United States of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 147 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, APRIL 24, 2001 No. 52

# House of Representatives

The House met at 2 p.m.

The Reverend Michael J. Cronin, student, the Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C., and priest, Diocese of Winona, Minnesota, offered the following prayer:

Almighty and eternal God, in Your great mercy, You have revealed Your glory to all the nations. Let the light of Your divine wisdom direct the deliberations of Congress and shine forth in all these proceedings and laws framed for our government. May those who serve in this body be enabled by Your powerful protection to discharge their duties with honesty and integrity. May they seek to preserve peace, promote national happiness, and continue to bring us the blessings of liberty and equality. May all people in this great land be preserved in union and peace and, after enjoying the blessings of this life, be admitted to those which are eternal. We pray to You, who are Lord and God, forever and ever. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

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

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

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. TRAFICANT led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

S. 700. An act to establish a Federal interagency task force for the purpose of coordinating actions to prevent the outbreak of bovine spongiform encephalopathy (commonly known as ''mad cow disease'') and foot-and-mouth disease in the United States.

S. Con. Res. 7. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should establish an international education policy to further national security, foreign policy, and economic competitiveness, promote mutual understanding and cooperation among nations, and for other purposes.

S. Con. Res. 23. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the involvement of the Government of Libya in the terrorist bombing of Pan Am Flight 103, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 83. Concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for the fiscal year 2002, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of the fiscal years 2003 through 2011.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the resolution (H. Con. Res. 83) ''Concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2002, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2011,'' requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints

Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. BOND, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. SARBANES, and Mrs. MURRAY, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 100–696, the Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, appoints the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE) as a member of the United States Capitol Preservation Commission.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 94–118, the Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, reappoints the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI) to the Japan-United States Friendship Commission.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 94–118, the Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, reappoints the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER) to the Japan-United States Friendship Commission.

## WELCOME TO REVEREND MICHAEL CRONIN

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, we are delighted to welcome the Reverend Michael Cronin today as our guest chaplain. Father Cronin was born and raised in Rochester, Minnesota, and graduated in 1988 from St. John's University in Collegeville. After graduation, Father Cronin came to Washington, D.C. to work as a staff assistant to my predecessor, Congressman Tim Penny.

In 1990, Father Cronin returned to Minnesota to begin his studies for the priesthood. Father Cronin was ordained in June of 1995 and went on to serve as assistant pastor at his home parish, the Church of St. Pius X in Rochester.

During this time, he also served as a chaplain and instructor at Lourdes High School. In 1998, Father Cronin was assigned to the Cathedral of the Sacred Heart in Winona, Minnesota, where he also served as chaplain at the Newman Center of Winona State University.



Printed on recycled paper.

Last year, Father Cronin began full-time studies in the Department of Canon Law at the Catholic University of America here in Washington, D.C. Upon completion, he hopes to return to the Diocese of Winona.

Permit me, Mr. Speaker, to thank Father Cronin for serving as our guest chaplain today and for his service to the young people of the First District of Minnesota.

## COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
*Washington, DC, April 9, 2001.*

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted to 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 April 9, 2001 at 9:43 a.m.

That the Senate PASSED without amendment H. Con. Res. 43.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

MARTHA MORRISON,
*Deputy Clerk of the House.*

## APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS TO UNITED STATES-CHINA SECURITY REVIEW COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 1238(b) of the Floyd D. Spence National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2001 (PL 106–398) and the order of the House of Wednesday, April 4, 2001, the Speaker on Thursday, April 5, 2001, appointed the following members on the part of the House to the United States-China Security Review Commission:

Mr. Stephen D. Bryen, Maryland;
Ms. June Teufel Dreyer, Florida; and
Mr. James R. Lilley, Maryland.

## COMMUNICATION FROM STAFF MEMBER OF THE HONORABLE JAMES A. LEACH, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Jill Rohret, district scheduler to the Honorable JAMES A. LEACH, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
*April 5, 2001.*

Hon. DENNIS J. HASTERT,
*Speaker, 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 subpoena for testimony issued by the District Court for Iowa, Johnson County.

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

Sincerely,

JILL ROHRET,
*District Scheduler.*

## COMMUNICATION FROM STAFF MEMBER OF THE HONORABLE JAMES A. LEACH, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Rachel Schrepferman, staff assistant to the Honorable JAMES A. LEACH, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
*April 6, 2001.*

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
*Speaker, 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 subpoena for testimony issued by the District Court for Iowa, Johnson County.

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

Sincerely,

RACHEL SCHREPFERMAN,
*Staff Assistant.*

## COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE BRAD SHERMAN, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable BRAD SHERMAN, Member of Congress:

BRAD SHERMAN,
*24th District, California, April 18, 2001.*

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
*Speaker, 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 civil subpoena for documents issued by the Municipal Court for Los Angeles County, California.

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

Sincerely,

BRAD SHERMAN,
*Member of Congress.*

## MILLIONAIRE'S TRIP TO SPACE STATION IS LATEST EXAMPLE OF RUSSIANS TAKING NASA'S MANAGEMENT TO CLEANERS

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today disappointed by the news that NASA has again acquiesced to inappropriate Russian demands to the Space Station program. Russia will be sending Dennis Tito, a 60-year-old American millionaire, as one of its contributions to this week's mission to the Space Station.

What unique characteristics does Mr. Tito possess that earned his place on this mission? Cold hard cash. $20 million of it from Mr. Tito to the Russians is all it took for a rocket-powered trip to the Space Station. Unfortunately, this partnership based on a core scientific mission apparently is now the next Club Med for those able to pony up millions of dollars to the Russian Government.

So how is it that the Russians, whose Station nonperformance cost the U.S. taxpayers at least 2 years' delay and over $5 billion in cost overruns, can brazenly increase the safety risk of the entire mission? They can because NASA's management did not provide the necessary safeguards earlier in this so-called partnership. NASA's forced acquiescence to Russia regarding Mr. Tito is just the latest example of the Russians taking NASA's management to the cleaners.

## AMERICA HAS BEEN BETRAYED BY JANET RENO AND FATCATS AT TOP, AND THERE HAS NOT EVEN BEEN AN INVESTIGATION

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, why does China really need our spy plane? Think about it. John Huang and James Riady and the Lippo Group, they already bought and sold all the secrets. What they did not buy and spy, the former administration gave it to them outright.

That is right. Let us tell it like it is. I believe America has been betrayed by Janet Reno and fatcats at the top, and there has not even been an investigation. Beam me up. If there is one good thing about all this, China is not going to learn anything because most of the equipment probably in that spy plane was made in China like everything else.

I yield back the fact that Congress should rescind and cancel permanent trade relations with China until China looks Uncle Sam in the eye and starts to get truthful.

## FURNITURE MARKET FACTS

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

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, High Point, North Carolina, is known far and wide as the furniture capital of the world. High Point is hosting this week the largest wholesale home furnishing show in the world, where approximately 80,000 industry professionals have come from 50 States and 110 countries to buy, sell, and discuss furniture.

The market was established in 1921 when 149 American companies organized their own show at a location central to the country's leading furniture manufacturers, and that is High Point, North Carolina.

We extend best wishes to those at High Point this week for a successful market and extend furthermore a cordial welcome for all to return to High Point in the fall, in October specifically, for the fall market.

## AMERICA NEEDS A REAL ENERGY POLICY

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to welcome all my colleagues back to Washington, D.C. It is obvious that spring is here and that summer is just around the corner; and soon no doubt air conditioners will be going full force and the energy crisis that has gripped the West will only get worse.

Nevadans are well aware of the energy crisis which has overcome one of our neighbors, California. First there were rolling blackouts, now massive rate hikes, up to 46 percent for some 10 million homes and businesses.

As Californians work to solve its energy problems, this Congress must address the energy crisis looming over our entire Nation. For too long the U.S. has operated without a responsible energy policy, and now Americans are beginning to pay the price. We need a responsible and reliable energy policy. Let us face it, Mr. Speaker, in the 21st century we expect the lights to go on and the air conditioning to work without fail. We must address the rolling blackouts, rate hikes, and consumer aggravation; and we must establish a real energy policy that meets the needs of modern America.

## TUBERCULOSIS IS SPREADING RAPIDLY THROUGH THE DEVELOPING WORLD

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the threat of tuberculosis is spreading rapidly throughout the developing world, and ultimately in this country.

TB is the greatest infectious killer of adults worldwide. More than one-third of African AIDS victims actually end up, in the end, dying from tuberculosis. 1,100 people a day are dying from tuberculosis in India. It kills 2 million people worldwide per year, one person every 15 seconds.

We have a very small window of opportunity, during which stopping TB would be very cost effective.

□ 1415

In the developing world, the cost can be as little as $20; $20 can save generally a pretty young life. If we wait or go too slowly, more drug-resistant TB will emerge. It costs billions to control with no guarantee of success. Drug-resistant TB is at least 100 times more expensive in developing countries, and is 100 times more expensive in the United States to cure than nondrug-resistant TB.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation to combat TB here and abroad. We have an opportunity to save millions of lives now and prevent millions of needless deaths, not just overseas, but ultimately in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to consider joining several dozen of us as cosponsors in our fight to eliminate tuberculosis.

## REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 641

Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 641.

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

There was no objection.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

## CONCERNING PARTICIPATION OF TAIWAN IN WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 428) concerning the participation of Taiwan in the World Health Organization, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 428

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

**SECTION 1. CONCERNING THE PARTICIPATION OF TAIWAN IN THE WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION (WHO).**

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Good health is a basic right for every citizen of the world and access to the highest standards of health information and services is necessary to help guarantee this right.

(2) Direct and unobstructed participation in international health cooperation forums and programs is therefore crucial for all parts of the world, especially with today's greater potential for the cross-border spread of various infectious diseases such as AIDS.

(3) Taiwan's population of 23,500,000 people is larger than that of ¾ of the member states already in the World Health Organization (WHO).

(4) Taiwan's achievements in the field of health are substantial, including one of the highest life expectancy levels in Asia, maternal and infant mortality rates comparable to those of western countries, the eradication of such infectious diseases as cholera, smallpox, and the plague, and the first to be rid of polio and to provide children with free hepatitis B vaccinations.

(5) The United States Centers for Disease Control and its Taiwan counterpart agencies have enjoyed close collaboration on a wide range of public health issues.

(6) In recent years Taiwan has expressed a willingness to assist financially and technically in international aid and health activities supported by the WHO.

(7) On January 14, 2001, an earthquake, registering between 7.6 and 7.9 on the Richter scale, struck El Salvador. In response, the Taiwanese government sent 2 rescue teams, consisting of 90 individuals specializing in firefighting, medicine, and civil engineering. The Taiwanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs also donated $200,000 in relief aid to the Salvadoran Government.

(8) The World Health Assembly has allowed observers to participate in the activities of the organization, including the Palestine Liberation Organization in 1974, the Order of Malta, and the Holy See in the early 1950's.

(9) The United States, in the 1994 Taiwan Policy Review, declared its intention to support Taiwan's participation in appropriate international organizations.

(10) Public Law 106–137 required the Secretary of State to submit a report to the Congress on efforts by the executive branch to support Taiwan's participation in international organizations, in particular the WHO.

(11) In light of all the benefits that Taiwan's participation in the WHO can bring to the state of health not only in Taiwan, but also regionally and globally, Taiwan and its 23,500,000 people should have appropriate and meaningful participation in the WHO.

(b) PLAN.—The Secretary of State shall initiate a United States plan to endorse and obtain observer status for Taiwan at the annual week-long summit of the World Health Assembly in May 2001 in Geneva, Switzerland, and shall instruct the United States delegation to Geneva to implement that plan.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 14 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall submit a written report to the Congress in unclassified form containing the plan required under subsection (b).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this legislation which would require the administration to initiate a plan to endorse and obtain observer status for Taiwan in the World Health Organization during the May 2001 World Health Assembly meeting in Geneva.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) for initiating this resolution. I would like to stress that nothing in this bill implies a change in this country's one China policy, which has been based for over 30 years on three communiques and the Taiwan Relations Act; but care should be taken not to arbitrarily exclude the 23 million people of Taiwan from appropriate economic and humanitarian venues.

This legislation recommends a symbolic step underscoring that where sovereignty is not in question, Taiwan ought to be brought into as many international organizations as possible. It already is a member of the Asian Development Bank, as well as APEC. In this context, WHO is a constructive

and thoughtful avenue for international participation by the government and people of Taiwan.

Mr. Speaker, disease and national disasters know no borders. Indeed, arguably the greatest international issue in the world today may be disease control, whether we are discussing the issue of HIV/AIDS, TB or other communicable diseases.

What the WHO issue symbolizes is a people-oriented concern for control of disease. Taiwan should not be excluded from such concern, and in fact has stepped forward to provide, in a number of instances, assistance and relief in other parts of the world, such as the recent earthquake circumstance in El Salvador.

