think he is going to get us that so that we get it right, but maybe my colleague from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) has it, but it is really saying, this battle of who controls our schools is important enough to fight and debate today, because now is when we can still have an impact, where there really is still a lot of local control, but where that has been eroding.

I will yield to my colleague from Minnesota, who maybe has the quote right there. He is smiling. He must have it. I appreciate the gentleman very much being a wonderful host today, helping us get an excellent set of witnesses. I think we had 10 or 11 witnesses in Bloomington, I guess we were at today, and just excellent testimony that I think really helped us. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Let me, first of all, say I thank the gentleman, and second I do not have that quote; but I do have it in my office now, and I will be sharing it from time to time. He quoted Winston Churchill, though; and I think the point was well taken.

Let me give you a simplier quote from Winston Churchill, it is one actually my wife needlepointed for me on my office wall, and it is simple, it says, ''Success is never permanent. Failure is never fatal. The only thing that really counts is courage.''

And what we saw today in Minnesota, and I cannot thank the gentleman enough, I left that meeting so excited about the future of education, not just in Minnesota, but around the country, because it renewed my belief that Americans do care. They care about their kids, and they want to make certain that every child, and this was what really came through with virtually all of the testimony today, that every child, whether they come from a family of privilege or a family of poverty, every child deserves a first-rate education in this country today.

The truth of the matter is, and we all know this, people on all sides of the political aisles of every spectrum philosophically, we all know that too many kids today are being cheated by the system, and we in Washington cannot completely change everything, but I think we can make some reforms. And the gentleman is making reforms, and I want to thank the gentleman for that and we see it happening.

I was so impressed, and I have worked for many years with Governor Ernie Carlson, now former Governor Carlson; but his testimony today was powerful. I think the only regret I have is that more Americans did not get a chance to actually see and hear that testimony today because it was from the heart. He grew up in a tough section of New York. He told us about PS36. He told us about what it was like when he was growing up, but the great thing was he told us what is happening today with the right leadership, with the right flexibility, allowing that new principal there to control his school, to motivate his teachers, to motivate those students; and, guess what, the results are there.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will just yield, PS36 is Public School 36.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Yes.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. For those who may be observing or watching this discussion, not knowing what is PS36, it is a public school. It is Public School 36 that Governor Carlson went to in the Bronx. When we were there, we were not at Public School 36, but probably a very rough neighborhood, probably low income; and he talked about some of the kids who would come to school and the first thing they would get from their principal each and every day was kind of talking about what happened at night because a number of them may have had a rough night.

So it is a tough part of New York City, and this principal and this public school has gone in and they have embraced these kids and are really making a difference; and what the gentleman said, what the gentleman saw today in Minnesota, I think that is what the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER) and I have had the opportunity to see around the country, is that you get to the local level, these parents, these administrators, these legislators, they have got a passion for their kids.

They absolutely have a passion for their kids, and they are kind of, you know, wanting us to get out of the way so that they can really do and help for these kids, and Governor Carlson's public school 36 is just one phenomenal example where they are having great success, not because of what we are doing, but because they are going in and taking the leadership.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. If the gentleman would yield back, and that was the thing that really impressed me, virtually everybody who testified today did not talk about preserving the status quo or protecting certain vested interest. It was not about protecting, you know, these rights and so forth. It really was all about what can we do to improve the quality of education for kids. And it was not us versus them. Unfortunately, what we hear so many times in the debate about education, both here in Washington and around the country, sort of a trench warfare mentality.

I want to congratulate Dr. Keith Dixon, who is a superintendent of schools in Faribault in my district, and he came to us from Colorado, and I was so impressed with him, because, you know, he did not get into this debate about charter schools versus public schools versus private schools. His concern was for the kids. He said to us that he really considered himself the superintendent of all of the children in the district, and it was his job to see that they got a chance. And for some kids maybe it worked out better for them and their parents that they got to charter schools.

He said some of them went to charter schools part of the day and part of the day they went to the public schools, and some went to the public schools part of the day and part of the day the private schools, but they are working out arrangements; but it is all about what is best for the kids.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. If the gentleman will yield, I thought he was a wonderful breath of fresh air in how he viewed that job, in saying, I am a superintendent for all the kids; and I recognize that, you know, my traditional public school may not be the best for all of the kids in this district each and every day, and so what I am doing is, in the business world we call it mass customization.

2045

He says, I am using the resources that I have been given and I am going to help parents put together a structured program that matches the needs of every child. And so, if some of the parents believe that home schooling, for whatever reason, is best for their kids, you know, if they come through and they want to use the school for band, for some extracurricular or advanced science classes, we are going to be there and we are going to open the door and we are going to work that out for the parents.

And it is the same for the charter and the parochial. It really was a demonstration of what he said, a superintendent for all of the kids in the district. And what I would guess they are doing in that district is just building a phenomenal partnership and a phenomenal loyalty in that community with all of these groups coming together, with the focal point being the kids, not home schooling, not charter schools, not public schools, not parochial schools, but they are developing a

trusting relationship between all of the providers of services to these kids that says, let us keep the kids and learning at the center, let us put aside our differences and let us come together and make sure that we have a relationship that enables us to be creative to meet the needs.

I thought it was awesome testimony.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, it absolutely was. I would bet long money and short odds that all the kids in Faribault are going to benefit from that kind of an attitude.

But the other thing I wanted to mention about Governor Carlson, he said something really profound; and that is that, for too long in public education and education in general, we have measured quality education by inputs. And he sort of reversed. Maybe it is because he came from PS–36. Maybe it is because he was State auditor. But when he was governor, he said, we better start measuring outputs. Because we have all labored under this Lake Woebegone mentality that all our children were above average, and that is not necessarily true. And when we began to actually test the students, we began to find out they were not doing nearly as well in many of the areas as we thought they were doing.

And so, we are starting to measure quality now in Minnesota not by how much we put into the process, and we put an awful lot of money in public education in the State of Minnesota, as my colleagues do in Colorado and in Michigan, as well. But we want to find out how well the students really are doing in terms of learning. And I think that if we focus on the students, if we focus on the children, and if we focus on outputs, what we are really getting out for the resources we put into it, I think in the long run the real winners are going to be the children.

So the testimony today was excellent. I cannot thank my colleagues enough. I came away charged up reminded that the Forefathers were even smarter than we thought they were when they created the system that we have today where each State becomes the laboratory of democracy.

We are seeing this happening in places like Milwaukee and in Minnesota and all around the country from governors, State legislators, private nonprofit groups. We heard from a number of them. The Executive Director of Partnership for Choice and Education spoke to us. Kids for Scholarship Fund. They are offering 1,200 scholarships a year now in the State of Minnesota to poor kids to go to the school of their choice. And we heard from some parents excellent testimony of the benefits of allowing students to have that kind of choice.

So I really came away with a renewed optimism that Americans do care about education, they do care about the children, and, in places like Minnesota, there are a lot of people doing the right things and, ultimately, the kids will be the beneficiaries.

So I want to thank my colleagues for coming to Minnesota. I thought the hearing was excellent. As I say, the only regret that I had was that we did not get more people at that hearing so more people could see what is really happening in places like Minnesota. We would love to have our colleagues come back and perhaps bring some of those folks into Washington to share with some of our colleagues what really is happening in terms of educational reform in Minnesota.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, the constituents of my colleague were perfect people to testify; and Minnesota turned out to be a perfect place to hold the hearing that we did because their comments were reflective, I think, of the same kind of comments that we have heard throughout the country.

But one of the interesting perspectives that I think we probably spend more time on in Minnesota than most other States is on the topic of the School to Work Program, which passed in 1994 by Congress. It was a program that was inspired by the Nation's desire to see schoolchildren graduating with the skills necessary to help them become more gainfully employed and ready to go to work.

And so, as classically happens here in Washington, there is a legitimate need that is identified by the country; and we throw lots of money at it in Washington. Now, this was before we took the majority. This was when the Democrats ran the House, and we saw even more of that then. But create a new program, throw hundreds of millions of dollars into a program called School to Work; and these dollars were funneled back to the States and once again the States were told, if you want your money back, you have to spend it the way we tell you to.

The School to Work Program is something that is in full force today in all 50 States. It is a mandatory program, there is no voluntary quality about it, that even from the very young ages of kindergarten starts orienting more and more students toward workplace skills. And the concern we heard voiced today was that that focus on workplace skills often comes at the expense of developing one's intellect in an academic approach to learning.

This is a complaint we are hearing more and more about. The School to Work Program, again, built around the right motives and identification of a very legitimate problem that occurs, but the solution is one that deemphasizes academic performance and academic progress in schools and moves the focus to actually an objective that is outside even the Department of Education, that includes the Department of Labor, where this morning the Medicare program is involved in School to Work. And it is kind of a comprehensive Government effort to try to change the way we have educated our children for hundreds of years in America.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, and that is going on at the same time. I still remember the first hearing or one of the first hearings that we did. We did a run through California. And then as we were doing the education at a crossroads hearing, we also did a hearing and we did it in California and we met with a number of the college presidents or the deans of various universities in California. And it was right after this process had started and as we were gathering the data. In one of these initial hearings, the deans came in and said, you know, one of the programs that we need more funding for is for remedial education. And we kind of get a startled look on our face, and these are from some prestigious colleges telling us that they need more money for remedial education. And we hear that from two or three of these experts from the colleges and we finally say, excuse me, why does a prestigious university with high academic standards and high entrance requirements, what do they need money from us for for remedial education?

The answer is, well, 25 percent of the students that are coming to college today are not ready for college requirements. And what does that mean? It meant that they were not at an 8th or 10th grade level for reading, writing, and math. And so, it is one of those key criteria again for successful schools is, rather than overlaying a whole new system on to our education, which is focusing on developing the skills to work, the emphasis should be on teaching our kids and getting them basic academics.

We have seen that on international standards, international comparisons. We are not doing well enough on our kids learning the basics. So before we go off and try to dilute this process any further, let us focus on basic academics.

I do not know if the gentleman was in Arkansas when we went to Arkansas in Little Rock when we were at Central High School.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I was not there.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Again, it was fascinating. The school in Arkansas that gets some of the highest test scores, we asked them the question, Why are you getting such high test scores? Because they were the lowest funded school in the State? The answer was, We only have the time, energy, and money to focus on basic academics.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) for joining us in this special order. I see we are almost out of time. I hope this topic of School to Work is one we will be able to spend more time on and explore the impact that it has had in other States. I suspect the testimony we heard in Minnesota is similar to the impact to that which we would hear from other States. And it is one example where, once again, Washington is diffusing the emphasis of education on academic learning in a knowledge-based education.

We need to stop that, really, and we need to start allowing schools to focus on what they believe to be important locally.

VARIOUS ISSUES OF THE DAY

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago I became aware that this hour of time to speak before this House was available. I thought about it for a moment. I am confident that my presence here will not adversely affect the ratings of other cable television shows, many of which are made in our area. And so I figured I would take this opportunity even though I have not had the chance to prepare and my remarks may not be quite as crisp as I would like.

I would like to address a number of different topics that I have been thinking about, particularly over this last district work period. The first is an odd attempt by those who claim to love Ronald Reagan to rewrite the history of the fall of the Soviet Union.

We know what the real history was. The Soviet Union looked powerful. We spent on our defense, fearful of Soviet aggression and expansion, and Ronald Reagan led us in those efforts.

Our deficit grew. We tightened our belts domestically. We did so because we were told that the Soviet Union could expand, that it was powerful, that it could emerge as the most powerful nation on Earth.

In 1991, to the surprise of just about everyone both inside and outside the Soviet Union, the Soviet Union began to collapse. That is what really happened.

It is kind of disconcerting to think that all the experts in all the capitals did not foresee such an enormously important event. And experts are reluctant to admit that they cannot always see the future. But what is worse is that those who have come to idolize Ronald Reagan have started to rewrite history.

In their rewriting of history, Ronald Reagan foresaw as early as the early 1980s that, within a decade, the Soviet Union could be pushed into the dust bin of history, that Reagan knew that the Soviet Union had begun to corrode from the inside and far from being a challenge to the United States, in fact, it was a nation that could not survive.

These supposed supporters of Ronald Reagan ascribe to him an omniscience and all-knowingness, that they think is complimentary.

In fact, what these supporters of Reagan are doing are besmirching Ronald Reagan's character, attacking his honesty, and telling us that our former President is a liar to the American people.

Time and again, President Reagan came before us in this hall, I was not here, stood and delivered the State of the Union address and rallied America to spend more and more on our defense.

2100

He never told us it was offense. He said it was necessary to prevent Soviet expansion, not some secret plan to force the Soviet Union into collapse. Ronald Reagan came before the American people and told us the Soviet Union was a powerful threat and would remain so for quite some time. He urged us to embark upon military expenditure projects, some of which would last a decade or 2 decades because, he told us, the Soviet Union was a threat. Now, those who claim to be Ronald Reagan's ideological descendants, some who claim to be his friends, tell us it was all a lie, that Ronald Reagan knew that the Soviet Union had corroded from the inside, that he knew that these expenditures were not necessary to defend us but rather were part of a secret plan to force the Soviet Union to spend more and more on its defense in a dangerous game in which the Soviet Union would be faced either with the prospect of launching a nuclear strike or consenting to an arms race that it could not win, an arms race launched against it by a Reagan administration with a secret plan to drive it into destruction. Ronald Reagan never told us that we were engaged in such an effort. Ronald Reagan never told us that we were trying to push the Soviet Union to destruction, that they would face a moment at which they would blame us and would realize that either they would launch a military strike or go into the dustbin of history.

He never told us this, because he never believed it; and the Soviet Union in its dying hours did not believe it, either. The Soviets knew that their system collapsed of its own weight. Only retroactive American arrogance would say that the other superpower collapsed because of something we did here in Washington, D.C.

The fact of the matter is Communism does not work, and in the last decade or two, both Communist giants have ceased to embrace their ideology; and without that ideology they have ceased to be exporters of Communism, ceased to have confidence in Communism, and it has shaken them to their roots. Are we going to say that Communism lost favor in the Soviet Union because of American hostility and Communist ideology lost favor in China because of American friendship? That either friendship or hostility from America creates the same result? I think not. Communism does not work. Russia and China realized it. This forced a crisis of confidence in both places. The Soviet Union not being one nation but rather an amalgam of nations held together by a failed ideology collapsed, and China has moved from the ideology of Communism to the ideology of nationalism overseen by a relatively small group of oligarchs and local potentates that control the economy. To say that it all happened according to a plan is to dangerously rewrite history.

While I talk about the Reagan administration and the collapse of the Soviet Union, it leads naturally to a discussion of Star Wars, an issue that is still before us. Just because the Soviet Union is no longer intact does not mean that we are safe. In fact, the world is more complicated and more dangerous. There are those who have come before this House and suggested that the world does not have to be a dangerous place if only we developed a missile defense system.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to see us continue to research in this area, and when our technology has advanced to the point where we can provide some reasonable defense at reasonable cost, deployment is certainly called for. But let us not fool the American people. Those that cannot hit us with an ICBM, those who cannot hit us with an intercontinental ballistic missile will be able to smuggle nuclear weapons into our cities no matter how effective our missile shield. A nuclear weapon is about the size of a person, some smaller than a child. And anyone who has been in Southern California or probably just about any major city in this country is aware that every year hundreds of thousands, every day thousands of illegal immigrants are snuck across our border not just from the southern border but the northern as well; that illegal drugs are smuggled into America with relative ease, and this is by people being paid a few hundred dollars to sneak a person into the United States, marijuana importers or smugglers, criminals bringing in bales of marijuana for a few thousand dollars in compensation.

How difficult would it be to sneak a nuclear weapon into an American city? A nuclear weapon smaller than a child does not need ventilation, does not need to be fed. Children who are smuggled into America scream and cry. Nuclear weapons would not. So imagine that we had a perfect defense against Iranian or Iraqi or North Korean missiles. What would those countries do? They would smuggle a weapon or two into an American city, hire or kidnap an American scientist to come look at it, detain that American scientist until it could be moved to another apartment or another city, and inform our government that in some apartment, in some city, in some State in this country, there was a nuclear weapon in the custody of someone reporting to Baghdad or to Tehran.