Let me say this is a very modest step. It is a symbolic step, and it is a step towards achievement of observer status in a very appropriate humanitarian international organization. Other groups, such as the PLO and the Knights of Malta, have observer status at the World Health Assembly, and it would be very appropriate that Taiwan should accede to the same type of status.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) for yielding me this time and for his leadership and assistance on this issue.

On May 20 of last year, Chen Shuibian was sworn in as the President of Taiwan. This was a historic event, the first major transfer of power from one political party to a rival political party in Chinese or Taiwanese history. Mature democracies like ours take such political shifts for granted, but the peaceful exchange of power in many regions of the world is a rare legacy. Taiwan now shares in it.

Taiwan has evolved into a stable, prosperous nation governed by the rule of law. Taiwan's 40-year journey toward democracy is a success story, one which we should celebrate, one which we should acknowledge, and we should reward that process.

Mr. Speaker, to that end I introduced H.R. 428 requiring the State Department to initiate a plan to endorse and obtain observer status for Taiwan in this year's World Health Assembly. Ninety-two colleagues have joined in cosponsoring this bill. Fostering Taiwan's participation in the World Health Assembly is a modest step, but a meaningful one. Observer status in the World Health Organization does not require statehood. As the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) said, the Knights of Malta, the Palestinian Liberal Organization, the Vatican, and Rotary International all share observer status at the WHO.

Mr. Speaker, passing this bill will be a significant victory for every Taiwanese citizen, and for every American who cares about human rights. Children and families suffer from the effects of inadequate health care, whether they live in Washington or Geneva or Taipei or Beijing. With the high frequency of international travel and the increase in international trade, the risk of transmitting infectious diseases such as malaria and tuberculosis and AIDS within and across national borders is greater than ever.

Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago Taiwan suffered an outbreak of enterovirus 71, a potentially fatal disease that causes severe inflammation of muscles surrounding the brain, heart and spinal cord. Infants and children are particularly vulnerable to this highly contagious virus. Unfortunately, the Taiwanese doctors treating this virus did not have access to the medical resources because they do not have observer status at WHO. By the time the outbreak was under control, 70 Taiwanese children had died.

Mr. Speaker, had Taiwan been permitted to draw on WHO expertise, these children might still be alive. The fact that Taiwan remains handicapped in its effort to combat global illness is a tragedy. The fact that Taiwan remains handicapped in its efforts to save children is a crime, in some sense, in which we are all implicated. Our government's tacit support for the status quo, our unwillingness to fight for Taiwan's participation in the World Health Organization is not only shortsighted, it is unjustifiable.

Infectious diseases do not respect politically driven distinctions or politically drawn national borders. Infectious diseases travel. If there is TB in Taiwan, there will more likely be TB in the United States. If there is AIDS in South Africa, there will be, inevitably be, AIDS in Western Europe. Global illnesses are just that: Global. No country is immune when one country faces a health crisis.

This week, the administration decided to sell four KIDD Class destroyers to Taiwan, despite threats from China. If our commitment to Taiwan is strong enough to justify supporting its military defense, it is certainly strong enough to justify supporting access to global health resources for Taiwan's 23.5 million people.

Mr. Speaker, Taiwan is a country with a strong medical community. They have good scientific research, have a good public health community; and with their participation in WHO, they will contribute to the WHO as WHO information contributes to Taiwan.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the strong support that H.R. 428 has received from both sides of the aisle, and I look forward to the bill's passage today.

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

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. SNYDER), who is a physician and has practiced medicine around the world.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution, and agree with the intent of the sponsors in bringing it forward today.

As a family doctor who has worked in medicine in several different nations, including Africa and Asia, I know that health problems and disease do not wait for political divisions to be solved or for political problems to be overcome. Ten days ago during this recess, I visited Sierra Leone and Guinea. I had worked in Sierra Leone for 6 months in 1983 and 1984. For the last 10 years, there has been a civil war going on in Sierra Leone which is now going across the border into Guinea. I was helicoptered to the site of the hospital I worked at 10 years ago. The hospital had been burned to the ground several years ago by the rebels. Some of the villagers that were there told me that there were a number of people killed by the RUF, this rebel force, when they destroyed the hospital.

Mr. Speaker, why am I bringing up this issue on this resolution with Taiwan; because the rebels in Sierra Leone have been supported by Charles Taylor, the leader of Liberia. And Taiwan, unfortunately, contrary to every nation in the world, has been developing closer ties over this last decade with Charles Taylor in Liberia. The Taiwanese government has been very clear it is because Charles Taylor has expressed support for Taiwan in their efforts to be included in the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, while the United States has been supportive of Taiwan, I hope that the government of Taiwan will be sensitive to the international community's efforts to end support for these rebels in Sierra Leone. From press reports, Taiwanese government officials have been quoted as praising Charles Taylor for promoting peace and dialogue in West Africa. Charles Taylor has not been promoting peace and dialogue, he has been promoting violence and a brutal civil war; and I encourage our friends in Taiwan to be a part of the international community, just like they want to be a part of the WHO and end their developing relationship with Charles Taylor.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) who has fought for justice around the world.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to actually commend all of those who are sponsors of this bill. As a matter of fact, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and others have understood the tremendous developments that are taking place in Taiwan.

Mr. Speaker, I recently had the good fortune to be in Taiwan and meet with health officials, and they have developed serious movement towards high quality health care and health services. As a matter of fact, there is much that other countries could, in fact, learn from what they have been able to do; and so I would join with those who urge

that they be provided opportunity to enter into the dialogue at the World Health Organization in all of its actions and interactions so that not only will they benefit, but so that the rest of the world can benefit from what they have learned and what they are doing.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the legislation before us, H.R. 428, which calls for Taiwan's participation in the World Health Organization (WHO). To facilitate this important goal, the measure requires the Secretary of State to undertake efforts to endorse and obtain observer status for Taiwan at next month's summit meeting in Geneva of the World Health Assembly, and for the Secretary to submit the plan of action to Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the author of the legislation, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio, Mr. SHERROD BROWN, for his leadership on this issue. I further commend the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. HYDE, the Chairman of the House International Relations Committee, and the Committee's Ranking Democrat, the gentleman from California, Mr. LANTOS, for bringing this matter to the floor. I am proud to join my colleagues as a co-sponsor of this bipartisan legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the World Health Organization (WHO) is the preeminent international health organization on the planet. In its charter, the WHO sets forth the crucial objective of attaining the highest possible level of health for all people, yet today the 23 million citizens of Taiwan are still denied appropriate and meaningful participation in the international health forums and programs conducted by the WHO. This is simply wrong and inexcusable, Mr. Speaker, and Congress has spoken out in the past that this should be corrected.

Access to the World Health Organization ensures that the highest standards of health information and services are provided, facilitating the eradication of disease and improvement of public health worldwide. The work of the WHO is particularly crucial today given the tremendous volume of international travel, which has heightened the transmission of communicable diseases between borders.

With over 190 participants in the World Health Organization, it is a travesty that Taiwan is not permitted to receive WHO benefits, especially when you consider Taiwan's 23 million citizens outnumber the population of three-fourths of the WHO's member states. This lack of access to WHO protections has caused the good people of Taiwan to suffer needlessly, such as in 1998 when a deadly, yet preventable, virus killed 70 Taiwanese children and infected more than 1,100 others.

Mr. Speaker, there is no good nor valid reason why Taiwan should be denied observer status with the World Health Organization. As a strong democracy and one of the world's most robust economies, Taiwan rightfully should participate in the health services and medical protections offered by the WHO. Conversely, the WHO stands to benefit significantly from the financial and technological contributions that Taiwan has offered many times in the past.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge our colleagues to adopt this worthy and important legislation.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the initiative by the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. BROWN, concerning Taiwan's participation in the World Health Organization. I comment our Distinguished Chairman Mr. HYDE and our ranking Minority Member, Mr. LANTOS and the Subcommittee Chairmen and Ranking Minority Members of the International Operations and Human Rights and East Asia and the Pacific for crafting and bringing this resolution to the Floor at this time.

As Secretary Powell noted in testimony before our Committee, there should be ways for Taiwan to enjoy the full benefits of participation in international organizations without being a member. H.R. 428 only calls for the Secretary of State to initiate a U.S. plan to endorse and obtain observer status at the World Health Organization (WHO) for Taiwan.

In recent years Taiwan has expressed a willingness to assist financially and technically in international aid and health activities supported by the WHO, but has not been able to render such assistance because Taiwan is not a member of the WHO.

The WHO has allowed observers to participate in the activities of the organization, including the Palestinian Liberation Organization, the Knights of Malta, and the Vatican.

Along with many of my colleagues, I am extremely disappointed that Taiwan is not a full member of the UN and all international organizations that its democratically led government wishes to join. Although this resolution does not absolutely address this concern it is nevertheless a first step in addressing the problem that confronts Taiwan.

Accordingly I strongly support H.R. 428.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 428, a bill concerning Taiwan and the World Health Organization (WHO), and commend Representative BROWN for his work on this issue. H.R. 428 would recognize that Taiwan and its 21 million people deserve an appropriate role in the WHO.

There are three things the bill seeks to promote. First, H.R. 428 puts the U.S. Congress on record, again, as strongly supporting Taiwan's request to play a more active role in international organizations. This support reflects the results of the 1994 Taiwan Policy Review conducted by the Clinton Administration which declared its intention to support Taiwan's participation in international organizations and to make every effort to make sure that this important goal is accomplished.

Second, this legislation will move Taiwan toward membership in the WHO. Such membership could benefit Taiwan tremendously. For example, in 1998, the WHO was unable to assist Taiwan with an outbreak of a virus that killed 70 children and infected 1,100 more. WHO membership could have prevented needless deaths and sickness.

Third, the WHO could benefit enormously from Taiwan's more active participation in the WHO. Taiwan has made tremendous achievements in the field of health, and the WHO should have full access to Taiwan's technical and financial assistance.

Mr. Speaker, the bill requires the State Department to initiate a plan to endorse and obtain observer status for Taiwan at the annual summit of the World Health Assembly, next month in Geneva. I believe that this is an appropriate step for the United States to take in support Taiwan's participation in international organizations.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, this bill is a step in the right direction. It requires the Secretary of State to endorse and to work to obtain observer status for Taiwan in the World Health Organization.

The 24 million people of Taiwan are building a thriving Democracy.

It's the policy of the United States to support Taiwan's participation in International Organizations.

To lead the Free World, we must act on our responsibility by standing up for democracy and our democratic allies.

Taiwan is an island of freedom, but it is surrounded by the constant threat of Communist oppression from Mainland China.

Taiwan's participation in world organizations deserves recognition. They are one of our largest trading partners and they are a free and democratic nation that has recently undertaken a free, peaceful, democratic transition of power.

If we are going to support international organizations, we can't deny admission to free, democratic societies, with populations and economies that are larger than three quarters of the other participating nations. That would be unfair and it would constitute an abdication of American leadership.

Taiwan is a symbol of freedom and opportunity for the billion and a half Chinese held captive under communist rule.

Democracy, and the support for human rights that goes with it, is spreading throughout the world—we should reward and encourage it at every possible opportunity.

We should stand by our friends. We should stand up for freedom and democracy. We should never waver on matters of fundamental principle. And that means we must stand with Taiwan.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 428, which states that Taiwan should have appropriate and meaningful participation in the World Health Organization (WHO). The legislation also requires the State Department to initiate a U.S. plan to endorse and obtain observer status for Taiwan at the annual summit of the World Health Assembly in May 2001 in Geneva. In particular, I would like to commend Representative SHERROD BROWN for his leadership on this issue.

In the 1994 Taiwan Policy Review Act, the U.S. declared its intention to support Taiwan's participation in international organizations. We should abide by our intentions and support Taiwan's participation at the WHO.

The WHO is an organization dedicated to preventing the spread of disease and coordinating efforts on international health work. In a time when resources to fight global infectious diseases are scarce, we should encourage assistance and coordination from all sources. The global efforts to save lives should not take a back seat to China's global campaign against Taiwan.

Taiwan should be able to benefit from and contribute to the work of the WHO. As an official observer, Taiwan would assist in preventing the spread of global diseases. Taiwan's achievements in health are substantial, including high life expectancy levels and low maternal and infant mortality rates compared to other developed countries. Taiwan could assist both financially and technically in international aid and health activities benefiting people all over the world. Unfortunately, Taiwan has been unable to render such assistance through the WHO because it is not able to participate.

Taiwan's WHO entry is clearly being held hostage to the Chinese government. Last year, Beijing successfully blocked Taiwan's observer status in the World Health Organization. China led nine other nations—including Cuba and Pakistan in striking down Taiwan's motion "due to international political realities and China's objections." It is time for the U.S. to honor its commitments and support the right of 21 million Taiwanese people to assist and benefit from WHO participation.

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

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

I would just like to conclude by again congratulating the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) for this fine resolution.

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 Iowa (Mr. LEACH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 428, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. 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. 428.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1430

## URGING THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO SUPPORT EVENTS SUCH AS THE "INCREASE THE PEACE DAY"

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 113) urging the House of Representatives to support events such as the "Increase the Peace Day."

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 113

Whereas in order to promote non-violence, respect and responsibility, the students of Challenger Middle School in Lake Los Angeles, California, in conjunction with the Museum of Tolerance in Los Angeles, hold each year an "Increase the Peace Day" program on April 20; and

Whereas as part of the program, students signed the following pledge:

"I will honor the memory of the victims of school violence by committing myself to finding a peaceful solution to my own conflicts with others.

"I will not hit another person for any reason.

"I will not threaten another person, even as a joke.

"I will report all rumors of violence to the nearest adult and to all adults who will listen to me.

"I will smile at students I don't know when I make eye contact.

"I will talk to my parents about what takes place in school.

"I will remind myself and others that the diversity of the United States is one of our main strengths.

"I will be aware that I have choices in life and that I am responsible for my own actions.

"I will be considerate of other people and their feelings.

"I will not spread rumors.

"I will not call other people names that are hurtful to them.

"I will help make the world a better place one smile at a time.

"I will ask for help when I am confused or lonely.

"I will make others aware of these pledges in order to spread this message of peace.

"I will take the responsibility as a citizen of this great nation to make our country a more peaceful place by doing my own part to Increase the Peace.": Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives urges schools across the United States to participate in similar "Increase the Peace Day" events.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SOLIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 113.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to support H. Res. 113, which is an important resolution that urges the House of Representatives to support "Increase the Peace Day" events throughout the country.

Just last Friday, on April 20, students, teachers, parents and community leaders from the Antelope Valley in my congressional district held an "Increase the Peace Day." This was the second "Increase the Peace Day" and coincides with the anniversary of the Columbine High School tragedy. The program featured the formation of a human peace sign, presentations by representatives of the Simon Wiesenthal Center's Museum of Tolerance and the granting of "Increase the Peace" awards to youths who have prevented violence at their schools. One of the highlights of the day was when the students signed an "Increase the Peace" pledge, outlining how they could avoid similar acts of violence on their campuses.

Among the promises in the pledge were to find a peaceful solution to conflicts, to not hit another person, to not threaten another person, to report all rumors of violence to an adult, to celebrate diversity, and to seek help when feeling lonely or confused. I was proud to join the other supporters of "Increase the Peace Day" and be a part of this incredible event.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to recognize the outstanding efforts of teacher Bruce Galler at Challenger Middle School, who came up with the original idea for "Increase the Peace Day" because he believes that something can and should be done. Bruce uses a quote by Edward Everett Hale on literature to promote the event, and I believe it illustrates what was accomplished on "Increase the Peace Day." The quote is as follows: "I am only one, but I am one. I cannot do everything, but I can do something. I will not let what I cannot do interfere with what I can do."

At the first "Increase the Peace Day" last year, I promised to introduce a resolution in order to show that as one Member of Congress, I can do something to highlight this important event, to encourage all Americans to reject anger and hate, and to instead promote peace and community.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate Bruce and his students for hosting last week's events. The first event that they held last year was at Challenger Middle School and included the students from Challenger. This year they expanded it to include the whole community, and students were bused from many schools around the area. It was an exciting event.

At the end of the event, when the different resolutions had been presented, the students all came onto the field and formed this large peace symbol, and we had a helicopter from the local Marine base that flew over and took pictures of the event. It was exciting and a great thing to be part of.

It was wonderful to see what the youth did do of a positive nature. We hear so often of the negative things and we do not hear of the positive events, and there are many great wonderful, positive events happening around this country.

In closing, I urge all of my colleagues to support this resolution and to encourage their own local communities to institute a similar program.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON).

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about a subject close to my heart, and that is promoting tolerance and diversity. I commend the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) for introducing House Resolution 113, which urges us to recognize events such as

''Increase the Peace Day,'' which promotes the kind and thoughtful treatment of all people.

As adults, we have a responsibility to show our children the importance of compassion and tolerance. It is up to us to set an example for all of our young people to show them how to consider other people's feelings and how to be respectful of different points of view. We must take time to listen to our children and teach them to appreciate those who are different from us. Our children must learn that there is strength in diversity.

My home State of California and my congressional district are incredibly diverse, and I am proud to say that, where we have many Hispanic Americans, we have Asian Americans, and different people from all walks of life. Over 72 different languages are spoken and taught within our schools there. I cannot imagine Los Angeles or California without the incredible mix of people and backgrounds that we have. The State just would not be the same.

In addition to embracing our diversity, we must also teach our children how to solve conflicts peacefully. In a country as diverse as ours, there are bound to be differences of opinion. It is important that we teach young people how to express those differences without violence.

Many schools are already working to promote the benefits of diversity and the importance of peaceful conflict resolution. We know this is necessary because so many children across America dread going to school because of the harsh social pressures that they face simply by being themselves. Some students cannot talk to others for fear of being chastised by their peers. They feel embarrassed if they do not have the right clothes on or right colors or right shoes. If parents and schools work together, we can help young people feel good about themselves and show compassion for others.

A simple smile, a warm greeting, open communication, these are the things that help us live together peacefully. We must educate our parents about the importance of communicating one-on-one with their children, setting a good example, and promoting tolerance. Programs which help parents communicate with their children will truly be a good step in the right direction.

In Los Angeles, we have seen the tragedy of violent crimes committed against people simply because of the color of their skin. It is my hope that conflict resolution and parental involvement will help prevent this sort of tragedy in the future. If we can teach people when they are still young to embrace diversity and resolve their differences peacefully, we will increase our Nation's strength and unity.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to also support this resolution and support events like ''Increase the Peace Day.''

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

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from California for yielding me this time. I also want to commend the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) for introducing this resolution.

It seems to me that this resolution is an indication that we can, in fact, learn behavior. I have always been told that people have a tendency to learn what they live and live what they learn, and if we begin to focus seriously on conflict resolution, on the development of peaceful approaches to finding solutions to problems that people might have, then I think we can seriously reduce violence, and I think we can create for ourselves a saner, better world in which to live.

So I want to commend the University of Illinois for its violence prevention efforts and programs, the Chicago public school system, and also Prevention Partnership, a local community organization, and a program called Hands Without Guns, where children are taught that there are other things that they can do with their hands than put a gun in them. If one always has something else in one's hands, then, of course, there is no room for a gun.

So I commend all of those, once again, who would promote this approach to curbing violence in our society.

Mr. Speaker, I urge strong support for the resolution.

Ms. SOLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would just conclude by also providing my support and urging other Members to support this House resolution.

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

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues for their comments and for their support on this issue. I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 113.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 5 p.m.

□ 1700

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS) at 5 p.m.

## APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H. CON. RES. 83, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2002

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 83) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2002, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2011, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. SPRATT

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SPRATT moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 83 be instructed, within the scope of the conference:

(1) to increase the funding for education in the House resolution to provide for the maximum feasible funding;

(2) to provide that the costs of coverage for prescription drugs under Medicare not be taken from the surplus of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund;

(3) to increase the funding provided for Medicare prescription drug coverage to the level set by the Senate amendment; and

(4) to insist that the on-budget surplus set forth in the resolution for any fiscal year not be less than the surplus of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund for that fiscal year.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under rule XXII, the proponent of the motion and a member of the other party each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to explain the motion.

Mr. Speaker, this motion has four purposes. First of all, it says to the conferees on the budget resolution, go as close as they can to what the Senate provided for education.

Basically, the House resolution endorses and puts forth the President's budget. The President's budget provides an increase in education next year, fiscal year 2002, of 5.8 percent. That is an increase, but it pales in comparison with last year where the increase was 18 percent and the last 5 years over which the increase in education has averaged 13 percent.

The Senate, given a choice, a choice we did not have here on the House

floor, between a higher tax cut and less for education, opted to do more for education on four different occasions. As a consequence, their plus-up for education over and above the President's baseline budget is nearly $300 billion. We are simply saying go as far as they feasibly can toward the Senate on education.

Secondly, with respect to Medicare, and in particular with respect to Medicare prescription drugs, the President's proposal again was to put $147 billion out for the next 10 years to provide for a temporary helping-hand benefit and eventually to have some kind of benefit possibly integrated with Medicare. Over 10 years the amount he provided for this purpose was $147 billion, but when that proposal came from the House and to the Senate, Members in both bodies said it is totally unrealistic. It will not even get Medicare prescription drugs off the ground.

The Senate, once again, had a choice. They had an amendment on the Senate floor. The Senate plussed-up its allocation for Medicare prescription drugs to $300 billion, a minimum amount that is realistic to provide for a decent benefit.

We say go to the Senate, be realistic, be faithful to their commitments about providing prescription drug coverage under Medicare; provide the full amount that the Senate allocates in its budget resolution.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, we say with respect to funding that new benefit, this money should not come out of the Medicare part A trust fund. It is already obligated, over-obligated, scheduled to run short of funds in the second decade of this century. Rather than putting another obligation on funds that are already short and over-obligated, we think that the funding for the Medicare prescription drug benefit should come from the general fund of the Treasury and not from the hospital insurance trust fund of Medicare.

That is what this budget resolution provides. Take the money out of the general fund to pay for Medicare prescription benefits so that the HI trust fund is not made insolvent any sooner.

Finally, we say as to the HI trust fund, the hospital insurance trust fund generally, protect it. Go to the language that we passed here on the House floor, where we said that Medicare should be treated just the same as the Social Security surpluses; that is to say, it will be used only for benefits provided under those two programs, and in the meantime to buy up outstanding debt in which the trust fund surpluses will be invested.

This is not an idle concern. The President's budget came to us claiming that it had unprecedented reserve funds or contingency funds. In one place it says it is providing a contingency fund of a $1.2 trillion. Towards the end, that contingency fund is whittled down to $842 billion. When one looks more closely at the $842 billion, they find that of that amount $526 billion comes from the consolidation of what is left over with what is in the surplus, the surplus accumulating and the HI trust fund. Those two numbers add up to $842 billion.

□ 1715

We say that the contingency fund should not include the Medicare trust funds. In keeping with the resolution that this House passed by an overwhelming margin, that money should be confined exclusively to Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, these are the four principles that we raise in our motion to the conferees.

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

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition and yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, it is good to have the opportunity to discuss some of the budget issues with the gentleman from South Carolina. I would have thought over the last couple of weeks some issues would have resolved themselves, but we find ourselves debating some of the same issues that we were debating prior to the Easter recess. It is good to engage in these discussions again.

Mr. Speaker, I would say that the gentleman's motion to instruct conferees to some extent is asking for the second bite of the apple. What could not be won on the floor as an alternative is being requested as a motion to instruct. I have to reluctantly oppose the instruction. Most are noncontroversial. Certainly motions to conferees are nonbinding on the conferees themselves. It gives an opportunity for Members to make a few points that they would like to make, and I certainly respect that opportunity; but let us go through the motion to instruct conferees.

First, to increase the funding for education in the House resolution to provide for maximum feasible funding. I do not think that there is much controversy there. If Members of Congress had the opportunity to hold meetings such as I did, for example I held a youth summit in Dubuque, Iowa, to talk about education and met with special educators, people involved in special education, people involved in college education and higher education, early childhood education, reading, teacher training, administrators, principals, they all tell us anything we can do to improve education in this country is something that we should go back to Washington and get working on. Certainly one of the areas where we can help in education is to increase funding. That is why we made those increases, 11 percent; and we will hold to those. We will cheerfully continue to support those major increases in funding for education.

Mr. Speaker, certainly people say we can do more. I might add in that chorus. While we added $1.25 billion in special education in this resolution, I personally, as well as professionally, know we should do more; but this fits within a balanced budget and a balanced approach towards making sure that our kids have the best education possible.

Number two says to provide that the cost of coverage for prescription drugs under Medicare not be taken from the surplus in Medicare.

What we are saying is even though we collect taxes to provide for a Medicare benefit, you cannot use those tax dollars to either modernize Medicare or provide a prescription drug benefit. I do not think I understand.

We ask the American people for their hard-earned money to pay for a Medicare benefit; and then we say even though there are some obvious reforms, we cannot use the surplus to reform Medicare or modernize Medicare or provide a prescription drug benefit, we have to find money elsewhere, which is a little bit suspicious because we know our friends on the other side do not support tax relief, and it is probably a juxtaposition of tax relief versus Medicare benefits when all of us know that we can provide those benefits from the surplus in Medicare as well as possibly adding additional funds as necessary.