I would like to see a defensive shield shielding us from intercontinental ballistic missiles. But let us not fool the American people. That is just one small element of our defense. And if we spend a trillion dollars building a roof over a building that has no walls, we will have been misallocating resources. I am not sure that we can police our borders well enough to prevent nuclear weapons from being smuggled here, but

I do know that a missile defense shield is of only modest use as long as our borders remain porous.

We need to focus our attention on the rogue states that are currently developing nuclear weapons and might be willing to use them even if they faced the threat of annihilation from our nuclear weapons. And we need to cut off money, investment funds, from going to the regimes of North Korea, Iran and Iraq, because all three of those countries are trying to develop nuclear weapons.

North Korea has agreed to stop its program, and I leave them aside. We can discuss them separately at a different time. But let us focus for a while on the two great enemies or rivals that we face in Southwest Asia. We do need to prevent the government in Baghdad and the government in Tehran from getting their hands on money. When investment capital flows into those two countries, when money is loaned to them, money is given to them, export markets are given to them, when Iraq is allowed to sell its oil and not spend the money on food for its people, then money is in the hands of those who would wish to develop nuclear weapons and whom as I have pointed out will face little difficulty in smuggling them into the United States. Unfortunately, our efforts to stem the flow of money to Tehran and Baghdad have been set back in several different ways.

Today, Mr. Speaker, it was revealed that Iran, having suffered hundreds of thousands of casualties in a war of aggression launched by Iraq 2 decades ago, now is allowing Iraq to use its coastal waters to evade the U.N. blockade, evade U.N. sanctions, sell a billion dollars perhaps every year of oil, and this would not be money in the oil-for-food program controlled by the United Nations. This is money directly into the hands of the Iraqi military.

Mr. Speaker, we could spend a trillion dollars on a missile defense system, but if we do not stop those oil tankers from leaving the Strait of Hormuz, if we do not prevent that oil from being exported, we are literally allowing Saddam Hussein to build nuclear weapons and then we can worry about how to keep them out of the United States. What concerns me, Mr. Speaker, is that our policy toward Iran has been ineffective. The ineffectiveness is shown today by Iran allowing that Iraqi oil to be exported.

Now, we are told that the ships that come from Iran down into the Persian Gulf pass a checkpoint controlled by the revolutionary guard. We are told the revolutionary guard does not report to the President of Iran, and so we should not get bent out of shape if they allow those oil tankers into their coastal waters. The fact remains that in Iran, the president is not the head of their government or military. The supreme leader is. That leader controls those revolutionary guards, and those guards have allowed those tankers to use Iranian coastal waters.

Iran has said, well, we need help in stopping these ships. All Iran has to do is announce that those countries that are enforcing the U.N. blockade are allowed into Iranian coastal waters, allowed within 12 miles of its coast, and we will be able to shut down these illegal Iraqi oil exports. But instead, Iran lets the tankers go by the checkpoint and claims they cannot do anything to stop it and will not let United Nations ships or, rather, American and British ships detailed to enforce the U.N. blockade, will not allow them in their coastal waters.

Mr. Speaker, this is a dangerous situation; and it shows that our policy toward Iran, especially in the last 2 months, has been mistaken. Two months ago, the Secretary of State announced unilaterally, without really much consultation with Congress at all, certainly without any congressional encouragement or approval, the Secretary of State announced that the United States would allow Iran to export to the United States pistachios, carpets, caviar, dried fruit; and many people joked, how important could that be.

Mr. Speaker, first it is symbolically important, because if America will do business with Iran, business as usual, if America will open its markets to these nonenergy exports of Iran, then how can we turn to Europe and Japan and tell them not to do business as usual with Iran on a bigger scale? How can we today turn to Japan and Germany and tell them to stop buying Iranian oil because Iran is clearly complicit in the illegal export of Iraqi oil? Certainly it weakens our position.

2115

These exports, these non-energy exports from Iran, are important to Iran. They are its major non-energy exports. They pale into insignificance in dollar amount compared to oil, but reflect on this: Iran will always get the world price for its oil. Nothing we do is going to change by one penny the amount of revenue Iran gets for every barrel that it exports to a world thirsty for its oil.

In contrast, those other exports, the carpets, pistachios, et cetera, those exports need every market they can find to try to push up the price, and by opening up our markets we invigorate the world market for those Iranian exports, exports as to which there is no fixed world price, exports that are important to the Iranian economy. Some 5 million people, it is reported, work in the Iranian carpet industry. That is just one of the four imports.

We would think that today the State Department would react, react to these illegal shipments through Iranian waters and cut off Iran's access to America's markets. My fear is that that will not happen. Every time there is an opportunity to make a unilateral concession to Iran, we seem to do it and do it quickly, unilateral concession after unilateral concession.

The latest pat on the back that Iran has received is a $231 million loan from the World Bank. The U.S. voted against that loan, but we certainly did not tell our European allies that we would take their votes in favor of that loan as a reason to perhaps reexamine other aspects of our foreign policy. We were good losers. We accepted the defeat. This calls into question how we provide foreign aid.

Mr. Speaker, I have come to this floor in the past to support American foreign aid. I think we should do what we can to help the Third World develop, to help the poorest people on this planet survive. But the recent action by the World Bank threatens America's support for foreign aid. That support is not all that deep to begin with, but how do we go back to our districts and explain that America participates in the World Bank, its capital was provided in significant part by the American taxpayer, and the World Bank disbursed $231 million of loans to Iran; money that is fungible, money that allows the Iranians to spend their oil resources and oil revenues on their military programs? This is going to be a hard sell.

Mr. Speaker, sometime this month we will be dealing with the foreign ops appropriations bill. At that point, we will be asked to appropriate hundreds of millions of dollars to the IDA program administered by the World Bank. We have to be aware that money of the United States disbursed to that program could be lent on a concessionary basis, could be lent at very low interest rates, pay-us-when-you-feel-like-it terms, to such countries as North Korea or Sudan, or any other country that claims to have a good project and is very poor.

North Korea and Sudan are very poor because of the evil of their governments, not because of a lack of world aid. How are we going to go back to our constituents and say, these hundreds of millions of dollars were turned over to an international organization free to make loans to some of the most evil nations or evil governments, I want to stress evil governments, on this planet?

Better we appropriate these same funds, and I do not want to see a reduction, I want to see, if anything, an increase in our foreign aid, and provide these same funds to entities under the control of the United States government or entities where we at least have a veto power, so these funds are loaned or given only for projects in countries that have some minimal respect for human rights?

I look forward to working with Members of the relevant subcommittee and of the Committee on Appropriations to see what we can do to make sure that when we go back to our districts and defend foreign aid, we can say that all U.S. tax dollars are going for projects in countries that we can support.

Mr. Speaker, this is an additional reason why the loan to Iran was not only a poor decision but one that was ill-timed, as well. Not only does Iran

today, a few days after the loan, decide to facilitate Iraqi evasion of U.N. sanctions, not only does Iran sponsor terrorism and is on the State Department terrorism list, not only is Iran, along with Iraq, one of the two greatest threats for possible destruction of American cities at such time as they develop nuclear weapons, but Iran a year and a half ago decided to continue its oppression of its small Jewish community, just as it oppresses those of the Baha'i faith.

The Iranian government since its revolution has executed on trumped up charges 17 members of its small Jewish community. Well over half of that community has fled, and now 13 Jews are on trial in the city of Shiraz on the most trumped up charges in trials that would have made Josef Stalin ashamed, trials where the only evidence is the apparently tortured or coerced confessions of the defendants in which the defendants confessed to crimes they could not possibly have committed.

Mr. Speaker, here in the United States we live in a multi-ethnic, multicultural society in which people of any ethnic or religious group may be found in our national security agencies, and yes, may be found among those few who commit espionage.

Mr. Speaker, we have had British-American spies, we have had Jewish-American spies, we have allegedly had Chinese-American spies. Anybody of any ethnic group could find themselves in a position where they are the custodians of our national secrets. Iran is just the opposite. No one of the Jewish faith is allowed near anything of any military or national security significance whatsoever.

Mr. Speaker, these 13 are accused of spying for the CIA, and I put forward that we could not be the world's only superpower, we could not have emerged in this powerful position, if our CIA went to Iran looking for spies and decided to hire people from the small ethnic group that are prohibited from getting anywhere near any of the information our CIA might be interested in.

These charges are absurd. The World Bank loan to Iran, as this trial continues, was the kind of mistake that imperils American support for foreign aid and American support for the World Bank, and imperils a relationship that has recently been celebrated by the President in his farewell tour, farewell as President tour of Europe, involving ties that are certainly disrupted when European nations say, we will ignore the trial of the 13 Jews in Shiraz, we will ignore Iran's other problems, and when they will force the World Bank to take American capital and money borrowed on the strength of American capital and hijack that money to Tehran.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to shift my focus to a bill that will come before this House I believe on Friday, and that is a bill to repeal the estate tax.

At the outset, let me stress that 98 percent of all Americans, when their wills become operative, do not pay a penny of estate tax. This is a tax paid by only 1½ percent of all the families in America. Yet, to read some of the letters, to listen to some of the rhetoric on this floor, we would think that the estate tax was the most burdensome tax on American working families.

Estates of under $2 million will, after the current law becomes hopefully effective, pay absolutely nothing, as long as some law and estate planning documents are drafted in advance. Mr. Speaker, I introduced a bill that made this law I think less burdensome on upper middle class American families, and said that $2 million could be left by a man and wife or a husband and wife, to their children with no estate tax, even if they did not prepare a bunch of estate planning documents in advance.

This bill was designed to liberate widows and widowers from these bypassed trusts, complicated legal documents, almost required of them by our current estate tax law. But that bill did not get a hearing because there is an effort here not to liberate upper middle class families, and of course, those of lesser means are already exempt, but not to liberate upper middle class families from the estate tax and from the burdens of doing estate planning. The plan here is to abolish this estate tax altogether.

The estate tax is a painful tax. It is a bad tax. I hate the tax. I hate all taxes. Every single one of them is painful. There is no way for the Federal government to get money that does not have a bad effect on those who are required to pay.

The question is not whether the estate tax is a bad tax, but whether it is our worst tax. I ask Members, is a tax that 98½ percent of all Americans are exempt from, is that our worst tax? Or is it an income tax and a FICA tax that falls so heavily on the working poor? Must we first eliminate a tax that falls chiefly on those with estates over $10 million, or must we first eliminate taxes on those who are making $10 an hour or less? Should it be $10 million and more, or $10 an hour or less? Where should we focus our generosity? Where should we focus our tax cuts?

Mr. Speaker, there is an earned income tax credit, but it is not available to many of the working poor, and is not available to any that do not have children in their homes. So we have a situation where we are told that the estate tax diminishes the incentive to work because somebody working at age 40 or age 50 or age 60 is thinking ahead to the point when their estate plan would become effective, in their eighties or nineties, thinking ahead to what the estate tax law might be at that point, knocking off work early and going to the golf course.

Maybe it is happening, maybe it is not. But let us talk also about the effect that our current taxes have on the working poor, people who are called upon to work the second job to support a family, people who are called upon to get off of welfare and to enter the work force, and we tell them, we are going to take a chunk of your money, of your paycheck, to support the social security system, and I support the social security system. We are going to impose an income tax. We are not going to give you a tax credit for the social security tax you pay, and we will give you no tax credit for the State sales tax that you pay.

People who make less than $10 an hour are paying a lot of tax. What about them? Are they affected by incentives? Are we to say that the ability to leave the second $10 million to your kids 20 or 30 years from now is what is uppermost on the minds of somebody building a business, but that the size of today's paycheck is irrelevant to a person who is working two jobs? I do not think so.

Yes, all taxes have an adverse impact on incentive, the incentive to work, the incentive to participate in the economy. But I venture that there is a far worse effect on our economy from taxing those who make less than $10 an hour than taxing those who have more than $10 million.

2130

I would also point out that before we cut the estate tax, before we eliminate the estate tax, we ought to make sure that we are not endangering Social Security, that we are not putting ourselves in a position when we will not be able to provide any pharmaceuticals to those who are on Medicare, some who need $1,000, $5,000, $10,000 a year of pharmaceuticals to survive.

Mr. Speaker, they retired believing they had Social Security and now find that they are insecure, find that they do not have the wherewithal to pay for the pharmaceuticals that they need to survive.

Mr. Speaker, what will come before this House on Friday is a bill to repeal the estate tax before we have made Social Security secure, before we have made Medicare recipients secure. Every Medicare recipient today knows that tomorrow they could be diagnosed with a disease requiring $5,000 or $10,000 a year of pharmaceuticals for which they will get no Federal aid; and we are told that the most important thing we can do with the available Federal funds is to deal with a tax that falls most significantly on those with more than $10 million.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that we need to explore a number of avenues. Now, I do not want to ignore the adverse effects of the estate tax. It does make it more difficult to leave a business or a family farm to the next generation. And we hear statistics about how businesses are not always left intact to the next generation and we are told that it is the estate tax.

It is not always the estate tax. The son or daughter of a farmer does not necessarily want to farm. The owner who builds a business from nothing to

a $50 million business may find that his sons and daughters feel themselves unqualified or just disinterested in continuing to own that business. There is no proof that family businesses will stay in families if only we reduce taxes on those with assets of over $10 million.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, one little secret about the estate tax. No one will tell it to us. That is that at every major hospital complex, nonprofit hospital, at every major university in this country, if we abolish the estate tax, the buildings will not have names. I am not saying that we will not be able to find our way around campus. That is not the problem. The problem is that gifts, major gifts to our universities and hospitals will slow to a trickle.

If we go to any campus today, we see this building is named after the Smith family and that building is named after the Cohen family and we wonder why. The answer is simple. The families involved made huge gifts to the university, huge gifts to the hospital, motivated in part by the fact that those gifts will not be subject to the estate tax.

Charitable giving at the low end, the $5 and $10 put in the collection plate, would not be affected by a repeal of the estate tax. But at the high end, when people are bequeathing millions of dollars to universities that in their graciousness choose to name buildings after the donors, at the high end where people make gifts that are income tax deductible in their 80s, knowing that not only do they get an income tax deduction today but perhaps if they die in their 90s they get estate tax relief as well, those gifts are motivated by the fact that 60 or 70 percent of the gift's value is represented by a tax deduction. That $5 million Smith building cost the Smith family only 30 percent of $5 million.

What is going to happen when we repeal the estate tax? The universities and hospitals will be here saying: now, Congress, you have to appropriate some special money for us. But how will we do that? We will cut our own revenues by $17 billion a year. The colleges, the universities, the hospitals will not come here and tell us about this because essentially they do not want to bite the hand that feeds them.

Speaking of the hand that feeds them, I have had a lot of town halls in my district. I have heard hundreds of questions, hundreds of complaints. I am out in the community almost every day that I am in California. Mr. Speaker, at these public gatherings, I cannot remember a single occasion when someone has come up and said: let us abolish the estate tax.

Mr. Speaker, I hate to admit it, but it is a sin of which virtually everyone in this House suffers or is guilty. I also spend time raising money for my campaign and for the campaigns of my colleagues. Not a day goes by, or not even a couple hours go by. If a couple of hours are spent talking to those who might make major contributions, the estate tax comes up every time. Not with every person, but certainly in every hour or two.

The reason for that is that this tax does fall upon those who can most afford to come to fundraisers. I think that we in this House need to pass campaign finance reform for a lot of reasons, but one of them is that we spend too much time at fundraisers, and we hear too often too repeatedly from that 1½ percent of Americans who pay the estate tax, who happen to be the same 1½ percent of Americans who donate the most money for political campaigns.