It does not all have to come from the HI Trust Fund. We have made that very clear within our budget. We certainly do believe and we all voted on that as I believe one of the first resolutions of this year that we were going to lock away that money for Medicare and allow it for modernization and for adding the prescription drug benefits. So number two flies in the face of what the House has already done.

On three, it says to increase the funding provided for Medicare prescription drug benefit to the amount set by the Senate. I am not going to presuppose or prenegotiate this item today, but I think that is probably something that is at least a reasonable request. I think we had that debate on the floor here. While the President's proposal was 153, it probably is going to be scored slightly more than that; and, therefore, we may have to make an adjustment there. So number three is not that controversial.

Number four says to insist that the on-budget surplus set forth in the resolution for any fiscal year not be less than the surplus of the HI Trust Fund for that fiscal year. I think again this goes back to number two. What this is basically saying is that we are presupposing that you cannot use the trust fund that we collect the taxes from for Medicare in order to modernize or provide a prescription drug benefit for Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, two and four are really the controversy. One and three, I think, are easily supported or at least certainly not controversial on both sides.

Mr. Speaker, I would oppose the instruction for those two reasons. We should be able to, as we have already voted almost unanimously in this House in a bipartisan way, be able to provide the surplus from Medicare to

provide a prescription drug benefit as well as to modernize Medicare. Those funds should be available. Since they are paid for Medicare, they should be allowed to modernize Medicare and improve Medicare and provide a prescription drug benefit for Medicare.

Therefore, I believe it would not be a good idea for us to instruct our conferees just now appointed to hold that kind of position as we begin our negotiations with the Senate.

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, just in response, what we are trying to do here is make a decision as to which is better. The Senate had a choice. They could do more for tax cuts and less for education, or more for education and less for tax cuts. They decided to do substantially more for education. By the same token, they decided to adequately fund a Medicare prescription drug benefit.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN) to talk about double counting and overobligation of the Medicare Trust Fund.

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

Mr. Speaker, like my colleagues, and in particular the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, I just returned from my district where I had a number of town meetings with my constituents. We talked about the budget, and we talked about the budget not just being a 1-year budget, but the decisions we might make this year would have implications far beyond the next fiscal year, implications far beyond the next 10 fiscal years.

What we are saying with respect to the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund, the Medicare Trust Fund, is it is not so simple that we can take that money today and spend it on something else and not have to make it up later. My colleague from Iowa uses the do-not-worry, be-happy defense, that we can add prescription drug benefits using this money, we can modernize Medicare and use this money, and it will all work out in the wash. But the fact is that it will not work out in the wash because the money that you want to use, the trust fund money, is already obligated. It is already obligated to pay Hospital Insurance Trust Fund benefits.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that the demand on that money is not declining, it is increasing as America ages. It is interesting because my colleagues some years back, in fact my first year in the House when we went through all of the debates over the budget and whether we were going to cut Medicare or not, and the Speaker of the House at that time said we needed to cut Medicare in order to save it because the trust fund was going bankrupt; and yet today the Republican Party has brought a budget to the floor that would in fact shorten that trust fund, shorten the life span of that trust fund after all of the work we have gone to to extend the life span of that trust fund.

Legally and logically it is not correct that you can take Medicare Trust Fund moneys and spend them on anything, whether it is prescription drugs or highways or Howitzers or whatever. Those moneys are obligated to the beneficiaries currently and those in the future who will enjoy the benefits of the inpatient hospital trust fund.

Mr. Speaker, all we are saying is let us use some honest bookkeeping and set those funds aside. If we do not do that, what we are going to end up with in this budget, not just in fiscal year 2002, but for many years to come, is a budget which is borrow and spend. We are going to spend today, and then we are going to borrow tomorrow much deeper than we would otherwise.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time and also thank the gentleman for the instruction to the conferees.

Mr. Speaker, I want to understand the message. I think I heard the gentleman from Iowa, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget, say that one of these points he had some problem with. I do not know why my colleagues would have any problem with any of the points.

First of all, we are trying to make sure that we have a minimal amount of moneys, and that is the same amount that the Senate put for Medicare. We are trying to make sure that at least that amount of money, which has been recognized by both Republicans and Democrats, on this floor as well as in the Senate bicamerally, that the 147 was an insufficient number, and that $300 billion is closer.

Mr. Speaker, so first, it is to make sure that we have adequate amounts of money for prescription drugs. Is that what we are trying to achieve?

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman would yield, that is correct.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I do not know anyone in the House who would disagree with that. The Republicans say maybe they will do it.

The second one, there was a resolution at the beginning of the session that said we will not take any moneys out of the Social Security Trust Fund or the Medicare Trust Fund; so we are simply saying those dollars should not be financed out of the Medicare Trust Fund. The Medicare Trust Fund, as the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN) said, has already been pledged. It has been obligated. You cannot obligate it two and three times.

Mr. Speaker, is that the second point?

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman would yield, that is correct.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, why should the Republicans disagree with that? We are on record as saying we do not want to raid the Medicare Trust Fund, and this simply says it cannot be raided to pay for the additional moneys needed for prescription drugs.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Iowa for putting forward a very practical and a very consistent bill. I must say I wish we had more money for education. I wish we would go all of the way to where the Senate is. The second point is to go as close as possible to the Senate bill.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for a very practical motion to instruct, and I hope all of my colleagues vote for the motion to instruct.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina for his work all along, and for bringing up these instructions.

Mr. Speaker, the House-passed budget is really full of irresponsible tax cuts and fuzzy math; and it should be adjusted to match closely what has been reached in compromise in the other body.

As a teacher, I am particularly disappointed that the budget resolution fails to deal adequately with the many urgent needs for our children in public education. At a time when more is demanded of our schools through higher standards, annual assessments, ''increased accountability'' is the phrase we are using this year, we risk failing too many children by not providing greater resources to turn around low-performing schools.

Mr. Speaker, the House-passed mark falls short of providing adequate help for teacher training, recruitment, for school construction and modernization, for meeting Federal obligations to assist local schools in providing excellent education for students with special needs. The average age of public schools in this country is 40 years old. We have to get the students and their facilities into the 21st century.

Mr. Speaker, estimates are quite clear that we will need 2.2 million new teachers over the next 10 years to keep up with attrition. This is not even to get smaller class sizes; this is just to keep up.

□ 1730

Too often, I hear stories of teachers with history degrees teaching science and math because the schools have trouble finding qualified teachers. Having spent a year on the National Commission on the Teaching of Mathematics and Science, the John Glenn Commission, I have offered a bill to help schools recruit and retain qualified science and math teachers.

Mr. Speaker, we have to do that. The chairman of the Committee on the Budget said a few moments ago that they have provided, at the President's

request, an 11 percent increase in education spending. No, it is about half that; it is 5.8 percent. The total increase in the President's budget, as in the House-approved budget, would not cover even half of the cost of meeting our needs in special education, of meeting our obligation, our Federal obligation to assist the local schools with special education.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join in supporting the motion to instruct conferees.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I would like to engage the ranking member of the Committee on the Budget and perhaps also the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) in a discussion of the situation we are facing with respect to the Medicare Part A Trust Fund.

We have had for some years in this body, although sometimes the political rhetoric would not indicate it, an agreement between the parties that the Social Security Trust Fund ought to be off limits, that we ought not to be using the Social Security surplus to cut taxes or to increase spending or for any other purpose, other than to reduce the debt and ensure the future of Social Security, to make certain that those benefits will be there when the baby boomers retire, when that program's cash flow reverses.

I would like to ask my colleagues if there is any principled reason why we should treat the Medicare Trust Fund any differently from the Social Security Trust Fund. If anything, the Medicare Trust Fund is facing even more severe problems, even earlier than we face with Social Security.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, the Medicare Trust Fund is currently slated to become insolvent in 2028 or 2029. Social Security, fortunately, could last until 2038, 2039, for 10 more years. So the Medicare Trust Fund is intended, for the same reason, to sequester these funds, to confine them for use for Medicare; and we have reached certainly an accord on both sides of the aisle, both Houses and the White House as to Social Security, and I think the same logic applies to Medicare. It is not an idle concern.

We have a handout, if anyone cares to see it, and they will see that under the House resolution, as early as 2005 by our calculation, that resolution will take us back into the Medicare Trust Fund. The Senate resolution is even worse. By our calculation, in 2002 the Senate resolution would lead us into the trust fund to the tune of $11 billion, that soon, and we will be invading the trust fund in Medicare again.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, we are at present running a slight surplus in Medicare, but the Medicare Trust Fund is accumulating assets which we will need to draw on later. If we, instead, take those funds and use them for prescription drug benefits, as badly as that is needed, would that not reduce our ability to meet our basic Medicare obligations, the prescription benefit aside?

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will again yield, that is the very point we are trying to make. The fund as it is is overobligated from beneficiary expectations, so we are simply saying, do not overload another obligation on top of a fund that is already short of meeting its scheduled obligations.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, having sat on the Medicare Commission for a year and looked at the future of Medicare, and having realized that beginning in 2010, we are going to double the number of people on Medicare as the baby boomers move into that stage of their life, we cannot realistically argue against putting money in advance of that big deficit that is coming. Even more important, it is taken out of people's paychecks under the HI, the health insurance. If that money is not used for Medicare, it is breaking the trust with the workers who put it in.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER).

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I want to also thank him for all of his work on our behalf as the ranking member of the Committee on the Budget.

We all recognize that we have an urgent national need in this country to make a greater investment in our education system so that we can help a greater number of our children succeed within that system. I had the honor and the pleasure of meeting with President Bush before he was sworn in to talk with him and a number of our colleagues about education reform in this country. We talked about the things that needed to be done: to make schools more accountable, to make teachers more accountable, to improve the professional development of teachers, to make sure that we could direct the resources, as he said, to the poorest children in the poorest performing schools. But we also said in that meeting that it was very clear that those things would not happen unless we had the resources that were necessary to provide those schools the quality education that we all want.

I had an opportunity to meet several other times with him and with Senator KENNEDY and Senator JEFFORDS and with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and again we talked about the kinds of reforms and the results that this President genuinely wants. We said again, Mr. President, if we are going to have testing and we are going to require all of the States to go about this, we are going to have to provide the resources. We are going to provide the resources so that, in fact, it can be done in the right way, not in the wrong way, not in a way that is harmful.

If we are really going to help these children and we are going to get qualified teachers in front of them on a daily basis, we are going to have to improve the quality of these teachers. It is going to take resources. He assured us that he recognized that and he understood that.

Now, when I see the budget, I am deeply disappointed, because a decision was made here between the times of those meetings and the times of this budget that those resources would be put off into the tax cut. Now we find that the amount of the tax cut that goes to the richest 1 percent of the people in this country is 13 times the amount we would spend on education in this budget, 13 times the amount on the richest 1 percent, and yet we have a huge number of children who are not getting access to a decent, first-class education, who are not having the kinds of reforms that the President wants, that I want, and that many of my colleagues in the Congress want, will not bring about the results that we want, that every parent wants for their child in the American education system.

Mr. Speaker, we urgently need these resources. We urgently need these resources because our schools are educating more children now than at any time in our history. They are educating more children with English as a second language, children with disabilities. These are expensive items, and we owe these children an education, and we have to make sure that they have an opportunity to participate in it.

That is not what this budget does. It is not an 11 percent increase, as is well documented by the minority on the Committee on the Budget and our committee and the Committee on Education and the Workforce. We are talking about a 5 percent increase. We are talking about the smallest increase in many years, and that is simply not adequate to get the results that the President says he wants and to get them for the children that he has quite properly focused on in his discussion of education, the children that are in most need of these resources so that they can get the same access to an education that children get in the wealthier schools and in the middle-class schools. But we cannot do it on this budget. We cannot do it on this budget.

This budget suggests that we are going to try to get first-class, world-

class standards in education attainment on behalf of America's children, but we are going to do it on the cheap, and that would be a horrible mistake, because that will lock us into another 5 years of spending without getting the results that the taxpayers deserve and that the children deserve in terms of their educational opportunity.

So I commend the gentleman for the motion to instruct, to say that we should move toward the figures that the Senate has talked about and has suggested in their budget resolution, figures that will, in fact, provide us the kind of resources that are necessary for special education, for Title I, for English as a second language, so that we can hire the 100,000 counselors that are necessary, so that we can finish hiring the 100,000 teachers that have allowed us to reduce class sizes. Those are the urgent needs of the American education system, but they cannot be met in this budget without going with the numbers that are suggested in the motion to instruct.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to read the motion to instruct to the gentleman from California when he is referring to numbers in the motion to instruct: ''To increase the funding for education in the House resolution to provide for maximum feasible funding.''

Now, the gentleman from California is a Member of the House who stands behind no one when it comes to his advocacy of education and education funding and for our students. He is a friend, he is someone who has always tried to responsibly put forward reforms and proposals on education. But to suggest that this motion to instruct somehow provides more money than what the House resolution provided is just simply not the case.

Let me review with the gentleman from California and others what is in the budget that has been passed that we are defending here today. The House-passed budget accommodates not only the President's ''no child left behind'' education reform, which links dollars to accountability. Simply throwing more money at the programs will not make them better. The gentleman from California even testified to that fact before me and the Committee on the Budget. It increases elementary and secondary education funding by 10 percent. It triples funding for reading programs. It improves by increasing IDEA by $1.25 billion to ensure that every child, particularly children with special needs, have access to the best possible education. It increases education savings accounts from $500 to $5,000 and makes them available not only for their original intent, but expands them to K through 12 education. It provides a full tax exemption to students using qualified prepaid tuition for college, and it provides $60 million to help older children in foster care transition to adulthood, including providing vouchers to cover tuition and vocational training costs.

Now, the gentleman says that we do not really have, if we take this out and we move this over and we minus this off the top, it is not really an 11 percent increase. One cannot do that. It is an 11 percent increase in this budget. One cannot say, if we do not include this, we do not include that; it is all part of the budget, it is all in here, that it is somehow some other percentage.

It is an 11 percent increase. We believe that is a responsible increase.

Are there more ways that we can improve education in this country? You bet. Is throwing money at it the only answer? No. That is why we need to move through this budget as quickly as possible, give these instructions to the committee, give these resources to the committees so that they can begin to reform our education programs in this country and begin to make sure that no child is left behind. Just simply to come in here and say, it is not enough money without the reforms, it is not enough money without proposals, it is not enough money just because somebody says it is not enough money does not mean it is not enough money.

Mr. Speaker, 11 percent over and above the huge increases we have provided for education has not necessarily solved the education concerns of America, and just providing a rhetorical response on the floor as a motion to instruct conferees, saying the maximum feasible funding, is not a way to do it either.

We believe this is a responsible budget, it is responsible in the context of overall reform of education. It will help us to ensure that no child is left behind.

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume just to respond to the gentleman before yielding to the gentleman from Florida.

Let me make clear that this budget passed by the House provided a 5.8 percent increase for fiscal year 2002 in education. In over 10 years, the President's budget, which was basically endorsed, provides just above the rate of inflation. Now, 5.8 percent is an increase, but it is less than half the increase of last year and less than half the increase of the last 5 years, and less than a third of the increase of last year.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak in support of the motion to instruct conferees with respect to the education increase that has been proposed.

The Senate has finally started to take us in the direction we need to go, an additional $300 billion increase, supported by Democrats and Republicans, to begin to put our money where our mouth is. I applaud the chairman of the House Committee on the Budget putting emphasis on increased funding for special education. But most of what we have said about doing that are promises. This is a chance for us today to put that into action and to begin to move in the direction of more funding for both special education and general education.

□ 1745

We know what works. We know what we need to do: we need to fix up some of our crumbling schools. We need to fix our schools that are overcrowded.

We have a class-reduction program at the Federal level that has paid huge dividends. In my community in Florida, in the Tampa Bay area, in Hillsboro County, $8 million has gone into reducing class size in some of our most struggling schools. It has given control of the classroom back to the teacher to reach those kids in the back row like me that needed some special attention to get engaged in learning.

As the teaching shortage begins to grow, we are going to have to pay more attention to attracting qualified teachers.

The Senate recognized these things when they increased education spending on a bipartisan basis. There is no reason why we should not do the same thing here today.

We are about to debate finally the President's proposal to provide more accountability and more resources to education. Many of us applauded him during the campaign for taking that position, both on the accountability and on the spending.

Guess what: unless we take the step today of adopting this motion to recommit conferees, those are hollow words, because this is the spending blueprint. This is the way we begin to back up with actions the words of the President, the words of the Congress, that we all want to do more for education. So I would urge adoption of the motion to instruct conferees with respect to education as well as the other points that have been made today.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman outlining some of the implications for elementary and secondary education on this budget.

Is it not true that President Bush campaigned on getting the Pell grants, in opening up opportunities for students on higher education, getting those Pell grants over $5,000?

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Yes, he did.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. This budget would keep the maximum Pell grant well under $4,000. It is simply not adequate to do what we need to do to open the doors to opportunity in higher education.

We have been increasing Pell grants several hundred dollars a year for several years. This would increase the Pell grant, as I understand it; and this has been borne out by CBO, only by $150.

That is totally inadequate. It really falls over $1,000 short of what President Bush himself promised.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I think the incredibly meager increase in the Pell grants cited by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) is really a pitiful example of how little we are doing and how much more we can do.

I would urge that we adopt this motion to recommit conferees today. Let us begin to put our actions where our words have been. Mr. Speaker, let us start to live up to what we know are the Chair's intentions to do more for special education in Congress. Let us lay the floor for the groundwork that is going to be done in the House and Congress in the next several years to do more for our schools and to let them make their decisions at home, let them reduce class size, fix up the schools, hire qualified teachers, and make sure we leave no children behind.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would just again refer the gentleman to the first paragraph. It is kind of hard for me to disagree with the first paragraph.

It says: ''To increase the funding in the House Resolution to provide'' not so much money for IDEA, not so much money for reading, not so much money for Pell grants, as has been argued on the floor here today, but just ''maximum feasible.''

We are all for that. My goodness, we go out and swing a dead cat and we could probably hit everybody who would be for maximum feasible everything in the budget. That is not what a budget is all about. A budget is putting numbers in here.

We put a number in here. I think our number is very responsible when looked at in the context of all of the numbers that are in the budget. So to come in here and say we want to instruct the conferees, here is a very specific instruction: get in there and do something really good for education. Okay, we will do that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU), the vice-chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, I am not quite sure where to begin.

First and foremost, it is interesting to sit in the Chamber today, to sit in the Chamber today and hear so much happiness and joy over something that has been done in the other body. I do not think I have heard this much excitement about legislation in the other body since I have been a Member of Congress, though admittedly, that has been for only two terms.

There has been a lot of discussion about education. Education is important. The chairman of our committee just talked about the instruction here to provide the maximum feasible amount for education.

I am all for good and I am opposed to evil; and I think it is nice that we have a motion to recommit conferees that says, let us provide more money for good things. They did not actually write in ''less money for bad things,'' but they might as well have.

But the fact of the matter is, if we go through what we passed on the floor here, what came out of our Committee on the Budget, I think we do have a very strong budget resolution. That is one of the reasons, for anyone listening to this debate, that we see so many numbers being thrown around: $1 billion here, $1 trillion of this, $10 billion here, 5 percent, 18 percent. Because when we are not really able to argue about good policy reform and good legislation, we try to blind people with numbers.

I make that comment as a former engineer who maybe tried once or twice to do the same, but I do not think it is appropriate for the floor of the House.

Let me talk a little bit about what is in the budget resolution that came out of committee. First, overall, we increase the size of the government by about 4 percent, increase discretionary spending 4 percent.

I think most Americans looking at this blueprint would say well, we are going to increase our household budget by about the level of inflation. We are not going to live beyond our means. There is no reason whatsoever that this Congress or any Congress should force Americans to live beyond their means, should collect more in taxes than we need, or should spend at 6 or 8 or 12 percent increases per year, because everyone here knows that is the quickest way to drive us into deficit.

A 4 percent increase in government, I certainly understand for a lot of people in this Chamber that is not enough government. Increasing spending 4 percent is not nearly enough government for some people here. But I think for most Americans to have the government grow by 4 percent or 5 percent would be plenty.

What do we do on the debt? We pay down $2 trillion in debt over the next 10 years. Everyone wants to see us retire public debt. We are paying it down at a record level. We have not heard much discussion about debt repayment in the debate tonight, and that is because the focus is on more spending. We are not going to be able to pay down $2 trillion in debt if we just start allowing the budget resolution to spend more and more and more.

We heard a discussion about education. We are increasing funding for education by 11 percent, as the chairman described, 10 percent for K through 12, tripling funding for literacy.

We have committed in the House budget resolution to a record increase in special education funds, which is the largest unfunded Federal mandate that I know of on the books.

But for some on the other side, it is never enough. It is all about resources, resources, resources. How many times did we hear that word tonight in talking about education? It is about resources, resources, resources.

If money was the answer to improving education, then we could go to those school districts in the country that were spending the most on education, some of them perhaps here in Washington, DC., some perhaps in New York City, and there we should find the best schools in the country; and we do not, because it is not all about resources. It is about how we deliver the education, it is about how we structure the competition, it is about the needs of the student and whether or not they are being met at the local level.

So much discussion has been held about resources; but there has been no discussion about reform tonight, no discussion about accountability and standards and all of the keystones that are in the President's reform bill, and certainly no discussion about the importance of giving those students in the failing schools in this country, so many of them in economically depressed areas of America, give those students a chance to get out of those failing schools, give them the economic power of a grant of school choice, and let their parents take them to a school that is safe, that is reliable, and that can deliver their children with the education that they deserve.

Education accountability and education choice is something the other side does not want to discuss because, one, it means empowering families to make a real decision; and two, because it means attacking a base, a status quo base that wants no competition in the public schools, no public school choice whatsoever.

I think that is outrageous. I think it is outrageous for people, certainly not all the opponents of school choice, but for many of them in the Senate and some here in the House who send their children to the best private schools in the country, to then come and say, well, we certainly do not want someone in a public school to have the power of choice, to take their child out of a failing school and give them an education and a safe setting that they deserve. But we hear about spending. It is all about spending.

That brings us to the other portions of this motion to instruct, to provide the cost of coverage for prescription drug benefits, not within the hospitalization trust fund; in other words, to pay for Medicare, but do not pay for Medicare with Medicare taxes.

That does not make sense to me. I do not think it makes sense to most Americans. I would love to add a prescription drug benefit to Medicare. I voted for legislation on the floor last year to add a prescription drug benefit to Medicare. But we have in the instructions here, if we add a prescription drug benefit under Medicare, we do not take it out of the Medicare Trust Fund.

Why would anyone want to do that? I think there is one answer that I can think of. It is because they do not want

to cut taxes. It is because they want to increase the size of government. It is because they want to find any excuse not to have to support tax relief.

Three years ago, 4 years ago, when I first came to Congress, they said, we cannot cut taxes until we balance the budget. We enacted balanced budget legislation in 1997.

Then they say, well, we cannot support cutting taxes because we have not started paying down the debt. And we started paying off the Federal debt.

Then they said, we cannot support any tax cuts until we set aside every penny of the Social Security surplus. We did that.

Now tonight we are hearing, well, if we set aside the Social Security surplus, let us also set aside the Medicare Trust Fund surplus.

We have actually done that in this budget, so now they are trying to find ways to force spending even higher, to drive us back to a point where, for some reason, we are not giving back that tax surplus to Americans.

I think that is unfortunate. Some people will look for any opportunity to vote against the tax cut. In the end, that is because there are some for whom this is not nearly enough government, and only by keeping all of the revenues that are coming into Washington in Washington will they have the resources to increase the size and scope of government to an untenable level.

I think that is unfortunate. Taxes today are higher than they have been at any point since World War II. Almost 21 percent of our economy is consumed in taxes. We wake up, we are paying energy taxes; we go to work, we are paying gasoline taxes; we make a phone call, we are paying 3 percent in telecommunications taxes that were put in place in 1899 to fund the Spanish-American war; of course, we pay income taxes; we pay Medicare taxes; we pay Social Security taxes.

There is very little in our life that is not taxed today, and when we are collecting more in taxes than in our history, and after we have paid for all of the essential operations of government, expanded discretionary spending 4 percent, invested in education and national defense, added $2.8 billion to the National Institutes of Health, if we have money left over, we ought to give it back to the American taxpayer by letting them keep more of what they earn every week.

We do not say it nearly enough, but the reason we have record tax collections is because Americans are working more productively and harder and more efficiently, earning more. We ought to send a little bit of that back.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this motion to instruct. It is all about the size of government. It is all about trying to keep it here in Washington. But I say when we take money out of Washington and give it back to families, we are making Washington a little less important and we are making those families and those American workers more important. That is what I came here to do.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2½ minutes.

□ 1800

Let me say in response to the gentleman's statement about the bite the government is taking out of our economy. In 1984, 1985, the peak of the Reagan years, the government was consuming 23.5 percent of the national pie known as GDP, gross domestic product. Peak of the Reagan years, 23.5 percent of GDP being consumed by the government.

Today, under this budget, the budget we have this year, which is the Clinton administration budget, less than 18½ percent of our GDP is devoted to government spending. That is five full percentage points, five full percentage points less than in the peak of the Reagan years.

In addition, let me clarify where we are with respect to education. The President came here to this House and made his State of the Union. He said the account plussed-up by the most in our budget will be education, 11.4 percent. Our spirits were lifted.