Mr. Speaker, if we do not stop and think about it, if we do not filter it out, we are going to come to the conclusion if one serves in this House that the whole country is concerned about the estate tax, because in the average month we hear about it five, 10, 20 times. We have to remember that every one of those times was not out at the community Little League, was not at a visitation to a senior center, was not at a widely publicized town hall, but in nine out of 10 cases, or maybe 10 out of 10 cases, it was through a friend that is a supporter of either us or our colleagues here.

Yes, if we serve in this House, we need to keep in touch with people, and sometimes that is thrown askew when the fundraising burdens and the time commitments of that are imposed upon us.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment just briefly on Governor Bush's Social Security plan and some of the rhetoric surrounding that plan. Governor Bush has turned to young people and said that they only get a 1 or 2 percent return for the money they put in Social Security. What he has not said is that the first two generations to participate in Social Security did incredibly well. Social Security brought us out of the Depression as much as any program. And the first two generations to participate in that program contributed for only a portion of their working lives and received the benefits, benefits that many are still receiving today in their 80s and 90s.

So what does this mean? It means that today's Social Security tax is paying for our grandparents' retirement. This was never a pension system where our money is saved exclusively for us. Rather, our money is being used to fund the retirement of those who went before, just as their money went to fund the retirement of those who went before, and we can trace it back to the Depression generation.

Now, we are told that the new generation does not have to contribute to pay for the previous generation's retirement. We are going to have their money diverted into separate individual accounts and that anything else would be unfair. Mr. Speaker, we cannot simultaneously take all the funds that are coming into Social Security and say that is the money of the people who put the money in and continue to fund the Social Security payments to those who are receiving checks today, people whose tax dollars, FICA contributions were used to pay the prior generation's benefits.

The proposal that the governor has put forward is to take one-sixth of the money, virtually, that is now going into the regular Social Security Trust Fund and divert it into special assets owned by those who contribute the funds. I wish we could promise that. I wish we could do that. But before we start bestowing multitrillion dollar benefits, new benefits, why do we not make sure that the program can continue to pay the existing benefits?

Another huge benefit promised by the governor of Texas is that if one were to die before reaching 65, their family gets a huge check from Social Security. Or if they were to die at age 68 or 69 or 70, before they have received their actuarial expected benefit, the family receives a giant benefit.

That is a wonderful promise. I wish I could make that promise. I would be a lot more popular if I made that promise. But what do we do to those who live to 90 or 100? Do we say that those who live less than their average life span get their money back and those that live longer than the average life span stop receiving benefits? There is no solution offered by the governor of Texas. Two huge benefits promised; no source of revenue to pay for them. A sixth roughly of the money diverted. Let us make Social Security secure, and then we can focus on whether we can do better.

Mr. Speaker, I have talked about a number of topics. Topics that are complex topics that I do not get enough time to study about, read about; and it leaves me longing for a greater level of intelligence. Mr. Speaker, there are those working on greater levels of intelligence today. There are those engaged in silicon chip engineering who are creating more intelligent machines all the time. And there will come a time when the silicon chip-driven machines rival humans in intelligence.

There are genetic engineers mapping the human genome and within a few decades they may be in a position to create a more intelligent human being, perhaps one that could have dealt with all of the topics confronting this Congress with greater wisdom than I have been able to muster.

There are those dealing with nanotechnology, technology where things are manipulated at the atomic and molecular levels, technologies that offer a chance to engineer either from biological materials or from electronic materials or from a combination of the two a level of intelligence way beyond today's computers, way beyond today's animals, and perhaps way beyond today's humans.

Speaking of intelligent humans, on August 7, 1939, Albert Einstein wrote to President Roosevelt and brought to his attention clearly and crisply the importance that nuclear technology

might have for the future of the world. In just a few years, that nuclear technology literally exploded. What was the high and unusual science of 1939 became the public policy issue of 1945 and beyond.

We today are still wrestling with the political, the international, and the ethical issues of nuclear power and, of course, nuclear weapons.

Would it not have been great if we had gotten a bit more of a head start? Would it not have been good for humankind if the scientists had come to us 20 or 30 years before the nuclear weapons were created and told the world's political leaders that the genie will soon be leaving the bottle and it is time to develop a code of ethics and central understandings that will fit the new technology?

2145

Now, some more than 50 years after nuclear weapons, we are still struggling with the ethical issues that they create. Well, I do not know how many years we have before what I refer to as remembered intelligence poses even more severe ethical issues for us than nuclear weapons do.

Let me bring a few of them to our attention. I know this may sound like science fiction today, but I do not think anyone familiar with science would say that these are not real possibilities. I am not saying this decade, maybe not next decade, maybe not in the lifetime of those of us who have lost our hair, but certainly within the lifetime of some of the younger folks in the back of the room.

First, we will see genetic engineering that will either create or offer to create our slaves or our masters. Today dogs are a man's and woman's best friend. They are great pets, and a few of them are engaged in work, shepherding sheep, for example. Today's dogs have been bred, not genetically engineered, just bred to be friendly, docile, and obedient.

There are a few who think it raises ethical issues, but most of us view a dog's intelligence as below that of self-awareness and consciousness and are quite happy to have dogs that are obedient, docile.

But what happens when the genetic engineers start developing more intelligent canines? What happens when we start having dogs as intelligent or more intelligence than apes? Fortunately, I do not think we are going to face this issue in the next decade. But we are going to face it this century, and we are probably going to face it before we figure out what to do with it.

At what point must we recognize other life forms as being protected by our Constitution? How intelligent must a genetically engineered animal be to be worthy of our protection and respect? I do not know.

Likewise, we have seen many science fiction shows where scientists start with human DNA and deliberately try to create a being that is less intelligent or simply more docile than the average human form, and we are told to imagine a race invented for slavery. I think all of us recoil at the ethics of that.

But will we recoil with the same level of revulsion if the nearly as intelligent as human or perhaps as intelligent as human docile race is engineered from canine DNA or simian DNA, perhaps someday if we are not careful, human DNA? But not only may there be genetic engineering that invents those entities which some would wish to enslave, genetic engineering, whether it starts with simian DNA or human DNA, could very well invent a level of intelligence well beyond that of any of us here, perhaps even beyond that of the Albert Einstein I quoted earlier. Then how should human kind react?

That which can be done with genetic engineering may also be done with silicon chip engineering. A book I have not had a chance to read bears the interesting title the Age of Spiritual Machines. How many decades is it before the computer screen lights up with the question, am I alive? Why am I here? Should there be any ethical limitations on creating computers with intelligence, not just to balance our checkbooks or to figure the trajectory of the rocket, but computers intelligent enough to ask the spiritual questions? I do not know. I do know that it will take a panel of Einsteins to give us some guidance as to what our laws should be. This is going to be a tough issue.

I am going to propose probably next Congress, if I am fortunate enough to be here, if there is interest by some of my colleagues, perhaps we could work on it this month or next month, that we create a national commission on the ethics of engineered intelligence to try to give some guidance to those lawmakers that will come after us in dealing with the issues of silicon or carbon-based intelligence that approach or exceed that of today's human being.

I do not know how to deal with these issues. It is a tradition in this town that, when one does not know what to do, one creates a commission. There is also a tradition in this town to wait till the last minute, to wait till some development is going to impair jobs in our own districts before we get serious about the issue. I would say that these are issues, and there are others as well that we ought to try to tackle at least at the thinking stage at the earliest possible time.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4576, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2001

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–652) on the resolution (H. Res. 514) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4576) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4577, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 2001

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–653) on the resolution (H. Res. 515) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4577) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3605, SAN RAFAEL LEGACY DISTRICT AND NATIONAL CONSERVATION ACT

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–654) on the resolution (H. Res. 516) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3605) to establish the San Rafael Western Legacy District in the State of Utah, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ILLEGAL NARCOTICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TANCREDO). 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 to the floor as we return from the Memorial Day work recess and am again pleased to appear before the House and my colleagues to talk about what I consider the most important subject facing this country and this Congress and that is the problem of illegal narcotics.

During this recess, as chair of the oversight and investigation Subcommittee on Criminal, Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources of the House of Representatives, I had the opportunity to continue our series of hearings, both here in the Congress the day before we left and adjourned and then during this holiday recess to conduct three national field hearings.

One of those was in New Orleans at the request of the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER), also a member of the Subcommittee on Criminal, Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources, to look at a drug testing program that had been instituted in some

of the private schools and is being expanded to the public schools in New Orleans. That hearing was conducted during the recess.

Then we moved our field hearings to Orlando, my own backyard, the area immediately south of me where we conducted a field hearing on the subject of club drugs and designer drugs and their impact now in central Florida, the State of Florida, and across the Nation.

Then we conducted a third hearing in the Dallas/Fort Worth, Texas area, actually in the city of Mesquite outside of Dallas at the request of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS). We looked at an area that had been hard hit by narcotics, illegal narcotics, primarily heroin, looked at the trend in illegal narcotic trafficking, particularly some of the designer drugs, methamphetamine, and focused our attention on what that community had done in successful treatment and prevention education, community-based programs to deal with the problem of illegal narcotics and drug abuse.

So we have had a full schedule, and tonight I want to update my colleagues and the American people on where we stand in our efforts to combat illegal narcotics.

Now, today is the 6th of June, and we come back from Memorial Day, a time when we remembered those who fought and died in service to this country to our great Nation. We remember today of course D-Day, such a memorable day in the history of the country, the beginning of the end of World War II when thousands of Americans died on the beaches of Normandy in attempting to bring the Second World War to an end.

As we remember each of those fallen heroes on Memorial Day and remember this day, we must realize that these individuals gave up their lives for service to this country and respect their great sacrifice and always honor that great sacrifice.

Tonight our country does not face the threat of a Cold War, of nuclear bombs possibly being rained from a Soviet Union. We still have many external threats. But today we face probably the most serious domestic threat since the very founding of this Nation. The toll continues to mount.

I asked my staff to research the number of American dead in some of the wars. In World War I, 117,000, nearly 117,000 Americans lost their lives. In World War II, over 408,000 Americans lost their lives. In the Korean War, some 52,246 Americans died in service of their country. The Vietnam War, some 58,219. In the Persian Gulf conflict in the past decade, 363 Americans gave their life in those battles.

It is incredible to note the loss of life directly and indirectly to illegal narcotics. Our Drug Czar, head of the National Office of Drug Control Policy, Barry McCaffrey, testified before our Subcommittee on Criminal, Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources in the neighborhood of 52,000 Americans lost their lives the last year as a result of direct and indirect deaths.

As a result of direct deaths, the last statistic that we have is 1998, and that figure was 15,973 Americans lost their lives. It is only to be compared to the external conflicts in which we have lost so many Americans.

So it is fitting that in the light of Memorial Day that we remember those who lost their lives in service to this great Nation, but it is sad to come back and face the reality of tens of thousands of Americans dying at the hands and at the call and at the destruction of illegal narcotics across our land.

2200

The toll in dead and destroyed families goes on and on. We have conducted field hearings across the Nation in the past year and a half since I have assumed the chairmanship and this responsibility. I am concerned that this situation may be getting even worse, rather than better.

Tonight I want to talk about where we are, some of the things we learned in our field hearings, where we can go from here, what we have done in the past that was correct, and what we have done most recently that has been incorrect, and what path we need to follow to get this situation under control. But, again, we have a very, very serious situation. It was brought to light in the hearing that was conducted in my own backyard in central Florida.

The last hearing we held focused on the last year and a half. That hearing focused on the number of deaths from heroin overdoses, which unfortunately continues to rise and even the number of admissions from overdoses of heroin continues to rise dramatically. The only reason we have not had more deaths, I am told by medical and law enforcement experts, is that they have developed better techniques to save our young people. And those who suffer from overdoses, they do not fall victim; but, nonetheless, we have even greater numbers of deaths from heroin.

We have taken a measure to create a high intensity drug traffic area, which is just getting underway the last year and a half in central Florida, and that may well be expanded up until Jacksonville and go through Orlando to Tampa, combined with the Miami HIDTA and Puerto Rican HIDTA, high intensity drug traffic area, Federal designation by Federal law that allows every possible Federal asset to be combined with State, local, other law enforcement efforts, to go after traffickers, certainly, a Federal responsibility. But even with those efforts underway, the incidents of death by heroin are still dramatically high.

Now we have learned about and we focused our hearing on club drugs, designer drugs and particularly Ecstasy. The cover of this week's Time magazine features Ecstasy, and it was ironic that we would have this national publication come out at the same time that we had this hearing in Orlando.

We had planned the hearing in advance of this publication, but certainly the problem that we heard in Orlando with Ecstasy and designer drugs, unfortunately, in this article, for those of us who will read it, will disclose, in fact, that Ecstasy and designer drugs are now rampant across the United States.

Club drugs, those drugs that are in dance and rave clubs in central Florida and around the country now, where sometimes parents think that their children are going to a dance or a music concert or activity where there is security, where there is no alcohol, these places that seem and sound secure have now turned, according to testimony we have had, into major sources of illegal designer drugs for our young people.

In Florida, the head of our State office of drug control policy, Jim McDonough, testified that we lost 200 individuals in Florida in the last several years to designer and club drugs and overdoses of these new fancy narcotics.

I do not think I have ever seen a more insidious threat to this country than what we face probably in the next year, not only from external heroin and cocaine coming in to the United States in unprecedented quantities and waves. And I will talk about how we got ourselves into that situation. Now we find the threat of these designer drugs, Ecstasy, coming in also through every conceivable means, huge quantities coming in from the Netherlands, which has had lax laws relating to narcotics distribution and consumption; huge quantities coming in from Mexico, our neighbor to the south, which we have given free and open trade access to the United States and to our markets.

Also the problem of methamphetamine, which really was not on the charts some 6 years ago or 7 years ago, and now we see an epidemic of methamphetamine from the West Coast, to the East Coast, from the North to the South, methamphetamine with consequences on individuals, that puts crack to shame. The crack epidemic that we had in the 1980s was brought under control by the Reagan administration. And this crack that caused people to do such bizarre actions, commit such bizarre crimes is nothing compared to what we are seeing around this country with methamphetamine.

It is hitting the rural areas. We are going out to Iowa to conduct a hearing at the request of the representative from Iowa (Mr. Latham), the heartland and core of America. Minnesota, another area filled full of family and tradition is now also ravaged by methamphetamine.

We conducted a hearing several weeks ago and had for the first time the Federal Sentencing Commission in, and the Sentencing Commission provided us with some charts, which I would like to put up and have my colleagues and the speaker pay attention

to for a minute, this problem has gotten entirely out of control since 1992. We look at the crack problem that we had, and I mentioned in the 1980s that was brought under control and rather limited.

If we look at this chart in two areas, in 1992, at the end of the Bush administration, Bush and Reagan had done an incredible job in bringing that situation under control. Methamphetamine in 1992, and again, I did not produce this chart, this was given by the Federal Sentencing Commission to our subcommittee, there is almost no meth on the chart in 1992.

If we go to 1993, we see the spread of crack, the appearance of methamphetamine. In 1994, you have to remember some of the situations which we developed; this is the end of the Bush and Reagan administration. This is the beginning of the Clinton/Gore just say maybe to drugs. Here is just say no era. Here is the just say maybe. Here is the appointment of a chief health officer of the United States, Jocelyn Elders, who said to our children, if it feels good, do it, the just say maybe generation.

Here we see the beginning of the meth epidemic, the cocaine, the crack reappearance. Again, these charts are just absolutely dramatic and revealing. 1994, in 1993, they began the closedown of the war on drugs.

During the break, I was home and heard one of our local councilmen, who is also an active Democrat, say that well, in fact, the problem is the war on drugs is a failure, and we just have not put enough money into treatment.

Let me just, if I may, show how much money we have put in treatment. Here is 1991, 1992, even in the Bush administration in these eras, we had put money into treatment. In almost every succeeding year and from this point on here, we have almost doubled the amount of money in treatment.

At the same time, this administration began the employment of an unprecedented number of people, and even the White House Executive Office of the President with such recent drug use histories that they could not pass security checks, the situation was so bad that, in fact, the Secret Service required a drug testing program be instituted before they would grant additional clearances to these individuals.

We ended up with an administration that began the dismantling of the war on drugs, cutting, with a Democrat-controlled House of Representatives, the entire executive branch, the presidency, the House and the Senate, the other body, by huge majorities, from 1993 to 1995 controlled this whole process. They began the dismantling of the war on drugs.

The money that had previously been used, the funds that had been previously used for stopping drugs at their source called international programs or funds were cut in half, gutted by, again, a White House and a Democrat-controlled Congress bent on just going for treatment, ignoring a war on drugs, closing down on a war on drugs.

The drug czar's office was slashed from 120 positions to some 30 positions in 1993. The use of the military for interdiction to stop drugs most cost effectively from their source before they got into the country, and our military people must understand, do not become involved in drug enforcement, they provide surveillance information; that information is given to source countries, and the source countries go after the drug traffickers. That is the pattern, and that is what can work, worked so effectively in the Bush and Reagan administration, no question about it.

They chose another path. This is, again, the result, another chart showing what took place from almost, again, if we went back to 1992, we had no methamphetamine on this chart and two spots of crack showing up. 1996, this is the result of that policy. 1997, almost the entire country now engulfed, finishing the job in 1998 and 1999.

These are some of the most dramatic charts, again, ever supplied, I think, to Congress showing the failure of a policy of this Congress, and the damage that was done in a 2-year, 3-year period by this administration.

I can only say to those that think the war on drugs is a failure to, again, please look at this chart.

And no matter how I stand, if I got up on top of this and looked down, if I look at it from the side, or if I get underneath, these are the facts. The source is the University of Michigan. In the Reagan administration, we see the long-term prevalence of drug use taking a decline; in the Bush administration, a dramatic decline.

I have not doctored these. I have not touched these. These were presented to our subcommittee. For any illicit drug, this is probably the best barometer that is produced on this. You look at the Clinton administration, you look at the emphasis of putting all of the money into treatment, closing down the enforcement or closing down the interdiction, closing down the source country, failing to stop drugs at their source, closing down the drug czar's operation, as we knew it, and these are the results.

So this, my friends, is not failure. This is success. This is a reduction. This is failure. It is incredible to see that where the Republicans took over, and even with the thwarting of this administration blocking the new majority's efforts to stop drugs at their source, to regain the cooperation and use of the military for surveillance purposes, and going after tough prosecution on some of the things that we have done, have we even begun to stabilize this in the last several years.

2215

But now I submit that the situation is again getting out of hand, and for several specific reasons.

First, during the holidays, the headline is very telling in The Washington Post. It says, ''Antidrug Efforts Stalls in Colombia.'' And it is ironic that on the same page they have ''U.S. Calls Peruvian Election Invalid.''

This shows two great failures of this administration. First, we begged, we pleaded with this President since 1994, when they started first of all closing down the sharing of information with Peru and Colombia and other countries that were sources of hard narcotics, we pleaded with them to continue allowing that surveillance information to be given.

Liberals from this administration and others who went into these various agencies, including the Department of Defense, came up with a cockamamie, and I am not sure, for the benefit of the Speaker and the stenographer, how ''cockamamie'' is spelled, but a cockamamie opinion was drafted by these liberals that we could no longer share that information and they closed down the surveillance, they closed down stopping us providing that information and, basically, shut down the shoot-down policies that these countries had adopted.

When we would provide these countries information on drugs leaving their source, they would, in fact, send their pilot out after warning and shoot down drug traffickers. It worked. It worked in the Bush administration. It worked in the Reagan administration. And we saw this decline.

I always ask, how many people have HD TVs? Not many people have HD TVs. That is because there is not a big supply of HD TVs, there is a very small supply available and the price is very high.

With the policy of closing down the war on drugs, you would not have your planes shot down, if the surveillance is prohibited, which it was by this administration, and that mistake was made back in 1994 and 1995 and only corrected after a bipartisan effort, everyone in the House who dealt with this issue knew the great mistake that was made, the damage that was made, and we changed the law and allowed that information to be shared.

And then in the last 2 or 3 years, we see the same pattern over and over again. This administration has failed to provide the interdiction effort. The Department of Defense does not have the will. And I just thought of this the other day. Have my colleagues ever heard the President of the United States mention the war on drugs? Have we ever heard Bill Clinton, the Chief Executive Officer, from this podium, in a joint session of Congress or in any public forum? I cannot recall.

At one time I know that a search was done on one of these Nexus searches to see how many times he had mentioned illegal narcotics or an effort to deal with the drug problem; and, in fact, it is almost the lowest recorded of any President. That is why we see the lack of leadership from the White House and not only the lack of leadership and the message that is sent to our young people and our population, but also the

policy and the policy is an antidrug effort stalled in Colombia.

Why did it stall? This administration never brought up until the last minute, almost to the week of the presentation of the budget, their proposal for dealing with this problem in Colombia.

Now, when the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) chaired the subcommittee responsible for trying to deal with that narcotics problem, he actually was the chair of the subcommittee that had this responsibility in the last Congress, he began restoration in several countries and was able to get in Peru and Bolivia efforts started. They have eliminated between 55 and 60 percent of the cocaine production in both of those countries, successful programs.

That is why I thought this was ironic that the U.S. calls the Peruvian election invalid. I think they backed off today. But here, this administration, instead of praising President Fujimori, is condemning President Fujimori. Why in the world would we take a president who has stabilized the country, and I can tell my colleagues firsthand because I flew into Lima, Peru in 1990, the end of 1993, with the airport sandbagged, with people sleeping in the streets, with chaos, with thousands of displaced Indian population, hungry people, I will never forget going to a village outside of Lima and meeting a peasant woman and she had five children and the interpreter told me what she was saying, and she said that her difficulty, her problem, was she only had enough food for four of those children so she had to choose which child not to feed that would die.

This is the situation that President Fujimori inherited, complete chaos, 60, 70 percent of the cocaine coming into the United States produced in that country. Here is someone who brought law and order, who calmed a country that was in total disruption, and here is this administration condemning him for a candidate who called not to have a runoff election and would not commit to a date certain.

Could you imagine the Republicans saying, we will not have a runoff election or the Democrats in this country saying we will not have a runoff election or do not have a runoff election, and we will figure out at some time when the election will be? This is a slap in the face to President Fujimori who has done an incredible job of first stabilizing that country.

I remember going down when I took over chairmanship of this responsibility on our drug policy and trying to put these programs back together both with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) and myself when I assumed this chair and met with President Fujimori, I was stunned at Lima, I was stunned at the countryside, at the order, the ability of people to conduct their daily business, of glass everywhere, which everything had been boarded, people sleeping in the alleyways, bombs going off at night, gunfire. And that was a situation he inherited, brought the cocaine trafficking under control, brought down the terrorism that disrupted so many lives, and stabilized the economy so a mother would not have to make a decision whether she fed four children and let one die.

This is the type of foreign policy. Even the President of the United States's representative in Peru wrote this administration and said, your policy for, and this is the policy of a second time, they made the mistake in 1994 and 1993 by stopping the surveillance information, they stopped it again, and the President's representative, the ambassador of the United States of America, appointed by the President of the United States, said, this is a mistake in a report that was given to me in December by GAO, the General Accounting Office. I asked for a report from an impartial panel to see what was going on.

So mistake after mistake, error after error, has been made.

Now, again, in the 1980s, we had most of the cocaine coming in from South America and from Peru and Bolivia. About 95 percent of it really was coming in from those two countries. We were able to stem that. We were able to bring down the prevalence of drug use. This is the new picture; and we have almost all of the cocaine, probably 80 to 90 percent of the cocaine, now being produced in Colombia.

Now, in 6 or 7 years, we managed to turn Colombia from a transit and trafficking country into a producing country. Fortunately, the policies of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) and the new Republican majority were instituted at very low cost, $20 million, $30 million, $40 million in those source countries to stop incredible volumes of cocaine coming into the United States. But what happened is the Clinton administration blocked aid, blocked helicopters, blocked equipment again because the liberals in the administration said, oh, we cannot harm the hair on the back of any leftist, Marxist guerilla. It does not matter if they, in fact, were trafficking and supporting their guerilla activities through the sale of illegal narcotics that were coming into the United States.

So now we have really, protected by the Clinton-Gore administration, Colombia with no resources. It is almost farcical what has happened. And until the first couple of months of this year were we able to get to the National Police three Blackhawk helicopters, which we have been pleading and begging for 4 or 5 years to get down to Colombia.

We knew what was going to happen, and it happened. This administration ignored it. They sent the military assets to Haiti. Ironically, Haiti is now one of the biggest traffickers in the Caribbean, lawless killing. We have one corrupted administration replacing another one. After billions of American taxpayer dollars, this is now one of the main routes. And Colombia is another disaster. The two foreign policy disasters unparalleled in the history of this hemisphere. Billions spent there, nothing spent there, creating a market, creating a source for drug trafficking.

There was almost no heroin produced in 1993 in January when this President took office, President Clinton; and this is now the source of some 75 percent of the heroin killing kids in Orlando and Plano, Texas and California; Chicago; and New York. And now it is transiting through the country, where we spent $3 billion in nation building, in establishing a judicial system and electoral processes that have been, in fact, a farce.

It is the bad leading, the bad destroying American business activity there, forcing the whole island, at least this half, which is Haiti, of Dominica, the island nation of Haiti into a welfare state supported by U.S. taxpayers, one of the saddest chapters in failed policy of this administration.

And then what was not diverted here, the Defense Department will tell you was diverted to Kosovo, to Bosnia, to the other many deployments of this administration.

What are the results of these policies? For the first time again, we are seeing with the blocking of aid to Colombia, and I must say that at this point the Republicans must take some heat in the United States Senate, the other body, and some blame and responsibility for blocking the aid. The House did act and had a package ready to go to aid Colombia to get additional resources. The other body did not act with the speed they should have. But again, there is some justification because the President dragged his heels in getting this request to the Congress.

2230

This is what is happening now. We are seeing a resurgence of cocaine. The chart that I showed just a few minutes ago showed the crack coming in. Crack is part of the cocaine trafficking. This was presented to us by the Customs Service. These are boats mostly coming through Haiti with literally tons of cocaine which is smuggled in through the hulls of these vessels. This is 706 pounds of cocaine seized. This is just what they are seizing, January 31, 2000. This is another vessel, 1,083 pounds of cocaine coming in at the beginning of February. Another one, February 5, 539 pounds of cocaine. Another one, February 10, 226 pounds of cocaine, most of it coming into the United States through Haiti, some of it being transshipped through Puerto Rico, the Bahamas and into Florida. We are seeing an unprecedented amount of cocaine again for the first time coming in.

We are seeing an unprecedented amount of methamphetamine labs. Most of the meth we hear about is tied to Mexican gangs, Mexican drug dealers and chemical dealers who are selling the precursors or organizing the lab efforts. We have had testimony that

their operations from Mexico extend, of course, through Texas, through Oklahoma. We heard testimony that from 60 labs in the Oklahoma area that the FBI controls Oklahoma and Texas, there is now over 1,000 labs that have been busted. In Iowa, the heartland again of America. On the West Coast in Sacramento, up in the north central area, incredible amounts of methamphetamine all the way down to the base of California with methamphetamine. Methamphetamine we have done hearings on.

I want to digress for a minute and talk about methamphetamine. Because I do not think we have ever seen a more damaging substance than methamphetamine. These are some charts provided to us by the National Drug Institute. Dr. Leschner presented these before our subcommittee, showing the normal brain with dopamine which helps with the brain function which is shown in the bright yellow. This is the normal brain. The second is a brain that has had a small amount of methamphetamine. The third is someone addicted to methamphetamine. The last one is someone who has Parkinson's Disease in a serious stage.

This drug, methamphetamine, does incredible things to human beings. It causes the most bizarre actions. This is what chemically happens to the brain and destroys the brain function. It is not something that can be regenerated. This is permanent damage. This is damage so severe that mothers and fathers abandon their children not to reclaim them, as we found in testimony in California, where in a small county some 600 addicted to methamphetamine, only a handful were even capable or could take back or would take back their children. This is what happens to the brain. Meth is absolutely a destructive substance and again causes people to commit the most bizarre actions. The worst case we heard was a mother and father that tortured their child and then boiled the child to finally kill the child. Again, just incredibly bizarre acts that are committed on this drug.

Mr. Speaker, we are facing a very, very difficult situation. When you have in one small locale 1,000 meth labs and this methamphetamine being produced by recipes provided over the Internet, by people experimenting and getting substances from their drug stores, chemicals, and then the larger problem, the Mexican meth dealers and getting the precursor chemicals from predominantly Mexico, China, and the Netherlands according to testimony we have had.

We are facing an incredible challenge with these narcotics coming into the United States. I am convinced, too, given the ability to produce these drugs domestically, such as methamphetamine, and we can do our best, we have a responsibility to do our best to control the precursor chemicals and find them before they come into the country and then as they come into the country and are used for these illicit purposes; but we must do an even better job of education and prevention.

Treatment is fine, but treatment assumes that someone is already addicted and a victim. If we fought World War II and we only treated victims, we did not invent the equipment that we did, the bomb that we did to go after the source, we did not stop the production of the German rockets, if we did not stop their war machine, we never would have brought the war under control. The war on drugs, it does not take a rocket scientist to figure out, you stop the drugs at their source. This also, though, as I have said, is a much more insidious threat than anything we have seen, again with Ecstasy, again with methamphetamine, again with GHB, and I believe it is GHB, I really do not know that much other than what I have heard at the last hearings about this new drug.

This is another drug that has an incredible consequence in its use. People are using it, mixing it with alcohol and dropping dead. The difference with GHB is that there is almost no trace left in the blood stream. There is almost no trace left in the body to detect. So it is a much more insidious drug; it is a deadly drug, and people are dying from it; and we do not even know they are dying. We had expert testimony that tells us because it dissipates from the body that what happens is the only way that you can really detect it is by doing a dissection of the brain and an autopsy after death and finding minute traces of this substance.

But we are facing with these designer drugs an incredible challenge to this Nation, to our young people, to parents. Parents have no idea about these drugs that are out there and again available in these clubs that sound like they would be something that you could securely send your children to with no alcohol, with security posted, with other limits. Yet these clubs, and we now have the term club drugs and we have this wide variety of small tablets and pills. Some of them we saw at the hearing that were presented in the Orlando hearing by this drug enforcement and customs agency that had been seized that are small pills with designer emblems, designer emblems of Nike, of other trademarks that are imposed, and the drugs have such an attractive appearance and seem almost harmless that now our young people are being victimized by even the appearance of these drugs. Again, the dramatic rise in death in Florida has been recounted, and the deaths that we cannot count because of, again, drugs like GHB that are almost impossible to detect.

Again, I think it is important that we look at what is happening. Our hearing focused on that in Orlando.

This chart talks about a comparison of designer drugs and other drug overdoses and shows in 1999, this would be other drugs and this is designer drugs in the year 2000 so far to date, we see we are well on our way to breaking the records of 1999, and we are only partially through the year. What is interesting is we conducted this hearing in Orlando; we moved to New Orleans. I heard the same scenario being laid out by the district attorney there, Harry Connick, and others who testified, local sheriffs, the same problem is being repeated. Then we went on to Dallas and we hear the Dallas-Fort Worth area also being victimized by designer drugs and incredible increases in activity.

One of the problems that we have had in this administration, not only a failure in closing down some of the war on drugs, again, source country interdiction, the drug czar's office, getting that back up and running full speed, which I might say Barry McCaffrey is doing his best. General McCaffrey inherited a disaster from Lee Brown who should have been run out of office, who dismantled the drug czar's office, did the most damage of any public official probably in the history of the United States, just an incredible disaster. Barry McCaffrey and others like myself are now stuck with trying to bring us out of this morass.