We got the budget and started looking at it, started dissecting it; and we saw that he was claiming for his increase for next year $2.1 billion that the House appropriated last year for 2002. When we back that out, because he is not providing, it was previously provided, when we back that out, we saw that the increase was 5.8 percent. As I have said, 5.8 percent is an increase; I will grant one that. But it is nothing compared to last year, 18 percent. It is nothing compared to the last 5 years, 13 percent.

Furthermore, when the Senate had an opportunity, amendment by amendment, to add to education, they added through four amendments $300 billion. When we say in this motion to instruct conferees provide the maximum feasible funding for education, we also say within the scope of conference, the text of the resolution. What does that mean? Get as close to that $300 billion increase as you possibly can. We will not dictate it in numerical terms. But within the scope of conference, that means you can go up to $300 billion plus-up in education, provide the maximum feasible funding for education.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question; and it will be a short one.

Mr. SPRATT. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from South Carolina indicated that the Federal spending is 18.3 percent of GNP today.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, that is correct.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, we are collecting almost 21 percent in taxes.

Mr. SPRATT. That is correct, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, what is the justification for collecting so much more in taxes than the Federal Government is spending?

Mr. SPRATT. The difference is, the surplus is——

Mr. SUNUNU. I know what the difference is. What is the normal justification for collecting so much more in taxes than we spend in government?

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, it is this: From 1982 to 1992, we increased the national debt of this country, which we will leave to our children, by more than $4 trillion. It is time we paid some of that off, and the budget we brought to the floor would have done that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from South Carolina for his motion to instruct because it is clear that the massive tax cut package pushed through the House earlier this year was financed by cutting much-needed programs, particularly as it regards to education.

There are devastating cuts in education spending affecting areas where continued progress relies on at least maintaining current levels of funding. Where the President proposes an increase in funds to disadvantaged students and programs, he proposes major cutbacks in educational technology programs and a decrease in funds for vocational educational programs.

This budget does not provide the necessary increases to the Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities Program or the 21st Century Community Learning Centers, programs which have been proven to work and be successful. This is a major blow to all urban and rural communities. These programs are vital to providing a safe and stimulating academic environment for students, both while they are in school and during after-school hours. We need these programs, and we need them at full funding, which covers real operating costs.

Despite campaign promises to increase the average Pell grant to $5,100, this budget proposes approximately $3,800, a $100 increase per student. The President then freezes all other critical student aid programs, making it almost impossible for working families and students to finance the higher education, to keep us moving on and keep us ahead of the curve.

The elimination of the budget line for school renovation is ill-advised and absolutely devastating to restoring and modernizing our schools and bringing them up to the 21st century standards. This must be reversed.

Mr. Speaker, my constituents need each and every dollar of this Nation's education budget to provide a safe and competent educational experience. The President's budget stops short of providing real educational relief.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU) says he does not know why we could possibly have ever seen anything good about the other body. The fact is that even a stopped clock is right twice a day. The question is: Do you know when it is? In this instance, their budget makes more sense.

I went back to my district for 2 weeks, and I had four community meetings with an average of 150 people in each meeting; 600 people. Seventy-five percent of them, after you go through the budget and explain what the tax cut does to all of it, said we do not want the tax cut. We would rather have you pay down the debt. We would rather you protect Social Security and protect Medicare. They understand.

Now, my colleagues say, well, you are from Seattle. You are from that liberal district out on the Left Coast. The district of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) right on the border between Texas and Louisiana was reported in the New York Times as having exactly the same result.

The people understand that education is the future of this country, that also the future is the security that comes with Medicare and Social Security.

Now, for us to say that we cannot support the Senate, they in fact are much more in tune with the people than are the House of Representatives who rammed this budget through with very little discussion about what it actually does in the long-term.

This resolution supports what the people support. They are not asking for tax relief. They are not begging. When one explains in the meetings who gets the tax cut and where it goes and what it means when we do not pay down the debt and we have to pay an extra $500 billion in interest, they say: Why do not you just keep the money, pay the debt down and save the interest. You can use that on education.

People, they do not need to be rocket scientists. If one can add and subtract, one can see what the Senate did. If my colleagues allowed us to have the kind of amendments over here that they had in the other body, we would have a much different resolution on the floor, because they would have found there is much more support in this body for education. But they would not allow it. So that is why they have to have this resolution passed.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) has 1 minute remaining and the right to close. The gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) has 9½ minutes.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes to close our portion of the debate.

Let me just reiterate that certainly we have tried and we will continue to try and reform our education system. Part of that reform requires us to consider new funding. Part of that reform requires us to consider that we are not paying the bills that have been promised under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Part of that is to recognize that, as people continue a lifetime of learning, that we have to find new ways to pay for higher education; that we recognize that reading programs in this country need additional assistance.

But in part, that is the reason why our budget lays out for education those many different priorities we believe so succinctly and with so much of a priority.

I think it is wrong to assume that because we have over the course of our appropriations passed some advanced appropriations that all of a sudden now that that should not be included as a priority for this year's budget or beyond. We have increased budgets for education in the past. We will do so in the future. This year's is 11 percent. We are proud of that. If there are ways that we can help improve that in the future with reform, we will consider that.

As far as reform and modernization of Medicare, we believe based on the 407 to 2 vote earlier this year that the House of Representatives is clearly on record that not one penny of Social Security or Medicare ought to be used for anything else except Social Security or Medicare. Finally we have done that.

I do not want to recall history, but the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), my good friend, knows that this is a very brief history involved in any side coming forth with a budget that does not touch the trust funds and the surpluses for Medicare and Social Security. Finally, in a bipartisan way, this year, we were able to say do not touch it, only use it for its intended purpose.

But this is its intended purpose. If one cannot use Medicare Trust Fund dollars for Medicare, for modernization of Medicare, for improving Medicare and providing Medicare recipients more Medicare, what is one going to use the money for? I mean, I do not quite understand that.

This desire to run to the floor and to say every penny you use from the Medicare Trust Fund automatically takes a penny away from its solvency in the future is just not factually correct. Modernization is intended for and we will pass modernization that needs to extend the life of Medicare.

I just say the following: If one cannot use Medicare Trust Fund dollars for Medicare, if one cannot use Medicare surpluses for Medicare, what can one use it for? We believe we have finally arrived at a bipartisan principle on that issue. We believe that is embodied in this budget that has already passed the House.

I believe it would be a grave mistake to change that tact now and to instruct our conferees, albeit it is not binding, I realize that, and maybe we should not make a controversy out of it, but I believe it is a mistake for us to bind our conferees or instruct our conferees by suggesting to them that now, all of a sudden, we are going to reverse that 407 to 2 vote and say that one cannot use Medicare now for anything, one cannot use it for prescription drugs, one cannot use it for modernization. I believe that would be a mistake.

Therefore, I urge Members not to adopt the motion to instruct offered by the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, basically this is what this motion to instruct does: The Senate has added $300 billion to education. We say go as far as you can, conferees, as far as feasible in the direction of the Senate's plus-up for education.

Secondly, the Senate has provided $147 billion to the $153 billion provided in the House for a Medicare prescription drug benefit. That is the minimum amount that will actually provide the benefit. We say adopt the Senate provision.

Thirdly, we say as to Medicare, do not double count. Do not take these overobligated underfunded trust funds and use them for new obligation. Take the money out of the general fund to provide for the Medicare prescription drug benefit.

If one is for education, if one is for Medicare prescription drugs, if one is for making Medicare sound and solvent far into the future, one should vote for the motion to instruct conferees because that is what it does.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for an electronic vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 428, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 200, nays 207, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 85]

YEAS—200

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Ackerman | Baca | Baldwin |
| Allen | Baird | Barcia |
| Andrews | Baldacci | Barrett |

Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Ford
Frank
Frost
Ganske
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hill
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy (RI)
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Mascara
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Mink
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Phelps
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Ross
Rothman
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Shows
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Spratt
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NAYS—207

Aderholt
Akin
Armey
Bachus
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bereuter
Biggert
Bilirakis
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady (TX)
Brown (SC)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Capito
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Everett
Ferguson
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Fossella
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hart
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Issa
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kerns
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Knollenberg
Kolbe
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCrery
McInnis
McKeon
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Oxley
Paul
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Pombo
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reynolds
Riley
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schrock
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Simmons
Simpson
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Tancredo
Tauzin
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Toomey
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—24

Abercrombie
Brown (FL)
Cantor
Capps
Davis (CA)
Filner
Holden
Hunter
Istook
Linder
McHugh
McKinney
Mica
Moakley
Myrick
Payne
Roybal-Allard
Schiff
Smith (TX)
Stark
Taylor (NC)
Vitter
Weller
Whitfield

□ 1835

Mrs. CUBIN, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Messrs. OXLEY, GOSS, WATTS of Oklahoma, SKEEN, HOBSON, WALDEN of Oregon, and NEY changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 85, I was unavoidably detained due to flight cancellations. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees:

Messrs. NUSSLE, SUNUNU, and SPRATT.

There was no objection.

## CONCERNING PARTICIPATION OF TAIWAN IN WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 428, 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 Iowa (Mr. LEACH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 428, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 407, nays 0, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 86]

YEAS—407

Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Allen
Andrews
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Cannon
Capito
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cubin
Culberson
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Jo Ann
Davis, Tom
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Flake
Fletcher
Foley
Ford
Fossella
Frank
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Graves
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Grucci
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Harman
Hart
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Israel
Issa
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kelly
Kennedy (MN)
Kennedy (RI)
Kerns
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Langevin
Lantos
Largent
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mink
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Osborne
Ose
Otter
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Pelosi
Pence
Peterson (MN)

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Peterson (PA) | Saxton | Terry |
| Petri | Scarborough | Thomas |
| Phelps | Schaffer | Thompson (CA) |
| Pickering | Schakowsky | Thompson (MS) |
| Pitts | Schrock | Thornberry |
| Platts | Scott | Thune |
| Pombo | Sensenbrenner | Thurman |
| Pomeroy | Serrano | Tiahrt |
| Portman | Sessions | Tiberi |
| Price (NC) | Shadegg | Tierney |
| Pryce (OH) | Shaw | Toomey |
| Putnam | Shays | Towns |
| Quinn | Sherman | Traficant |
| Radanovich | Sherwood | Turner |
| Rahall | Shimkus | Udall (CO) |
| Ramstad | Shows | Udall (NM) |
| Rangel | Simmons | Upton |
| Regula | Simpson | Velazquez |
| Rehberg | Skeen | Visclosky |
| Reyes | Skelton | Walden |
| Reynolds | Slaughter | Walsh |
| Riley | Smith (MI) | Wamp |
| Rivers | Smith (NJ) | Waters |
| Rodriguez | Smith (WA) | Watkins |
| Roemer | Snyder | Watt (NC) |
| Rogers (KY) | Solis | Watts (OK) |
| Rogers (MI) | Souder | Waxman |
| Rohrabacher | Spence | Weiner |
| Ros-Lehtinen | Spratt | Weldon (FL) |
| Ross | Stearns | Weldon (PA) |
| Rothman | Stenholm | Wexler |
| Roukema | Strickland | Wicker |
| Royce | Stump | Wilson |
| Rush | Stupak | Wolf |
| Ryan (WI) | Sununu | Woolsey |
| Ryun (KS) | Sweeney | Wu |
| Sabo | Tancredo | Wynn |
| Sanchez | Tanner | Young (AK) |
| Sanders | Tauscher | Young (FL) |
| Sandlin | Tauzin | |
| Sawyer | Taylor (MS) | |

NOT VOTING—24

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Abercrombie | Hunter | Roybal-Allard |
| Berman | Linder | Schiff |
| Brown (FL) | McHugh | Smith (TX) |
| Cantor | McKinney | Stark |
| Capps | Mica | Taylor (NC) |
| Davis (CA) | Moakley | Vitter |
| Filner | Myrick | Weller |
| Holden | Payne | Whitfield |

□ 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.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 86, I was unavoidably detained, due to flight cancellations. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and could not vote on rollcall Nos. 85 and 86. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on rollcall No. 85 and "yes" on rollcall No. 86.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and was not able to cast my vote on rollcall Nos. 85 and 86.

Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall 85, a motion to instruct conferees with respect to House Concurrent Resolution 83, and "aye" on rollcall No. 86, H.R. 428, Concerning the Participation of Taiwan in the World Health Organization.

□ 1845

## REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 41, TAX LIMITATION CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107–49) on the resolution (H. Res. 118) providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 41) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to tax limitations, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

## REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 503, UNBORN VICTIMS OF VIOLENCE ACT OF 2001

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107–50) on the resolution (H. Res. 119) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 503) to amend title 18, United States Code, and the Uniform Code of Military Justice to protect unborn children from assault and murder, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

## REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1310

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1310.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York.

There was no objection.

## SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

## GAINESVILLE-HALL COUNTY JUNIOR LEAGUE CELEBRATES 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF SERVICE

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

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and commend the Junior League of Gainesville-Hall County, Georgia as that group celebrates its 50th anniversary of service to our community. The Junior League is an organization of women committed to promoting volunteerism, developing the potential of women, and improving the community; and the women of Gainesville and Hall counties have certainly demonstrated during the past half century that hard work and good spirits can make a powerful difference in the community that we live in.

The Gainesville-Hall County chapter of the Junior League was founded by Ms. Idalu Haugabook Slack and chartered on May 21, 1951. The group began making a strong impact then, and I am proud to report that their work has not only continued but has intensified since that time. In 1951, the 21 charter members donated some 515 hours of community service. This year's membership donated over 8,000 hours, all while raising some $80,000 in a single year.

Early projects from the Gainesville-Hall County Junior League included services to the Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts, a story hour for children at the Hall County Library, and school lunches for less fortunate children. In 1952, this strong group of women began two permanent projects as well, the Green Hunter Homes Nursery, and the Charity Ball. Their list of accomplishments continued through the years, and in 1954 the first "Fall Thrift Sale" began.

The Junior League of Gainesville-Hall County has a special tradition of helping children with speech problems. After spending 4 years transporting children to the Atlanta Speech School, the members retained a speech correctionist to allow the children of Gainesville and Hall counties to get help closer to home. In the early 1970s, the Northeast Georgia Speech and Hearing Center was opened, and I had the honor of serving on that first board of directors. The Junior League also donated money for newborn intensive care equipment.

In recent years, the Junior League of Gainesville-Hall County underwrote a $30,000 grant to help open a new child advocacy center and has participated in the massive restoration of the Gainesville Civic Center. Joining with the Association of Junior Leagues International, health concerns emerged as major initiatives and projects were begun, including the creation of a mobile health van and the hosting of a Child Welfare Forum. History shows that the women of Gainesville-Hall County Junior League are able to continue old projects even as they engage in new endeavors that help our community.

Mr. Speaker, one of the main problems of the Junior League is demonstrating the effectiveness of trained volunteers, and they are certainly doing a great job at it. League members have a strong history as State and community leaders, and I commend the Gainesville-Hall County Junior League for their continuing legacy of service and achievement.

## REMEMBERING THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

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

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, earlier today tens of thousands of Armenian

mourners gathered on the hilltop over the city of Yerevan, the capital of Armenia, to remember the Armenian genocide.

Here in the United States, in the Capitol, we also are remembering. It often seems that the world has not learned the crucial lessons of the past. We have witnessed awful genocides in nearly every corner of the globe, including the Holocaust of the Jews in Europe, and genocides in Cambodia, Rwanda, and Bosnia.

We must pause today and say, ''Never again.'' We must, because the cost of the alternative is too high.

Eighty-six years ago in 1915, 1.5 million Armenians were killed; 300 Armenian leaders, writers, thinkers and professionals in Constantinople, modern day Istanbul, were rounded up, deported and killed. 5,000 of the poorest Armenians were butchered in the streets and in their homes.

Most Armenians in America are children or grandchildren of those survivors although there are still many survivors amongst us today. I sometimes hear voices that ask, ''You know, after all of these years, why do we need to keep addressing this?'' After all, some of the skeptics say, this was something that ended back in 1915 and the 1920s.

I suppose that someone who thinks of genocide with that kind of detachment, as if it were just something in a textbook, some distant memory, as something that happened far away and long ago to a people that they never knew, that argument might sound reasonable. But the reason we are here today with my colleagues is because we know better, because we know that 1.5 million men, women and children who were murdered in the genocide are not some abstraction, are not some number in a textbook. To those who survived them, they were beloved family members and dear friends. They were our fathers and mothers and grandparents and uncles and aunts and confidants and neighbors. They were individuals who were robbed of their dignity, they were robbed of their humanity; and finally, they were robbed of their lives.

While time has made the events more distant, the pain is no less real today than it has ever been. How can it be otherwise when we hear the stories of the survivors. How can it be when we are haunted by the words of women like Katharine Magarian. Just listen. Three years ago she said, ''I saw my father killed when I was 9 years old. We lived in an Armenian enclave in Turkey in the mountains. My father was a businessman. The Turks, they ride in one day, got all of the men together and brought them to the church. Every man came out with hands tied behind them. They slaughtered them, like sheep, with long knives.

''They all die. Twenty-five people in my family die. You cannot walk, they kill you. You walk, they kill you. They did not care who they killed. My husband, who was a boy in my village but I did not know him then, he saw his mother's head cut off,'' and she goes on describing the atrocities that befell her and her family.

To most Americans these stories are things that, maybe, you have heard about or read about. But anyone who grew up in an Armenian American family will tell you they knew about these stories their whole life. They may not have always known the specifics, but they always knew about the pain and hurt and tears. They know there were members of their family who died. Why did they die? Because they were Armenian.

Mr. Speaker, that is why we commemorate the genocide. It is not because we cannot let go of history, it is because history will not let go of us. We know that silence does not bind up wounds, it only leaves those wounds to fester. Because we understand if Turkey is never held accountable for the crimes it committed in the past, it only becomes more certain that those crimes will occur again in the future.

Some in Congress and the White House believe that by speaking out on the genocide, America would be betraying the Turkish government. By failing to speak out, we are betraying our own principles as a free people. We cannot sit idle. We cannot let Turkey hide within a fortress of lies.

Mr. Speaker, that is why we will be introducing our resolution on the Armenian genocide. I would like to share an old Armenian saying with you. The saying is: ''Many a molehill thinks it is a mountain. But the mountain? Mountains are too busy being mountains, doing mountain-type things and thinking mountain-type thoughts to worry about what being a mountain means.''

I think of America as sometimes being a bit like that mountain. We are a Nation that is so busy with our economy, our culture and politics, we sometimes forget what it is like to be really an American, what it means to be an American. And the way I see it, America means standing up for justice. America means speaking out against injustice.

□ 1900

That is what I urge all of my colleagues to do, and join me in recognizing the Armenian genocide and supporting the resolution.

Recognizing inhumanity is the first step toward healing and understanding. The current tensions between Turkey, Azerbaijan, and Armenia are deeply rooted in his history, and achieving a just and lasting peace and cooperation will only be possible if the past is acknowledged. But it will not happen on its own. That's why congressional action on the Armenian Genocide resolution is so important.

I believe that those of us who stand for human rights and dignity have a responsibility to remember the victims and the survivors. We have a responsibility to speak out and to make sure that tragedies like this are never allowed to happen again.

In remembering the Armenian Genocide, we are making a commitment against genocide and discrimination. We are making a personal commitment to speaking out against injustice wherever we see it.

---

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Michigan). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

---

## COMMEMORATING ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be here this evening to honor my Armenian friends, particularly on the eve of the 86th anniversary of the Armenian Genocide.

The 20th century was one of historic progress, but also horrible brutality. Throughout the century, America has also been the source of this progress, as well as the nation of first resort to combat brutality around the world. The first great American diplomatic and humanitarian initiative of the 20th century was in response to the attempted extermination of the Armenian people.

As I did last year on this date, I want to associate my comments with the comments of the Jerusalem Post which said, ''The 1915 wholesale massacre of the Armenians by the Ottoman Turks remains a core experience of the Armenian nation. While there is virtually zero tolerance for Holocaust denial, there is tacit acceptance of the denial of the Armenian Genocide, in part because the Turks have managed to structure this debate so that people question whether this really did happen.''

It is fact that the death of 1.5 million Armenians by execution or starvation really did happen, and we must not tolerate this denial.

Mr. Speaker, I say we must affirm history, not bury it. We must learn from history, not reshape it according to the geostrategic needs of the moment, and we must refuse to be intimidated or other states with troubled pasts will ask that the American record on their dark chapter in history be expunged.

As Members of this body, we have an obligation to educate and familiarize Americans on the Armenian Genocide.

In fact, we must assure that the genocide is remembered so that this human tragedy will not be repeated.

As we have seen in recent years, genocide and ethnic cleansing continue to plague nations around the world and, as a great nation, we must always be attentive and willing to stand against such atrocities. We must do the right thing and call upon our human decency to commemorate the Armenian Genocide. We must take our role as the leader of the Free World seriously and educate people on the systematic and deliberate annihilation of 1.5 million Armenians. We must characterize this as genocide.

A key element of the record of the American response to this crime against humanity consists of the reports of our ambassador and his consular officials throughout what are now central and eastern Turkey. This record is a priceless tool in the hands of any American concerned with or responsible for our Nation's ongoing global role to prevent genocide and ethnic cleansing. Therefore, I will tomorrow will be introducing a strong bipartisan resolution to bring together all of the U.S. records on the Armenian Genocide and to provide this collection to the House Committee on International Relations, the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum, and the Armenian Genocide Museum in Yerevan, Armenia.

U.S. Archives contain extensive documentation of the widespread opposition to Ottoman Turkey's brutal massacres and deportations. They also contain records of the unprecedented efforts of the American people to bring relief to the survivors of the 20th century's first genocide. In introducing this legislation, we challenge those who will deny the genocide, past or present. I urge my colleagues to please add their names as an original cosponsor.

Finally, I would like to close by expressing my sincere hope that we will have President Bush's support on this initiative. During his campaign he pledged to properly commemorate the Armenian Genocide. I have every reason to believe that he will honor that pledge and do what is right for both the Armenian people and for our historical record.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in commemorating one of the most appalling violations of human rights in all of modern history—the eighty-sixth anniversary of the Armenian genocide.

I want to commend my colleagues Representative JOE KNOLLENBERG of Michigan and Representative FRANK PALLONE of New Jersey, the co-chairs of the Congressional Caucus on Armenian Issues, for sponsoring this special order.

Today, I want to acknowledge this dark moment in history and remember the Armenian people who tragically lost their lives. We must always remember tumultuous moments in history when people suffered because they were different.

The Armenian genocide lasted over an eight-year period from 1915 to 1923. During this time, the Ottoman empire carried out a systematic policy of eliminating its Christian Armenian population. The Armenian genocide was the first of the 20th century, but unfortunately, not the last.

The atrocious acts of annihilation against the Armenian people were denounced by Paris, London and Washington as war crimes. Even the Germans, the Ottoman Empire's ally in the First World War, condemned these heinous acts. Henry Morgenthau, the U.S. Ambassador to Constantinople at the time, vividly documented the massacre of 1.5 million Armenians.

Winston Churchill used the word ''holocaust'' to describe the Armenian massacres when he said: ''in 1915 the Turkish government began and ruthlessly carried out the infamous general massacre and deportation of Armenians in Asia minor . . . [the Turks were] massacring uncounted thousands of helpless Armenians—men, women, and children together; whole districts blotted out in one administrative holocaust—these were beyond human redress.''

This orchestrated extermination of a people is contrary to the values the United States espouses. We are a nation which strictly adheres to the affirmation of human rights everywhere and cannot dispute a horrendous historical fact by ignoring what so many witnessed and survived.

Recognition and acceptance of any misdeed are necessary steps towards its extinction. Without acceptance there is no remorse, and without remorse, there is no catharsis and pardon.

Even as recently as the last year of this millennium, the United States, together with many European nations, took active part in putting a stop to the genocidal events in Kosovo. It demonstrates that we are willing to risk our lives in order to remain true to our long tradition of intolerance to tyranny and injustice. We cannot remain silent and turn our face away from similar events that took place against the Armenian people.

Of course, we all want to forget these horrific tragedies in our history and bury them in the past. However, it is only through painful process of acknowledging and remembering that we can keep similar dark moments from happening in the future.

At the end of my statement, I have included several quotes from prominent world leaders and political figures, including several U.S. presidents, who describe and sadly affirm what happened to the 1.5 million Armenians in the Ottoman Empire eighty-six years ago.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask that as we take a moment to reflect upon the hardships endured by the Armenians, we also acknowledge that in the face of adversity the Armenian people have persevered. The survivors of the genocide and their descendants have made great contributions to every country in which they have settled—including the United States, where Armenians have made their mark in business, the professions and our cultural life.

QUOTES REGARDING THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE FROM VARIOUS WORLD LEADERS AND PROMINENT POLITICAL FIGURES

''The twentieth century was marred by wars of unimaginable brutality, mass murder and genocide. History records that the Armenians were the first people of the last century to have endured these cruelties. The Armenians were subjected to a genocidal campaign that defies comprehension and commands all decent people to remember and acknowledge the facts and lessons of an awful crime in a century of bloody crimes against humanity. If elected President, I would ensure that our nation properly recognizes the tragic suffering of the Armenian people.''—George W. Bush Jr., June 2, 2000, letter to the members of the Armenian Assembly.

''[We join] Armenians around the world [as we remember] the terrible massacres suffered in 1915–1923 at the hands of the rulers of the Ottoman Empire. The United States responded to this crime against humanity by leading diplomatic and private relief efforts.''—George W. Bush Sr., April 20, 1990, speech in Orlando, Florida.