One of the additional policy failures we have had, I talked about Haiti, the nation-building effort and now a disaster, one of the major sources of drug transit operations. This administration knew that Panama was going to cease our military operations in Panama. Panama was key to the war on drugs because all of the forward operating locations were centered from Panama. This little yellow dot here represents and is right over Panama. We had Howard Air Force Base, part of the $10.5 billion in assets that we turned over to the Panamanians last year. May 1 of last year was an important date, about a year ago. The U.S. knew this was going to happen, but this administration failed to negotiate with Panama not for continued military use but for continued use of drug surveillance flights, because this was such a key area, and it covered this whole area very cost effectively. We had also built the infrastructure, billions of dollars for those bases, and we could have in fact even leased them for a small amount of money. Instead, the talks collapsed. Instead, the administration was left in the cold and they quickly scurried to the Department of Defense and Department of State to find other locations. Now, that is a responsible thing to do. It was irresponsible in the fashion it was done because it was delayed. We called them before our committee even before I was chair of this subcommittee; said, are things getting in place, are you ready, are you negotiating with the Panamanians, could we not just keep the drug operations out of there, this forward operation going and do it cost effectively with cutting a deal with the Panamanians?

In fact, what happened is it all fell apart. We were totally asked to leave, kicked out of Panama. Even Barry

McCaffrey told me that corrupt tenders by the Panamanians allowed the Chinese to take control of the two port activities and the U.S. was excluded from any flights as of May 1.

So as of May 1 last year, we have had a wide-open field day for drug traffickers because the United States, the Department of Defense and the State Department, have been handicapped in getting these forward-operating locations, drug surveillance operations back in place.

2245

When we do not have that information, we have this huge supply. Remember what I said about HDTVs? Not too many people have them because there is not a big supply. Well, on every street in this country we can find cocaine in unprecedented quantities today. On every street in this country we can find heroin in unprecedented quantities today, because we have an incredible supply.

Just doing treatment, as this administration put its eggs all in the treatment basket, it just does not cut it. We have to stop some of this supply from its source. We know it is coming from Colombia.

The American taxpayers are now stuck with the bill in trying to put together this operation in a piecemeal fashion with a base in Ecuador, a base in Curacao and Aruba, and possibly a base in El Salvador. Unfortunately, the price tag will probably be $100 million.

Ecuador, in a recent hearing we conducted, and we will be talking about this again in a hearing on Friday with the Department of Defense and Department of State, it will not be until 2002 that this runway, which is incapable of supporting some of the aircraft that we need to do this surveillance work, it will not be until 2002 until that is in place, so that is one reason we have tons of this stuff coming in unchecked.

In Aruba, we do have some flights going out of Aruba. Unfortunately, they take off from a commercial field, and our staff has said that sometimes these flights are even delayed.

Now we have a problem with Venezuela, who has thumbed its nose at the President of the United States, at the United States' efforts to conduct surveillance flights in Venezuelan airspace or pursue traffickers, even when we provide them with information.

In the final area, we have two 10-year contracts here. We will be investing that money for 10 years, and again, not up until 2002. The last location that they have suggested and recently signed an agreement, but I believe it has not been approved by the El Salvador parliament, is a location in El Salvador. So we have three that will not be in place for a long time. More drugs will be coming into the country. It is another disaster at our doorstep.

Let me again look at, if we can, the money that was spent for interdiction and also international programs, which is source country programs. These are the figures in 1991, 1992, and 1993. This would be the end of the Bush administration, the beginning of the Clinton administration.

Members will see the dramatic drop, the dramatic drop here. In fact, we are barely at, and with the efforts of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), who was able to fund additional money when he had responsibility for chairing drug policy, we are barely back at the levels at the end of the Bush-Reagan administration when these programs were gutted.

As we gut these programs, it is interesting, and we turn to treatment, and we saw the graphs on treatment, we see again in the Reagan-Bush era that this is a lifetime annual and 30-day drug use, and we see it declining in the Bush and Reagan administration. We see it on a steep incline, and again, this is the policy of success of this administration.

We only see here where we began, again, the Republican and new majority takeover, some slight change. But I will tell the Members that this chart, if we continue and not stop drugs coming in from Colombia, not stop drugs coming in from their source, not interdicting drugs, not stopping the precursor chemicals that allow the production of deeper drugs and methamphetamine, Mr. Speaker, we are about to have this again go off the charts. The damage to our 12th graders and others will be unbelievable.

This is long-term trend of prevalence of heroin use, and also produced by the University of Michigan. We see in the Reagan administration pretty much a flat line, some downturn, another downturn in the Bush administration. In the Clinton administration, it is off the charts. I did not make these charts. We enlarged them. This obviously is a story of failure. This is success.

Now, any administration like the Clinton administration that can get us long-term trends on prevalence of heroin use going up like that, that is a success. That means that the war on drugs was a failure, but this is a success. Again, we see the first bleep there, again after some of the policies of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), the new Republican administration of the Congress took over, not of the executive branch.

Again, we see in the Reagan era, this is long-term prevalence use of cocaine, and in the Bush era a dramatic success. This is the beginning of the Andean strategy, stopping the cocaine at its source. This was the Vice President's task force that Vice President Bush led. This is blue lightning and other initiatives to go after this stuff.

This did not work, Mr. Speaker. These are imaginary downturn lines, but then we see the Clinton administration, and I would be afraid to rechart this given what we now know about the Clinton administration diverting assets, with Vice President Gore sending AWACs to Alaska to look for oil spills, the President of the United States in his many deployments in Haiti diverting resources from this anti-narcotics effort to nationbuilding while our people are falling like flies, particularly our young people.

If Members do not believe those charts, there is a 1999 GAO report that I requested that shows in fact that in 1992–1993, the beginning of the Clinton administration, dramatic drops occurred in this.

First is the total use of DOD assets in the war on drugs. This is, again, not produced by me but the General Accounting Office; overall assets down dramatically.

This next line in red, the DOD, down dramatically. The Coast Guard was up slightly, but also leveled off here.

Mr. Speaker, I will continue next week on more information relating to our efforts to stem illegal narcotics and drug abuse in this country.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MCNULTY (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of personal reasons.

Ms. SANCHEZ (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business.

Mr. PASTOR (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of illness in the family.

Mr. VENTO (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and the balance of the month on account of illness.

Mr. JEFFERSON (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business.

Mr. ENGLISH (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of a death in the family.

Mr. GREENWOOD (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and June 7 on account of personal reasons.

Mr. HILLEARY (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and the balance of the week on account of emergency eye surgery.

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. LAMPSON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DEMINT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. VITTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEMINT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today, June 7 and 13.

Mr. METCALF, for 5 minutes, June 7, 8, and 9.

Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KASICH, for 5 minutes, today.

BILLS 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, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 4489. To amend section 110 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigration Responsibility Act of 1996, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3293. To amend the law that authorized the Vietnam Veterans Memorial to authorize the placement within the site of the memorial of a plaque to honor those Vietnam veterans who died after their service in the Vietnam war, but as a direct result of that service.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 7, 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:

7875. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Fenhexamid; Pesticide Tolerances [OPP–300991; FRL–6553–7] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received April 7, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7876. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting requests for Fiscal Year 2001 budget amendments for the Departments of Agriculture, Energy, Health and Human Services, and State; International Assistance Programs; the Corporation for National and Community Service; the Merit Systems Protection Board; the National Archives and Records Administration; and, the National Capital Planning Commission; (H. Doc. No. 106—251); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

7877. A letter from the Principal Deputy Under the Secretary of Defense, Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act by the Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Appropriations.

7878. A letter from the Director, Defense Finance and Accounting Service, Department of Defense, transmitting notification that the Defense Finance and Accounting Service is initiating an A–76 cost comparison study of the Security Assistance Accounting function, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2461; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7879. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of the Navy, transmitting the Secretary's determination and findings that it is in the public interest to use other than competitive procedures for a specific procurement, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2304(c)(7); to the Committee on Armed Services.

7880. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition and Technology, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on Federally Funded Research and Development Centers Estimated FY 2001 Staff-years of Technical Effort (STE), pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2367nt.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7881. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Health Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting a report entitled, ''Dental Care For Active Duty Military Family Members 18 Years of Age and Under''; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7882. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Health Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting a report describing the scope of preventive health care benefits to all eligible TRICARE beneficiaries; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7883. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report entitled, ''Distribution of DoD Depot Maintenance Workloads Fiscal Years 2000 Through 2004''; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7884. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition and Technology, Department of Defense, transmitting a interim response to the Department of Defense missions and functions review report under OMB Circular A–76; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7885. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Procurement, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Manufacturing Technology Program [DFARS Case 99–D302] received April 13, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

7886. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Procurement, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Caribbean Basin Countries [DFARS Case 2000–D006] received April 13, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

7887. A letter from the Directors of Congressional Budget Office and Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a joint report on the National Defense Function (050) outlays for Fiscal Year 2001, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 226(a); to the Committee on Armed Services.

7888. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the approved retirement and advancement to the grade of Lieutenant General Phillip J. Ford, United States Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7889. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the annual report of the Maritime Administration (MARAD) for Fiscal Year 1999; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7890. A letter from the Senior Banking Counsel, Office of General Counsel, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Bank Holding Companies and Change in Bank Control (RIN: 1505–AA78) received March 29, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

7891. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—Single Family Mortage Insurance; Appraiser Roster Removal Procedures [Docket No. FR–4429–F–03] (RIN: 2502–AH29) received April 5, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

7892. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report involving U.S. exports to Malaysia, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(i); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

7893. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule—Asset and Liability Backup Program (RIN: 3064–AC23) received April 5, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

7894. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule—Activities and Investments of Insured State Banks (RIN: 3064–AC38) received April 3, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

7895. A letter from the Managing Director, Federal Housing Finance Board, transmitting the Board's final rule—Amendment of Membership Regulation and Advances Regulation [No. 2000–10] (RIN: 3069–AA94) received March 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

7896. A letter from the Managing Director, Federal Housing Finance Board, transmitting the Board's final rule—Devolution of Corporate Governance Responsibilities [No. 2000–09] (RIN: 3069–AA–96) received March 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

7897. A letter from the Managing Director, Federal Housing Finance Board, transmitting the Board's final rule—Determination of Appropriate Present-Value Factors Associated With Payments Made by the Federal Home Loan Banks to the Resolution Funding Corporation [No. 2000–15] (RIN: 3069–AA92) received April 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

7898. A letter from the Secretary, BCP, Division of Financial Practices, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Advisory Opinion Regarding the Fair Debt Collection Practives Act—received April 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

7899. A letter from the Chairman, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the 1999 Annual Report of the National Credit Union Administration, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 1752a(d); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

7900. A letter from the Chairman, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the 1999 annual report regarding activities related to credit practices, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 1752a(d); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

7901. A letter from the Director, Office of Thrift Supervision, transmitting the Preservation of Minority Savings Institutions Annual Report to Congress for 1999; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

7902. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the OMB Cost Estimate For Pay-As-You-Go Calculations; to the Committee on the Budget.

7903. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting the Department's annual report to Congress on the FY 1998 program operations of the Office of Workers' Compensation Programs (OWCP), the administration of the Black Lung Benefits Act (BLBA), the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act (LHWCA), and the Federal Employees' Compensation Act for the period October 1, 1997, through September 30, 1998, pursuant to 30 U.S.C. 936(b); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

7904. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Office of Postsecondary Education, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule—Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants Program—received April 6, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

7905. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Postsecondary Education, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule—Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants Program—received April 10, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

7906. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule—Projects With Industry (RIN: 1820–AB45) received April 10, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

7907. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule—Federal Perkins Loan Program—received April 3, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

7908. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule—Projects With Industry (RIN: 1820–AB45) received April 3, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

7909. A letter from the Chairman, National Council on the Humanities, transmitting the Federal Council on the Arts and the Humanities' twenty-fourth annual report on the Arts and Artifacts Indemnity Program for Fiscal Year 1999, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 959(c); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

7910. A letter from the Administrator, Energy Information Administration, transmitting the Energy Information Administration's ''International Energy Outlook 2000,'' pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 790f(a)(2); to the Committee on Commerce.

7911. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the 1999 annual report on the Loan Repayment Program for Research Generally, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 2541—1(i); to the Committee on Commerce.

7912. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Western Area Power Administration, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—Energy Planning and Management Program; Integrated Resource Planning Approval Criteria (RIN: 1901–AA84) received April 3, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7913. A letter from the National Committee on Vital and Health Statistics, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Third Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Adminstrative Simplification Provisions of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act, pursuant to Public Law 104—191, section 263 (110 Stat. 2033); to the Committee on Commerce.

7914. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Removal of Designated Journals; Confirmation of Effective Dates [Docket No. 99N–4957] received April 6, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7915. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plan; Indiana [IN99–1a; FRL–6573–7] received April 13, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7916. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Protection of Stratospheric Ozone [FRL–6575–7] received April 7, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7917. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Revisions to the Interim Enhanced Surface Water Treatment Rule (IESWTR), the State 1 Disinfectants and Disinfection Byproducts Rule (Stage 1DBPR), and Revisions to State Primacy Requirements to Implement the Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) Amendments [FRL–6575–9] (RIN: 2040–AD43) received April 7, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7918. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Managment and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Standards of Performance for New Stationary Sources (NSPS) and National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP); Delegation of Authority to the States of Iowa; Kansas; Missouri; Nebraska; LINCOLN–Lancaster County, Nebraska; and City of Omaha, Nebraska [FRL–6577–1] received April 10, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7919. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Plans For Designated Facilities and Pollutants: Connecticut; Plan for Controlling MWC Emissions From Existing MWC Plants [Docket No. CT–055–7214A; FRL–6577–3] received April 10, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7920. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Air Quality Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; Delaware; Control of Emissions from Existing Hospital/Medical/Infectious Waste Incinerators [DE040–1023a; FRL–6577–7] received April 10, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7921. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants: Mississippi [MS23–200015a; FRL–6574–3] received April 5, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7922. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans, California—South Coast [CA–237–0221; FRL–6570–7] received April 5, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7923. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Air Quality Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; Allegheny County, Pennsylvania; Control of Emissions from Existing Hospital/Medical/Infectious Waste Incinerators [PA152–4099a; FRL–6571–5] received April 5, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7924. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California State Implementation Plan Revision, Antelope Valley Air Pollution Control District and Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District [CA231–0227a; FRL–6570–9] received April 5, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7925. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans Georgia: Approval of Revisions to the Georgia State Implementation Plan: Transportation Conformity Interagency Memorandum of Agreement [GA–48–200010(a); FRL–6573–5] received April 5, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7926. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Transportation Conformity Amendment: Deletion of Grace Period [FRL–6574–7] (RIN: 2060–AI76) received April 5, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7927. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Interim Final Determination that State has Corrected the Plan Deficiency and Stay of Sanctions; Phoenix PM–10 Nonattainment Area, Arizona [AZ092–002; FRL–6575–2] received April 5, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7928. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Massachusetts; Revised VOC Rules [MA063–01–7200a; A–1–FRL–6574–7A] received April 5, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7929. A letter from the Deputy Chief, Industry Analysis Division, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Local Competition and Boardband Reporting [CC Docket No. 99–301] received April 6, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7930. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Voluntary Submission of Performance Indicator Data [NRC Regulatory Issue Summary 2000–08] received April 6, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7931. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Use of Risk-Informed Decision-making in License Amendment Reviews [NRC Regulatory Issue Summary 2000–07] received April 6, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7932. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board, transmitting the Board's report entitled ''Report to the U.S. Congress and the Secretary of Energy—1999 Findings and Recommendations,'' pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 10268; to the Committee on Commerce.

7933. A letter from the Lieutenant General, USA, Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Air Force's Proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to Israel for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 00–43), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

7934. A letter from the Lieutenant General, USA, Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in the United States for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 00–41), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

7935. A letter from the Lieutenant General, USA, Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office in the United States for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 00–42), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

7936. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition and Technology, Department of Defense, transmitting a copy of Transmittal No. 14–99 which constitutes a Request for Final Approval for the Memorandum of Agreement with Canada and the United Kingdom concerning Chemical, Biological and Radiological (CBR) Defense Material, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2767(f); to the Committee on International Relations.

7937. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report on chemical and biological weapons proliferation control efforts for the period of February 1, 1999 to January 31, 2000, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 5606; to the Committee on International Relations.

7938. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

7939. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the President's Determination No. 2000–16, regarding certification of the 26 major illicit drug producing and transit countries; to the Committee on International Relations.

7940. A letter from the Chairman, Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission, transmitting the 1999 annual reports on activities of the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission, pursuant to 29 U.S.C. 675; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7941. A letter from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting List of all reports issued or released by the GAO in March 2000, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 719(h); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7942. A letter from the Federal Co-Chairman, Appalachian Regional Commission, transmitting the FY 2001 Performance Plan and the Annual Performance Report for FY 1999; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7943. A letter from the Chairman, Broadcasting Board of Governors, transmitting a copy of the Broadcasting Board of Governors' 1999 Annual Report, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 6204; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7944. A letter from the Executive Director, Committee For Purchase From People Who Are Blind Or Severely Disabled, transmitting the Committee's final rule—Procurement List: Additions and Deletions—received April 5, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7945. A letter from the Chairman, Defense Nuclear Facilities Board, transmitting the Annual Program Performance Report for Fiscal Year 1999; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7946. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Civil Works, Department of the Army, transmitting the Annual Financial Report for Fiscal Year 1999; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7947. A letter from the Chief Financial Officer, Department of Energy, transmitting the Fiscal Year 1999 Accountability Report; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7948. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Fiscal Year 1999 Annual Performance Report; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7949. A letter from the Acting Director of Communications and Legislative Affairs, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting the Fiscal Year 1999 Annual Performance Report and Fiscal Year 2000 Annual Performance Plan; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7950. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the 1999 Program Performance Report; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7951. A letter from the Director, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Fiscal Year 2001 Annual Performance Plan; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7952. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Labor Relations Authority, transmitting the Fiscal Year 1999 Annual Program Performance Report; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7953. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting the Annual Program Performance Report for FY 1999; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7954. A letter from the Director, Holocaust Memorial Museum, transmitting the Annual Performance Report for Fiscal Year 1999; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7955. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Fiscal Year 1999 Performance Report; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7956. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, National Archives and Records Administration, transmitting the Fiscal Year 1999 Annual Performance Report; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7957. A letter from the Chairman, National Capital Planning Commission, transmitting the Commission's annual report fulfilling the reporting requirements of the Inspector General Act of 1978 (IG Act), as amended, and the Federal Manager's Financial Integrity Act, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7958. A letter from the Executive Director, National Council on Disability, transmitting the Annual Performance Report Fiscal Year 1999; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7959. A letter from the Chairman, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the 1999 Performance Plan and the Annual Plan for 2000; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7960. A letter from the Director, National Gallery of Art, transmitting the Annual Program Performance Report for FY 1999; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7961. A letter from the Chairman and General Counsel, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting the Performance Program Report for Fiscal Year 1999; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7962. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Fiscal Year 1999 Annual Performance Report; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7963. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule—Prevailing Rate Systems; Abolishment of the King, WA, Nonappropriated Fund Wage Area (RIN: 3206–AI75) received April 4, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7964. A letter from the The Special Counsel, Office of Special Counsel, transmitting the Annual Performance Report for Fiscal Year 1999; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7965. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the FY 1999 Annual Performance Report; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7966. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the Financial Report of the United States Government for the Fiscal Year 1999; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7967. A letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Government National Mortgage Association's (GNMA) management report, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7968. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting the Fiscal Year 1999 Annual Report on Performance and Accountablity; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7969. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the Fiscal Year 2001 Performance Plan combined with the Fiscal Year 1999 Performance Report; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7970. A letter from the Director, U.S. Trade and Development Agency, transmitting the Annual Performance Report for FY 1999; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7971. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 1999 Biennial report with respect to the Striped Bass Research Study, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 1851; to the Committee on Resources.

7972. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Royalty Management, Minerals Management Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting notification of proposed refunds of offshore lease revenues where a refund or recoupment is appropriate, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Resources.

7973. A letter from the Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Determination of Threatened Status for the Northern Idaho Ground Squirrel (RIN: 1018–AE84) received April 3, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7974. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Atka MACKeral in the Central Aleutian District of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands [Docket No. 000211040–0040–01; I.D. 040300A] received April 10, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7975. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Sea Grant Minority Serving Institutions Partnership Program: Request for Proposals for FY 2000 [Docket No. 000218045–0045–01] (RIN: 0648–ZA80) received March 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7976. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the

Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in the West Yakutat District in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 000211039–0039–01; I.D. 033100A] received April 10, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7977. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock Within the Shelikof Strait Conservation Area in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 000211039–0039–01; I.D. 032300A] received April 3, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7978. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic; Amendment 9 [Docket No. 991008273–0070–02; I.D. 062399B] (RIN: 0648–AK89) received April 3, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7979. A letter from the Acting Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries off West Coast States and in the Western Pacific; Western Pacific Pelagic Fisheries; Hawaii-based Pelagic Longline Fishery Line Clipper and Dipnet Requirement; Guidelines for Handling of Sea Turtles Brought Aboard Hawaii-based Pelagic Longline Vessels [Docket No. 000214041–0081–02; I.D. 012100C] (RIN: 0648–AN50) received April 4, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7980. A letter from the Acting 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; Spiny Dogfish Fishery Management Plan [Docket No. 990713189–9335–02; I.D. 060899B] (RIN: 0648–AK79) received April 4, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7981. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the FY 1999 Annual Accountability Report; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7982. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting a report on Forensic DNA Laboratory Improvement Program, Phase 4 for Fiscal Year 1999; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7983. A letter from the Chief Financial Officer, Paralyzed Veterans of America, transmitting a copy of the annual audit report of the Paralyzed Veterans of America for the fiscal years ended September 30, 1998 and 1999, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 1166; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7984. A letter from the Director, The Federal Judicial Center, transmitting the Federal Judicial Center's Annual Report for 1999, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 623(b); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7985. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration, transmitting the fourth annual report of actions the Federal Aviation Administration has taken in response to Section 304 of the Federal Aviation Administration Authorization Act of 1994, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 40101nt.; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7986. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Establishment of Jet Routes; AK [Airspace Docket No. 98–AAL–13] (RIN: 2120–AA66) received April 10, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7987. A letter from the Regulations Officer, FHA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations; Definition of the Commercial Motor Vehicle [FHWA Docket No. FHWA 97–2858] (RIN: 2125–AE22) received April 10, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7988. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of the Dimensions of the Grand Canyon National Park Special Flight Rules Area and Flight Free Zones [Docket No. FAA–99–5926 NM 3–27–00; Amendment No. 93–80 NM 3–28–00] (RIN: 2120–AG74) received April 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7989. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Commercial Air Tour Limitation in the Grand Canyon National Park Special Flight Rules Area [Docket No. FAA–99–5927; Amdt. No. 93–81; NM–3–28–00] (RIN: 2120–AG73) received April 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7990. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Establishment of Colored Federal Airways; AK [Airspace Docket No. 98–AAL–15] (RIN: 2120–AA66) received April 10, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7991. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of Class E Airspace; Delaware, OH [Airspace Docket No. 98–AGL–37] received April 10, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7992. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 29977; Amdt. No. 1985] received April 10, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7993. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 29976; Amdt. No. 1984] received April 10, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7994. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; The New Piper Aircraft, Inc. J–2 Series Airplanes That Are Eqipped With Wings Lift Struts [Docket No. 99–CE–13–AD; Amendment 39–11479; AD 99–26–19] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received April 10, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7995. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Model F27 Mark 050 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99–NM–317–AD; Amendment 39–11459; AD 99–25–16] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received April 10, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7996. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 757 Series Airplanes Equipped With Rolls Royce Engines [Docket No. 99–NM–125–AD; Amendment 39–11431; AD 99–24–07] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received April 10, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7997. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney PW 4000 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 97–ANE–55–AD; Amendment 39–11220; AD 99–15–01] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received April 10, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7998. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Fairchild Aircraft, Inc. Models SA226–T, SA226–T(B), SA226–AT, and SA226–TC Airplanes [Docket No. 99–CE–15–AD; Amendment 39–11348; AD 99–21–05] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received April 10, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7999. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica, S.A. (EMBRAER), Model EMB–145 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99–NM–203–AD; Amendment 39–11655; AD 2000–07–01] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received April 10, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8000. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737–200, -200C, -300, and -400 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99–NM–84–AD; Amendment 39–11654; AD 2000–06–13] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received April 10, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8001. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model MD–11 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2000–NM–86–AD; Amendment 39–11656; AD 2000–07–02] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received April 10, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8002. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC–9, DC–9–80, and C–9 (Military) Series Airplanes; and Model MD–90 Airplanes [Docket No. 98–NM–147–AD; Amendment 39–11208; AD 99–13–13] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received April 10, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8003. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Robinson Helicopter Company Model R44 Helicopters [Docket No. 99–SW–08–AD; Amendment 39–11657; AD 2000–07–03] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received April 10, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8004. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Guidance for Developing TMDLs in California EPA Region

9—received April 13, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8005. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Withdrawl of Certain Federal Human Health and Aquatic Life Water Quality Criteria Applicable to Rhode Island, Vermont, the District of Columbia, Kansas and Idaho [FRL–6576–2] received April 7, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8006. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—EPA Review and Approval of State and Tribal Water Quality Standards [FRL–6571–7] (RIN: 2040–AD33) received April 5, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8007. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting the 38th Annual Report of the Federal Maritime Commission for fiscal year 1999, pursuant to 46 U.S.C. app. 1118; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8008. A letter from the Chairman, Bureau of Consumer Complaints and Licensing, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—In the Matter of a Single Individual Contemporaneously Acting as the Qualifying Individual for Both an Ocean Freight Forwarder and a Non-vessel-operating Common Carrier [Docket No. 99–23] received March 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8009. A letter from the Deputy Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting informational copy of a lease prospectus for FY 2001, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 606(a); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8010. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting an informational copy of the the lease prospectus for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Cleveland, OH, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 606(a); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8011. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a report on the Coast Guard's regulations concerning oils, including animal fats and vegetable oils, carry out the intent of the Edible Oil Regulatory Reform Act (P.L. 104–324) Section 1130 of the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 1996 (P.L. 104–324) directs the Secretary of Transportation to submit these annual reports; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8012. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a report entitled, ''Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act of 1994 (USERA) Annual Report to Congress For Fiscal Year 1999''; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

8013. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification of his determination that continuation of the waiver currently in effect for Vietnam will substantially promote the objectives of section 402 of the Trade Act of 1974, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2432(c) and (d); (H. Doc. No. 106—252); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

8014. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification of his determination that a continuation of a waiver currently in efect for the People's Republic of China will substantially promote the objectives of section 402, of the Trade Act of 1974, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2432(c) and (d); (H. Doc. No. 106—253); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

8015. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification of his determination that a continuation of a waiver currently in effect for the Republic of Belarus will substantially promote the objectives of section 402, of the Trade Act of 1974, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2432(c) and (d); (H. Doc. No. 106—254); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

8016. A letter from the Regulatory Policy Officer, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, transmitting the Bureau's final rule—Floor Stocks Tax for Cigarettes (99R–259P) [T.D. ATF–423] (RIN: 1512–AB95) received April 5, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8017. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Division, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, transmitting the Bureau's final rule—Yountville Viticultural Area (98R–28P) [TD ATF–410; RE: Notice No. 864] (RIN: 1512–AA07) received April 5, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8018. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Division, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, transmitting the Bureau's final rule—Chiles Valley Viticultural Area (96F–111) [TD ATF–408; Re: Notice No. 858] (RIN: 1512–AA07) received April 5, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8019. A letter from the Regulatory Policy Officer, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Increase in Tax on Tobacco Products and Cigarette Papers and Tubes [99R–88P] [T.D. ATF–420] (RIN: 1512–AB88) received April 5, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8020. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amended Regulation Concerning the Revocation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Orders [Docket No. 990521142–9252–02] (RIN: 0625–AA54) received April 6, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8021. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Charitable Split-Dollar Insurance Reporting Requirements [Notice 2000–24] received April 6, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8022. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Department Stores Indexes [Rev. Rul. 2000–21] received April 3, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8023. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the 1999 Report on the Analysis of the Impact on Welfare Recidivism of PRWORA Child Support Arrears Distribution Policy Changes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8024. A letter from the Regulations Officer, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Federal Old-Age, Survivors and Disability Insurance and Supplemental Security Income for the Aged, Blind, and Disabled; Determining Disability and Blindness; Classification of ''Age'' as a Vocational Factor [Regulations Nos. 4 and 16] (RIN: 0960–AE 96) received April 3, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8025. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a notification of the designation of operations in East Timor are expected to exceed $50 million; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and International Relations.

8026. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Presidential Determination 2000–19, the President has exercised the authority provided to him and has issued the required determination to waive certain restrictions on the maintenance of a Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) Office and on expenditure of PLO funds for a period of six months; jointly to the Committees on International Relations and Appropriations.

8027. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a Memorandum of Justification: Nonproliferation and Disarmament Fund (First Submission for FY 00); jointly to the Committees on International Relations and Appropriations.

8028. A letter from the President, U.S. Institute of Peace, transmitting the audit of the Institute's accounts for the fiscal year 1999 conducted by certified accountants from the firm of Ernst & Young, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 4611; jointly to the Committees on International Relations and Education and the Workforce.

8029. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting a listing of one property covered by the Coastal Barrier Improvement Act of 1990; jointly to the Committees on Resources and Banking and Financial Services.

8030. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a legislative proposal entitled, ''Coalfields Security Act of 2000''; jointly to the Committees on Resources and Ways and Means.

8031. A letter from the the Commissioners, the National Commission on Terrorism, transmitting a report entitled, ''Countering The Changing Threat Of International Terrorism,'' pursuant to Public Law 105—277; (H. Doc. No. 106—250); jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and International Relations, and ordered to be printed.

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:

[Pursuant to the order of the House on May 25, 2000 the following reports were filed on June 1, 2000]

Mr. LEWIS of California: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 4576. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes (Rept. 106–644). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PORTER: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 4577. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes (Rept. 106–645). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REGULA: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 4578. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes (Rept. 106–646). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

[The following action occurred on May 26, 2000]

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the Committee on Ways and Means discharged. H.R. 1070 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted June 6, 2000]

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 3605. A bill to establish the San Rafael Western Legacy District in the State of Utah, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 106–647). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 4435. A bill to clarify certain boundaries on the map relating to Unit NC01 of the Coastal Barrier Resources System (Rept. 106–648). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 3176. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study to determine ways of restoring the natural wetlands conditions in the Kealia Pond National Wildlife Refuge, Hawaii (Rept. 106–649). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 3535. A bill to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to eliminate the wasteful and unsportsmanlike practice of shark finning; with an amendment (Rept. 106–650). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ARCHER: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 8. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to phaseout the estate and gift taxes over a 10-year period; with an amendment (Rept. 106–651). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mrs. MYRICK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 514. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4576) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes (Rept. 106–652). Referred to the House Calendar.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 515. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4577) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes (Rept. 106–653). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 516. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3605) to establish the San Rafael Western Legacy District in the State of Utah, and for other purposes (Rept. 106–654). Referred to the House Calendar.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker:

[The following action occurred on May 26, 2000}

H.R. 984. Referral to the Committees on International Relations, Banking and Financial Services, the Judiciary, and Armed Services extended for a period ending not later than June 7, 2000.

H.R. 1656. Referral to the Committees on Commerce and Education and the Workforce extended for a period ending not later than June 7, 2000.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. HANSEN:

H.R. 4579. A bill to provide for the exchange of certain lands within the State of Utah; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER (for himself and Mr. WU):

H.R. 4580. A bill to provide further protections for the watershed of the Little Sandy River as part of the Bull Run Watershed Management Unit, Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. CHRISTENSEN (for herself, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. HILLIARD, Ms. CARSON, Mrs. CLAYTON, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. LEE, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. CLAY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WYNN, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FORD, Ms. MCKINNEY, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. DIXON, Mr. FATTAH, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, and Mr. WATT of North Carolina):

H.R. 4581. A bill to authorize the Homeward Bound Foundation to establish the Middle Passage National Monument; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. DEMINT (for himself, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE, Mr. COBURN, Mr. METCALF, Mr. SALMON, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. TANCREDO, and Mr. TOOMEY):

H.R. 4582. A bill to provide Internet access to congressional documents, including certain Congressional Research Service publications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HANSEN:

H.R. 4583. A bill to extend the authorization for the Air Force Memorial Foundation to establish a memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. LAFALCE:

H.R. 4584. A bill to require insured depository institutions to make affordable transaction accounts available to their customers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. LEACH:

H.R. 4585. A bill to strengthen consumers' control over the use and disclosure of their health information by financial institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. LUTHER, and Mr. EVANS):

H.R. 4586. A bill to amend the Consumer Product Safety Act and the Federal Hazardous Substances Act regarding repair, replacement, or refund actions, civil penalties, and criminal penalties under those Acts; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Ms. MCKINNEY:

H.R. 4587. A bill to authorize the Broadcasting Board of Governors to make available to the Institute for Media Development certain materials of the Voice of America; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 4588. A bill to amend the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act to include workers who were employed on Amchitka Island, Alaska, in the construction and maintenance of deep shafts for underground nuclear testing and various other military purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 4589. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to establish an eleventh region of the Environmental Protection Agency, comprised solely of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. GUTIERREZ (for himself, Mr. BACA, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. REYES, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD):

H.R. 4590. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to establish special procedures for the filing and consideration of asylum applications by alien children who are unaccompanied by a parent or guardian and for the detention of any alien children unaccompained by a parent or guardian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROHRABACHER:

H.J. Res. 99. A joint resolution disapproving the extension of the waiver authority contained in section 402(c) of the Trade Act of 1974 with respect to Vietnam; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROEMER:

H. Con. Res. 344. Concurrent resolution permitting the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony to present the Congressional Gold Medal to Father Theodore Hesburgh; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ROGAN:

H. Con. Res. 345. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding the need for cataloging and maintaining public memorials commemorating military conflicts of the United States and the service of individuals in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. WYNN:

H. Con. Res. 346. Concurrent resolution concerning the establishment of a permanent United Nations security force; to the Committee on International Relations.

MEMORIALS

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

317. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Kansas, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 5050 urging Congress to pass legislation allowing state-inspected meat and meat products to be shipped interstate and to pass legislation increasing the number of poultry to be slaughtered at home and offered for sale to the consumer; to the Committee on Agriculture.

318. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, relative to 1999 Senate Joint Resolution 13 memorializing Congress to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act to allow for the interstate shipment of state-inspected meat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

319. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 125 memorializing Congress to restore quality health care to active duty and retired military personnel and their families; to the Committee on Armed Services.

320. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Iowa, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 107 memorializing the United States Department of Defense, the United States Army, and the United States Congress to place production work at the Rock Island Arsenal, and to consider increased utilization of the Arsenal's facilities, so that the capabilities of the Rock Island Arsenal, and economic vitality of the surrounding region, may be utilized to the fullest extent

possible; to the Committee on Armed Services.

321. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 92 memorializing the United States Congress and the United States Department of the Army to select Fort Belvoir as the site of the United States Army Museum; to the Committee on Armed Services.

322. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 222 memorializing the United States Congress to increase funding for Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) and financial aid for middle income students; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

323. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Missouri, relative to Senate Resolution No. 1034 memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide the full forty-percent federal share of funding for special education programs so that Missouri and other states participating in these critical programs will not be required to take funding from other vital state and local programs in order to fund this underfunded federal mandate; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

324. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, relative to House Joint Resolution No. 10 memorializing the President and the Congress to authorize humanitarian assistance to the people of Taiwan and urging the President to seek public renunciation from China of any potential use of force by China against Taiwan; and affirming that Taiwan's future should be resolved peacefully; to the Committee on International Relations.

325. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution 1001 proposing amendments to the Constitution of Arizona; amending article X, sections 1 through 4, 7 and 10, Constitution of Arizona; amending article X, Constitution of Arizona, by adding sections 12, 13 and 14; Relating to State Lands; to the Committee on Resources.

326. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, relative to House Concurrent Memorial 2003 memorializing the President, the Secretary of the Interior and the Congress of the United States to take action to prevent the designation of any additional National Monuments or Forest Service roadless areas in this state without full public participation and an express act of Congress; to the Committee on Resources.

327. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, relative to House Joint Resolution 2001 denouncing the establishment of new national monuments in the State of Arizona without full public participation, consent and approval of local governments, the Arizona Legislature, the Governor and Congress; to the Committee on Resources.

328. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to Senate Joint Memorial No. 108 urging the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to enact federal legislation to provide full deductibility from federal income taxes of health insurance premiums for individuals, the self-employed and small groups; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

329. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 98 memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend that portion of the Trade Act of 1974 establishing the North American Free Trade Agreement Transitional Adjustment Assistance Program to extend the maximum time period for receipt of benefits from 52 weeks to 78 weeks; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

330. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 3 memorializing the United States Congress to immediately increase the tax-exempt private activity volume cap and the allocation of low-income housing tax credits available to Utah to levels that would fully restore the tax-exempt private activity bond volume cap purchasing power of the states to levels that would offset the diluted effects of inflation since 1987, and to index increases for these resources to inflation in future years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

331. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 35 memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact ''The Keep Our Promise to America's Military Retirees Act''; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Government Reform.

332. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Virginia, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 255 memorializing Congress to protect Virginia's dairy industry by approving the Southern Dairy Compact and ensuring that the federal Clean Water Act is implemented in a way that does not place an undue burden on farmers; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and Transportation and Infrastructure.

333. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, relative to Senate Joint Memorial No. 8017 memorializing the President of the United States and the Congress to provide federal assistance in ensuring pipeline safety; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Commerce.

334. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 109 memorializing the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to enact federal legislation to increase Medicare reimbursements to levels allowing providers to fully recover the actual costs of providing necessary health care services to Medicare eligible patients; jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Commerce.

335. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of New Hampshire, relative to Senate Resolution No. 14 memorializing the Congress of the United States to repeal the new 25 percent Weatherization Program match requirement scheduled to go into effect in 2001, which would place states like New Hampshire at potential risk of loss of all federal funding for this valuable program and to support increased funding for much-needed federal programs, so that states can best assist residents and businesses to decrease their fuel consumption and afford essential heating costs; jointly to the Committees on Commerce, International Relations, and Education and the Workforce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. FORD introduced a bill (H.R. 4591) to provide for the reliquidation of certain entries of steel wire rods; which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 8: Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 49: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 207: Mr. HOYER.

H.R. 220: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.

H.R. 229: Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. STARK.

H.R. 460: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. OWENS, Mr. CARDIN, and Ms. KILPATRICK.

H.R. 483: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 488: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 531: Mr. GUTKNECHT and Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 534: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HORN, and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 583: Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 632: Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. SAWYER, and Mr. SAXTON.

H.R. 742: Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 860: Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 1020: Mr. MASCARA, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. WYNN, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. WAMP, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. SAXTON, and Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 1053: Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. SABO, and Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 1080: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1179: Mr. NORWOOD.

H.R. 1216: Mr. RODRIGUEZ.

H.R. 1227: Mr. HILLIARD.

H.R. 1248: Mr. COYNE.

H.R. 1322: Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. OSE, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. COBLE, Mr. FORD, Mr. LEACH, Ms. DANNER, and Mr. JOHN.

H.R. 1382: Mr. SAXTON.

H.R. 1396: Mr. CROWLEY, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 1494: Mr. RILEY and Mr. THORNBERRY.

H.R. 1532: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H.R. 1623: Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky.

H.R. 1634: Mr. BAKER.

H.R. 1640: Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 1732: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 1795: Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. GUTKNECHT, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1871: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1914: Mr. NETHERCUTT.

H.R. 1926: Mrs. ROUKEMA.

H.R. 2129: Mr. WAMP, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. COOK, and Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 2298: Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 2341: Mr. WEXLER, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, MS. NORTON, Mr. NEAL of Masssachusetts, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. MCHUGH.

H.R. 2355: Mr. BORSKI.

H.R. 2451: Mr. JOHN.

H.R. 2485: Mr. SCHAFFER.

H.R. 2499: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 2512: Mr. LARSON.

H.R. 2528: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 2586: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 2631: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GOODE, and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 2697: Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 2733: Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 2739: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 2741: Mr. WYNN, Mr. LANTOS, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2790: Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. LEE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. WAMP, and Mr. STARK.

H.R. 2807: Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 2883: Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H.R. 2892: Mr. COYNE and Mr. WAMP.

H.R. 2909: Mr. CASTLE and Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 2919: Mr. KINGSTON.

H.R. 2966: Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 3006: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 3083: Ms. KILPATRICK.

H.R. 3102: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 3142: Mr. WYNN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. HILLIARD.

H.R. 3144: Mr. JOHN.

H.R. 3161: Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 3235: Mrs. TAUSCHER and Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 3294: Mr. SANDLIN.

H.R. 3301: Mr. COYNE, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. GILCHREST.

H.R. 3315: Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. STRICKLAND, and Mr. UNDERWOOD.

H.R. 3433: Mr. STARK, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. FORBES, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. GEJDENSON, and Mr. WEYGAND.

H.R. 3485: Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. FROST, and Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 3540: Mr. WELLER.

H.R. 3546: Mr. PICKETT, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 3576: Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. COMBEST.

H.R. 3580: Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Ms. CARSON, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. BERRY, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. DICKEY, and Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 3590: Mr. LEWIS of California.

H.R. 3609: Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 3634: Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. HOLT, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H.R. 3663: Mr. HUTCHINSON and Mr. HOYER.

H.R. 3677: Mr. SANFORD and Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 3688: Mr. HORN, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. GANSKE.

H.R. 3694: Mr. BAKER.

H.R. 3766: Mr. NADLER and Mr. SAXTON.

H.R. 3817: Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 3825: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 3826: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. FILNER, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. BACA, and Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 3836: Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 3896: Ms. STABENOW and Mr. WU.

H.R. 3918: Mr. BONILLA, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H.R. 4042: Mr. COOK and Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 4118: Mr. MENENDEZ.

H.R. 4149: Mr. ENGEL and Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 4176: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H.R. 4196: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.

H.R. 4206: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. SANDLIN.

H.R. 4209: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 4214: Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. SAXTON.

H.R. 4219: Mr. GOODLING, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. VISCLOSKY, and Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 4239: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. FORD, Mr. RUSH, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. WYNN, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. OLIVER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. NADLER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. FROST, Mr. DICKS, and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 4245: Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. SAXTON.

H.R. 4246: Mr. ANDREWS.

H.R. 4257: Mr. CALVERT and Mr. COMBEST.

H.R. 4259: Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. GILCHREST, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 4271: Mr. SALMON, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, and Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 4272: Mr. SALMON, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, and Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 4273: Mr. SALMON, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, and Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 4274: Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 4277: Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. PASTOR.

H.R. 4298: Mr. POMBO.

H.R. 4301: Mr. GORDON, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. EWING, and Ms. LEE.

H.R. 4320: Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. DICKS, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. DOYLE, and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 4328: Mr. FROST, Mr. FILNER, Mr. SNYDER, and Mr. GILCHREST.

H.R. 4329: Mr. FOLEY and Mr. MCNULTY.

H.R. 4334: Mr. WYNN and Mr. SAXTON.

H.R. 4357: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. LEE, Mr. NADLER, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Ms. NORTON, and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 4361: Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. KLINK, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. PETRI, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 4384: Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Ms. DANNER, Mr. WOLF, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. SPRATT, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. WAXMAN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. FROST, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. STUPAK, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. UPTON, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, and Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.

H.R. 4393: Mr. BILIRAKIS and Mr. WAMP.

H.R. 4395: Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 4442: Mr. GILCHREST and Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

H.R. 4453: Ms. NORTON, Mr. NADLER, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H.R. 4467: Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Ms. CARSON, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. LATHAM, and Mr. EDWARDS.

H.R. 4470: Mr. MATSUI, Mr. SHAW, and Mr. FOLEY.

H.R. 4471: Mr. SALMON, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. JOHN, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. KIND, and Mr. FORD.

H.R. 4483: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD and Mrs. THURMAN.

H.R. 4492: Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. LAHOOD, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. OWENS, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SWEENEY, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. WYNN, Mr. FROST, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H.R. 4537: Mr. TIAHRT.

H.R. 4539: Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey and Mr. ROGAN.

H.R. 4542: Mr. HOYER.

H.R. 4547: Mr. HOBSON.

H.R. 4549: Mr. HILLIARD.

H.R. 4560: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota and Mr. RADANOVICH.

H.R. 4567: Mr. WYNN, Mr. LARSON, Mr. PALLONE, MR. OWENS, and Ms. DELAURO.

H.J. Res. 56: Mr. ACKERMAN.

H. Con. Res. 238: Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.

H. Con. Res. 285: Mr. FOLEY and Mr. ANDREWS.

H. Con. Res. 306: Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. NADLER, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. LATOURETTE, and Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky.

H. Con. Res. 308: Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H. Con. Res. 332: Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H. Con. Res. 341: Mr. HOLT, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mrs. MALONEY of New York.

H. Con. Res. 343: Mr. FILNER, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. HILLIARD, and Mr. ENGEL.

H. Res. 37: Mr. BACA.

H. Res. 238: Mr. WYNN.

H. Res. 398: Mr. LARSON, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. LAZIO, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. COX, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DEUTSCH, and Mr. SHAYS.

H. Res. 461: Mr. HOYER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. NADLER, and Ms. MCKINNEY.

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. 4006: Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

86. The SPEAKER presented a petition of City of Cordova, relative to Resolution No. 04–00–17 supporting the Conservation and Reinvestment Act of 1999 H.R. 701 and S. 2123; jointly to the Committees on Agriculture, Resources, and the Budget.

87. Also, a petition of Kodiak Island Borough, relative to Resolution No. 2000–13 supporting the Conservation and Reinvestment Act of 1999 H.R. 701 and S. 2123; jointly to the Committees on Resources, Agriculture, and the Budget.

88. Also, a petition of Downers Grove Board of Park Commissioners, relative to Resolution No. 00–3 urging Congress to pass HR 701/S 2123 the Conservation Reinvestment Act (CARA) during its session in 2000; jointly to the Committees on Resources, Agriculture, and the Budget.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 3605

OFFERED BY: MR. HINCHEY

AMENDMENT NO. 1: At the end of the bill, add the following new title:

TITLE III—WILDERNESS

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''San Rafael Swell Region Wilderness Act of 2000''.

SEC. 302. DESIGNATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In furtherance of the purposes of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), certain public lands in Utah, comprising approximately 1,054,800 acres as generally depicted on a map entitled ''Proposed Wilderness within San Rafael Swell Region'' and dated March, 2000, and as specified in subsection (b) of this section, are hereby designated as wilderness and therefore as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System.

(b) WILDERNESS AREAS.—The areas designated as wilderness by subsection (a) are as follows:

(1) The lands identified as ''Sids Mountain'' and ''Eagle Canyon'' on the map referred to in subsection (a), comprising approximately 112,000 acres, which shall be known as ''Sids Mountain-Eagle Canyon Wilderness''.

(2) The lands identified as ''Mexican Mountain'' on the map referred to in subsection (a), comprising approximately 99,000 acres, which shall be known as ''Mexican Mountain Wilderness''.

(3) The lands identified as ''Muddy Creek'' on the map referred to in subsection (a), comprising approximately 235,000 acres, which shall be known as ''Muddy Creek Wilderness''.

(4) The lands identified as ''Wild Horse Mesa'' on the map referred to in subsection (a), comprising approximately 91,000 acres, which shall be known as ''Wild Horse Mesa Wilderness''.

(5) The lands identified as ''Factory Butte'' on the map referred to in subsection (a), comprising approximately 25,000 acres, which

shall be known as ''Factory Butte Wilderness''.

(6) The lands identified as ''Red Desert'' and ''Capital Reef Adjacent Units'' on the map referred to in subsection (a), comprising approximately 40,000 acres, which shall be known as ''Red Desert Wilderness''.

(7) The lands identified as ''Price River-Humbug'' on the map referred to in subsection (a), comprising approximately 99,000 acres, which shall be known as ''Price River-Humbug Wilderness''.

(8) The lands identified as ''Lost Spring Wash'' on the map referred to in subsection (a), comprising approximately 35,000 acres, which shall be known as ''Lost Spring Wash Wilderness''.

(9) The lands identified as ''Mussentuchit Badlands'' on the map referred to in subsection (a), comprising approximately 25,000 acres, which shall be known as the ''Mussentuchit Badlands Wilderness''.

(10) The lands identified as ''Rock Canyon'' on the map referred to in subsection (a), comprising approximately 17,000 acres, which shall be known as ''Rock Canyon Wilderness''.

(11) The lands identified as ''Molen Reef'' on the map referred to in subsection (a), comprising approximately 33,000 acres, which shall be known as ''Molen Reef Wilderness''.

(12) The lands identified as ''Limestone Cliffs'' on the map referred to in subsection (a), comprising approximately 24,000 acres, which shall be known as ''Limestone Cliffs Wilderness''.

(13) The lands identified as ''Jones Bench'' on the map referred to in subsection (a), comprising approximately 2,800 acres, which shall be known as ''Jones Bench Wilderness''.

(14) The lands identified as ''Hondu Country'' on the map referred to in subsection (a), comprising approximately 20,000 acres, which shall be known as ''Hondu Country Wilderness''.

(15) The lands identified as ''Devil's Canyon'' on the map referred to in subsection (a), comprising approximately 23,000 acres, which shall be known as ''Devil's Canyon Wilderness''.

(16) The lands identified as ''Upper Muddy Creek'' on the map referred to in subsection (a), comprising approximately 19,000 acres, which shall be known as ''Upper Muddy Creek Wilderness''.

(17) The lands identified as ''Cedar Mountain'' on the map referred to in subsection (a), comprising approximately 15,000 acres, which shall be known as ''Cedar Mountain Wilderness''.

(18) The lands identified as ''San Rafael Swell Reef'' on the map referred to in subsection (a), comprising approximately 105,000 acres, which shall be known as ''San Rafael Swell Reef Wilderness''.

SEC. 303. MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.

As soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this Act, a map and a legal description for each of the Wilderness Areas shall be filed by the Secretary with the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives. Each such map and legal description shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act, except that the Secretary, as appropriate, may correct clerical and typographical errors in such legal description and map. Such map and legal description for each such Wilderness Area shall be on file and available for public inspection in the offices of the Director and Utah State Director, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior.

SEC. 304. ADMINISTRATION OF WILDERNESS AREAS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to valid existing rights and to subsection (b), the Wilderness Areas shall be administered by the Secretary in accordance with the provisions of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), except that—

(1) any reference in such provisions to the effective date of the Wilderness Act is deemed to be a reference to the effective date of this Act; and

(2) any reference in such provisions to the Secretary of Agriculture is deemed to be a reference to the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) FURTHER ACQUISITIONS.—Any lands within the boundaries of any of the Wilderness Areas that are acquired by the United States after the date of the enactment of this Act shall become part of the relevant Wilderness Area and shall be managed in accordance with all the provisions of this Act and other laws applicable to such a Wilderness Area.

SEC. 305. NO BUFFER ZONES.

The Congress does not intend for the designation of the Wilderness Areas by this Act to lead to the creation of protective perimeters or buffer zones around any Wilderness Area. The fact that nonwilderness activities or uses can be seen or heard from areas within a Wilderness Area shall not, of itself, preclude such activities or uses up to the boundary of the Wilderness Area.

SEC. 306. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this title:

(1) PUBLIC LANDS.—The term ''public lands'' has the same meaning as that term has in section 103(e) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976.

(2) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(3) WILDERNESS AREA.—The term ''Wilderness Area'' or ''Wilderness Areas'' means one or more of the areas specified in section 302(b).

H.R. 3605

OFFERED BY: MR. HOLT

AMENDMENT NO. 2: Strike section 202(b) and insert the following:

(b) USES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall allow only such uses of the Conservation Area as the Secretary finds will further the purposes for which the Conservation Area is established.

(2) MOTORIZED VEHICLES.—Except where needed for administrative purposes or to respond to an emergency—

(A) no motorized vehicles shall be permitted in any wilderness study area or other roadless area within the Conservation Area; and

(B) use of motorized vehicles on other lands within the Conservation Area shall be permitted only on roads and trails designated for use of motorized vehicles as part of the management plan prepared pursuant to subsection (f).

H.R. 3605

OFFERED BY: MR. UDALL OF COLORADO

AMENDMENT NO. 3: In the last subsection of section 202 (relating to wilderness Acts), strike the final period and insert the following: '', and in order to maintain the options of Congress with regard to possible future designation of lands as wilderness, the public lands in the San Rafael area, comprising approximately 1,054,800 acres as generally depicted on a map entitled 'Wilderness Study Lands Within San Rafael Swell Region' and dated April, 2000, shall be administered by the Secretary in accordance with section 603(c) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, so as not to impair the suitability of such areas for preservation of wilderness until Congress determines otherwise.''.

H.R. 4461

OFFERED BY: MR. ANDREWS

AMENDMENT NO. 23: At the end of title VII of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 753. Section 502(h) of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1472(h)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(13) GUARANTEES FOR REFINANCING LOANS.—Upon the request of the borrower, the Secretary shall, to the extent provided in appropriation Acts, guarantee a loan that is made to refinance an existing loan that is made under this section or guaranteed under this subsection, and that the Secretary determines complies with the following requirements:

''(A) INTEREST RATE.—The refinancing loan shall have a rate of interest that is fixed over the term of the loan and does not exceed the interest rate of the loan being refinanced.

''(B) SECURITY.—The refinancing loan shall be secured by the same single-family residence as was the loan being refinanced, which shall be owned by the borrower and occupied by the borrower as the principal residence of the borrower.

''(C) AMOUNT.—The principal obligation under the refinancing loan shall not exceed an amount equal to the sum of the balance of the loan being refinanced and such closing costs as may be authorized by the Secretary, which shall include a discount not exceeding 2 basis points and an origination fee not exceeding such amount as the Secretary shall prescribe.

The provisions of the last sentence of paragraph (1) and paragraphs (2), (5), (6)(A), (7), and (9) shall apply to loans guaranteed under this subsection, and no other provisions of paragraphs (1) through (12) shall apply to such loans.''.

H.R. 4576

OFFERED BY: MR. DEFAZIO

AMENDMENT NO. 1: Page 2, line 15, insert ''(increased by $1,500,000)'' after the dollar amount.

Page 3, line 3, insert ''(increased by $197,500,000)'' after the dollar amount.

Page 3, line 15, insert ''(increased by $1,500,000)'' after the dollar amount.

Page 4, line 3, insert ''(increased by $45,000,000)'' after the dollar amount.

Page 8, line 22, insert ''(increased by $168,000,000)'' after the dollar amount.

Page 9, line 4, insert ''(increased by $68,000,000)'' after the dollar amount.

Page 9, line 14, insert ''(increased by $414,400,000)'' after the dollar amount.

Page 10, line 2, insert ''(increased by $34,100,000)'' after the dollar amount.

Page 28, line 15, insert ''(reduced by $930,000,000)'' after the dollar amount.

H.R. 4576

OFFERED BY: MR. DEFAZIO

AMENDMENT NO. 2: Page 28, line 15, insert ''(reduced by $930,000,000)'' after the dollar amount.

H.R. 4576

OFFERED BY: MR. DEFAZIO

AMENDMENT NO. 3: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. . None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to enter into a contract with an entity that has submitted information to the Secretary of Defense, pursuant to the Federal Acquisition Regulation, that the entity has, on a total of three or more occasions after the date of the enactment of this Act, either been convicted of, or had a civil judgment rendered against it for—

(1) commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a Federal, State, or local contract or subcontract;

(2) violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes relating to the submission of offers for contracts; or

(3) commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false statements, or receiving stolen property.

H.R. 4576

OFFERED BY: MR. DEFAZIO

AMENDMENT NO. 4: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. . None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to enter into a contract with an entity for which a total of 3 or more convictions or civil judgments are rendered (as determined using information available to the Secretary of Defense pursuant to the Federal Acquisition Regulation) after the date of the enactment of this Act for—

(1) commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a Federal, State, or local contract or subcontract;

(2) violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes relating to the submission of offers for contracts;

(3) commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false statements, or receiving stolen property; or

(4) commission of any other offense indicating a lack of business integrity or business honesty that seriously or directly affects the present responsibility of a Government contractor or subcontractor.

H.R. 4576

OFFERED BY: MR. DEFAZIO

AMENDMENT NO. 5: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. . None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to enter into a contract with an entity for which a conviction or civil judgment is rendered (as determined using information available to the Secretary of Defense pursuant to the Federal Acquisition Regulation) for—

(1) commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a Federal, State, or local contract or subcontract;

(2) violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes relating to the submission of offers for contracts;

(3) commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false statements, or receiving stolen property; or

(4) commission of any other offense indicating a lack of business integrity or business honesty that seriously or directly affects the present responsibility of a Government contractor or subcontractor.

H.R. 4576

OFFERED BY: MR. DICKS

AMENDMENT NO. 6: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. . Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

(1) from amounts made available for Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force in this Act and the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2000 (Public Law 106–79), an aggregate amount of $99,700,000 (less any proportional general reduction required by law and any reduction required for the Small Business Innovative Research program) shall be available only for the B–2 Link 16/Center Instrument Display/In-Flight Replanner program;

(2) the Secretary of the Air Force hereafter shall not be required to obligate funds for potential termination liability in connection with the B–2 Link 16/Center Instrument Display/In-Flight Replanner program; and

(3) if any Act hereafter appropriates an amount for the B–2 Link 16/Center Instrument Display/In-Flight Replanner program for fiscal year 2001 or fiscal year 2002, the Secretary of Defense shall make such amount available for obligation not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of such Act.

H.R. 4576

OFFERED BY: MR. HOSTETTLER

AMENDMENT NO. 7: At the end of title VIII (page 116, after line 22) insert the following new section:

SEC. . (a) PROHIBITION AGAINST USE OF FUNDS FOR CERTAIN PREFERENCE.—None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to give or withhold a preference to a marketer or vendor of firearms or ammunition based on whether the manufacturer or vendor is a party to a covered agreement.

(b) COVERED AGREEMENT DEFINED.—For purposes of this section, the term ''covered agreement'' means any agreement requiring a person engaged in a business licensed under chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to abide by a designated code of conduct, operating practice, or product design respecting importing, manufacturing, or dealing in firearms or ammunition.

H.R. 4576

OFFERED BY: MR. KUCINICH

AMENDMENT NO. 8: Page 33, line 5, insert ''(reduced by $174,024,000)'' after the dollar amount.

Page 35, lines 10 and 11, insert ''(increased by $174,024,000)'' after the dollar amount.

H.R. 4576

OFFERED BY: MR. KUCINICH

AMENDMENT NO. 9: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 8119. Of the amount provided in title IV for ''Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Defense-Wide'', not more than 1,566,214,000 shall be available for the National Missile Defense program.

(b) The amount provided in title IV for ''Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation, Defense-Wide'' is hereby reduced by $174,024,000.

H.R. 4576

OFFERED BY: MR. MARKEY

AMENDMENT NO. 10: At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 8119. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available in title III of this Act may be obligated or expended for procurement for the National Missile Defense program.

(b) The amount provided in title III for ''Procurement, Defense-Wide'' is hereby reduced by $74,530,000.

H.R. 4576

OFFERED BY: MR. SANDERS

AMENDMENT NO. 11: At the end of title VIII (page 116, after line 22) insert the following new section:

SEC. . GRANT TO SUPPORT RESEARCH ON EXPOSURE TO HAZARDOUS AGENTS AND MATERIALS BY MILITARY PERSONNEL WHO SERVED IN THE PERSIAN GULF WAR.

(a) GRANT TO SUPPORT ESTABLISHMENT OF RESEARCH FACILITY TO STUDY LOW-LEVEL CHEMICAL SENSITIVITIES.—Of the amounts made available in this Act for research, development, test, and evaluation, the Secretary of Defense shall make a grant in the amount of $1,650,000 to a medical research institution for the purpose of initial construction and equipping of a specialized environmental medical facility at that institution for the conduct of research into the possible health effect of exposure to low levels of hazardous chemicals, including chemical warfare agents and other substances and the individual susceptibility of humans to such exposure under environmentally controlled conditions, and for the conduct of such research, especially among persons who served on active duty in the Southwest Asia theater of operations during the Persian Gulf War. The grant shall be made in consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Health and Human Services. The institution to which the grant is to be made shall be selected through established acquisition procedures.

(b) SELECTION CRITERIA.—To be eligible to be selected for a grant under subsection (a), an institution must meet each of the following requirements:

(1) Be an academic medical center and be affiliated with, and in close proximity to, a Department of Defense medical and a Department of Veterans Affairs medical center.

(2) Enter into an agreement with the Secretary of Defense to ensure that research personnel of those affiliated medical facilities and other relevant Federal personnel may have access to the facility to carry out research.

(3) Have demonstrated potential or ability to ensure the participation of scientific personnel with expertise in research on possible chemical sensitivities to low-level exposure to hazardous chemicals and other substances.

(4) Have immediate access to sophisticated physiological imaging (including functional brain imaging) and other innovative research technology that could better define the possible health effects of low-level exposure to hazardous chemicals and other substances and lead to new therapies.

(c) PARTICIPATION BY THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.—The Secretary of Defense shall ensure that each element of the Department of Defense provides to the medical research institution that is awarded the grant under subsection (a) any information possessed by that element on hazardous agents and materials to which members of the Armed Forces may have been exposed as a result of service in Southwest Asia during the Persian Gulf War and on the effects upon humans of such exposure. To the extent available, the information provided shall include unit designations, locations, and times for those instances in which such exposure is alleged to have occurred.

(d) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—Not later than October 1, 2002, and annually thereafter for the period that research described in subsection (a) is being carried out at the facility constructed with the grant made under this section, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the results during the year preceding the report of the research and studies carried out under the grant.

H.R. 4577

OFFERED BY: MR. ANDREWS

AMENDMENT NO. 1: Page 84, after line 21, insert the following:

SEC. 518. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by title III of this Act may be used to prohibit a State vocational rehabilitation agency, for purposes of reimbursement for the agency under the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, from counting a blind or visually-impaired person as successfully rehabilitated under such Act if the person is placed in a noncompetitive or nonintegrated employment setting at the Federal minimum wage or higher.

H.R. 4577

OFFERED BY: MR. GARY MILLER OF CALIFORNIA

AMENDMENT NO. 2: Page 64, after line 6, insert the following:

SEC. 306. The amounts otherwise provided by this title are revised by decreasing the amount made available under the heading ''DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION—EDUCATION REFORM'' for ready to learn television, and by increasing the amount made available under the heading ''DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION—SPECIAL EDUCATION'' for grants to States, by $16,000,000.

H.R. 4577

OFFERED BY: MR. PAUL

AMENDMENT NO. 3: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. . None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to promulgate or adopt any final standard under section 1173(b) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1320d–2(b)).