''Like the genocide of the Armenians before it, and the genocide of the Cambodians which followed it, . . . the lessons of the Holocaust must never be forgotten.''—Ronald Reagan, April 22, 1981, proclamation.

''It is generally not known in the world that, in the years preceding 1916, there was a concerted effort made to eliminate all the Armenian people, probably one of the greatest tragedies that ever befell any group. And there weren't any Nuremberg trials.''—Jimmy Carter, May 16, 1978, White House ceremony.

''The association of Mount Ararat and Noah, the staunch Christians who were massacred periodically by the Mohammedan Turks, and the Sunday School collections over fifty years for alleviating their miseries—all cumulate to impress the name Armenian on the front of the American mind.''—Herbert Hoover, The Memoirs of Herbert Hoover, 1952.

''. . . the Armenian massacre was the greatest crime of the war, and the failure to act against Turkey is to condone it . . . the failure to deal radically with the Turkish horror means that all talk of guaranteeing the future peace of the world is mischievous nonsense.''—Theodore Roosevelt, May 11, 1918, letter to Cleveland Hoadley Dodge.

''When the Turkish authorities gave the orders for these deportations, they were merely giving the death warrant to a whole race; they understood this well, and, in their conversations with me, they made no particular attempt to conceal the fact. . . . I am confident that the whole history of the human race contains no such horrible episode as this. The great massacres and persecutions of the past seem almost insignificant when compared to the sufferings of the Armenian race in 1915.''—Henry Morgenthau, Sr., U.S. Ambassador to the Ottoman Empire Ambassador Morgenthau's Story, 1919.

''These left-overs from the former Young Turk Party, who should have been made to account for the millions of our Christian subjects who were ruthlessly driven en masse, from their homes and massacred, have been restive under the Republican rule.''—Mustafa ''Ataturk'' Kemal, founder of the modern Turkish Republic in 1923 and revered throughout Turkey, in an interview published on August 1, 1926 in The Los Angeles Examiner, talking about former Young Turks in his country.

''Who, after all, speaks today of the annihilation of the Armenians?''—Adolf Hitler, while persuading his associates that a Jewish holocaust would be tolerated by the west.

''It was not war. It was most certainly massacre and genocide, something the world must remember . . . We will always reject any attempt to erase its record, even for some political advantage.''—Yossi Beilin, Israeli Deputy Foreign Minister, April 27, 1994 on the floor of the Knesset in response to a TV interview of the Turkish Ambassador.

''Mr. Speaker, with mixed emotions we mark the 50th anniversary of the Turkish

genocide of the Armenian people. In taking notice of the shocking events in 1915, we observe this anniversary with sorrow in recalling the massacres of Armenians and with pride in saluting those brave patriots who survived to fight on the side of freedom during World War I.''—Gerald Ford, addressing the U.S. House of Representatives.

''Turkey is taking advantage of the war in order to thoroughly liquidate (grundlich aufzaumen) its internal foes, i.e., the indigenous Christians, without being thereby disturbed by foreign intervention.''—Talat Pasha, one of the three rulers of wartime in the Ottoman Empire in a conservation with Dr. Mordtmann of the German Embassy in June 1915.

''What on earth do you want? The question is settled. There are no more Armenians.''—Talat said this after the German Ambassador persistently brought up the Armenian question in 1918.

''In an attempt to carry out its purpose to resolve the Armenian question by the destruction of the Armenian race, the Turkish government has refused to be deterred neither by our representations, nor by those of the American Embassy, nor by the delegate of the Pope, nor by the threats of the Allied Powers, nor in deference to the public opinion of the West representing one-half of the world.''—Count Wolff-Metternich, German Ambassador to the Ottoman Empire, July 10, 1916, cable to the German Chancellor.

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, as a proud member of the Congressional Armenian Caucus and the representative of a thriving community of Armenian-Americans, I join many of my colleagues today to recognize the 86th anniversary of the Armenian Genocide.

This terrible human tragedy must not be forgotten. Like the Holocaust, the Armenian Genocide stands as a tragic example of the human suffering that results from hatred and intolerance.

One and a half million Armenian people were massacred by the Ottoman Turkish Empire between 1915 and 1923. More than 500,000 Armenians were exiled from their ancestral homeland. A race of people was nearly eliminated.

It would be an even greater tragedy to forget the Armenian Genocide. To not recognize the horror of such events almost assures their repetition in the future.

Our statements today are intended to preserve the memory of the Armenian loss, and to remind the world that the Turkish government still refuses to acknowledge the Armenian Genocide. The truth of this tragedy can never and should never be denied.

I would like to commend the Armenian-American community as it continues to thrive and provide assistance and solidarity to its countrymen and women abroad. The Armenian-American community is bound together by strong generational and family ties, an enduring work ethic and a proud sense of ethnic heritage. Today we recall the tragedy of their past, not to place blame, but to answer a fundamental question, ''Who remembers the Armenians?''

Our commemoration of the Armenian Genocide speaks directly to that, and I answer, we do.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the victims of one of history's unacknowledged tragedies—the Armenian Genocide. Today marks the 86th anniversary of this tragedy that lasted from 1915 to 1923.

April 24, 1915 is remembered and commemorated each year by the Armenian community and by people of conscience throughout the world. On this day, the rulers of the Ottoman empire began the systematic and ruthless extermination of the Armenian minority in Turkey. By the end of the Terror, more than a million Armenian men, women, and children had been massacred and more than half a million others had been expelled from the homeland that their forbears had inhabited for three millennia.

The Armenian Genocide is a historical fact. The Republic of Turkey has adamantly refused to acknowledge that the Genocide happened on its soil but the evidence is irrefutable. In 1915, England, France and Russia jointly issued a statement charging the Ottoman Empire with ''a crime against humanity.'' Professor Raphael Lemkin, a holocaust survivor, is the key historical figure in making genocide a crime under international law. He coined the term ''genocide'' and was the first to characterize the atrocities of 1915–1923 as the ''Armenian Genocide.''

We understand that there is a difference between the Turkish people and the government of the Ottoman Turks. In fact, we know that during the massacres there were Turks who tried to save Armenians at the cost of their own lives. But our alliance with Turkey should not deter us from learning the lessons of past mistakes.

If we ignore the lessons of the Armenian Genocide, we are destined to repeat those same mistakes. The horrible conflicts in Sudan, Sierra Leone, and East Timor remind us that we must do more to prevent the systematic slaughter of innocent people. We must learn from the past and never forget the victims of the Armenian genocide.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in solemn memorial to the estimated 1.5 million men, women, and children who lost their lives during the Armenian Genocide. As in the past I am pleased to join so many distinguished House colleagues on both sides of the aisle in ensuring that the horrors wrought upon the Armenian people are never repeated.

On April 24, 1915, over 200 religious, political, and intellectual leaders of the Armenian community were brutally executed by the Turkish government in Istanbul. Over the course of the next 8 years, this war of ethnic genocide against the Armenian community in the Ottoman Empire took the lives of over half the world's Armenian population.

Sadly, there are some people who still deny the very existence of this period which saw the institutionalized slaughter of the Armenian people and dismantling of Armenian culture. To those who would question these events, I point to the numerous reports contained in the U.S. National Archives detailing the process that systematically decimated the Armenian population of the Ottoman Empire. However, old records are too easily forgotten—and dismissed. That is why we come together every year at this time: to remember in words what some may wish to file away in archives. This genocide did take place, and these lives were taken. That memory must keep us forever vigilant in our efforts to prevent these atrocities from ever happening again.

I am proud to note that Armenian immigrants found, in the United States, a country where their culture could take root and thrive. Most Armenians in America are children or grandchildren of the survivors, although there are still survivors amongst us. In my district in Northwest Indiana, a vibrant Armenian-American community has developed and strong ties to Armenia continue to flourish. My predecessor in the House, the late Adam Benjamin, was of Armenian heritage, and his distinguished service in the House serves as an example to the entire Northwest Indiana community. Over the years, members of the Armenian-American community throughout the United States have contributed millions of dollars and countless hours of their time to various Armenian causes. Of particular note are Mrs. Vicki Hovanessian and her husband Dr. Raffi Hovanessian, residents of Indiana's First Congressional District, who have continually worked to improve the life in Armenia, as well as in Northwest Indiana. Three other Armenian-American families in my congressional district, Dr. Aram and Seta Semerdjian and Sonya Doumanian, and Ara and Rosy Yeretsian, have also contributed greatly toward charitable works in the United States and Armenia. Their efforts, together with hundreds of other members of the Armenian-American community, have helped to finance several important projects in Armenia, including the construction of new schools, a mammography clinic, and a crucial roadway connecting Armenia to Nagorno Karabagh.

In the House, I have tried to assist the efforts of my Armenian-American constituency by continually supporting foreign aid to Armenia. This past year, with my support, Armenia received over $90 million of the $219 million in U.S. aid earmarked for the Southern Caucasus. In addition, on April 6, 2001, I joined several of my colleagues in signing the letter to President Bush urging him to honor his pledge to recognize the Armenian Genocide.

The Armenian people have a long and proud history. In the fourth century, they became the first nation to embrace Christianity. During World War I, the Ottoman Empire was ruled by an organization known as the Young Turk Committee, which allied with Germany. Amid fighting in the Ottoman Empire's eastern Anatolian provinces, the historic heartland of the Christian Armenians, Ottoman authorities ordered the deportation and execution of all Armenians in the region. By the end of 1923, virtually the entire Armenian population of Anatolia and western Armenia had either been killed or deported.

While it is important to keep the lessons of history in mind, we must also remain committed to protecting Armenia from new and more hostile aggressors. In the last decade, thousands of lives have been lost and more than a million people displaced in the struggle between Armenia and Azerbaijan, over Nagorno-Karabagh. Even now, as we rise to commemorate the accomplishments of the Armenian people and mourn the tragedies they have suffered, Azerbaijan, Turkey, and other countries continue to engage in a debilitating blockade of this free nation.

On March 28th of this year, I testified before Foreign Operations Appropriations Subcommittee on the important issue of bringing peace to a troubled area of the world. I continued my support for maintaining of level funding for the Southern Caucasus region of the Independent States (IS), and of Armenia in particular. I also stressed the critical importance of retaining Section 907 of the Freedom

Support Act that restricts U.S. aid for Azerbaijan as a result of their blockade. Unfortunately, Armenia is now entering its twelfth year of a blockade, and Section 907 is the one protection afforded it by the Congress. The flow of food, fuel, and medicine continues to be hindered by the blockade, creating a humanitarian crisis in Armenia. A repeal of Section 907 would only serve to legitimize Azerbaijan's illegitimate acts of aggression. I stand in strong support of Section 907, which sends a clear message that the United States Congress stands behind the current peace process and encourages Azerbaijan to work with the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe's Minsk Group toward a meaningful and lasting resolution. In the end, I believe Section 907 will help conclude a conflict that threatens to destabilize the entire region and places the Armenian nation in distinct peril.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleagues, Representatives JOE KNOLLENBERG and FRANK PALLONE, for organizing this special order to commemorate the 86th Anniversary of the Armenian genocide. Their efforts will not only help bring needed attention to this tragic period in world history, but also serve to remind us of our duty to protect basic human rights and freedoms around the world.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, as we do every year, I rise to mark April 24, the somber anniversary of one of the great crimes of modern history: the beginning of the genocide perpetrated against the Armenians of the Ottoman Empire. During and after World War I, a government-orchestrated campaign to eliminate the Armenians under Ottoman rule led to the slaughter of about one and a half million people. Entire communities were uprooted, as survivors fled their homes and were forced into exile.

Fortunately for them, the United States offered a haven. In turn, Armenian refugees gave this country the best they had to offer. Their contributions in many fields of endeavor have energized and enriched American culture and politics. Surely Turkey's loss has been America's gain, as Armenian refugees in the early part of the 20th century and their progeny have become an inspiring success story.

Turkey has lost in another way: its longstanding campaign of denial that the atrocities perpetrated during 1915–1923 were a genocide has not convinced anyone. More and more representative institutions across the world have openly declared their recognition of the genocide, and their number will grow. By refusing to acknowledge what the rest of the world sees, Turkey has stunted its own development and complicated its ability to come to terms with its own past, present, and future.

As we soberly mark April 24 this year, there is at least reason to hope for progress on a front important to all Armenians. The OSCE-brokered negotiations over Nagorno-Karabakh finally seems to be making headway. Though the details remain confidential, the recent meeting between Armenia's President Kocharian and Azerbaijan's President Aliev in Key West, Florida apparently went well enough for the OSCE Minsk Group to prepare a new peace proposal that will be presented to the parties in Geneva in June. Much hard bargaining surely lies ahead. Nevertheless, for the first time in years, we can allow ourselves of bit of optimism about the prospects for peace in a very troubled and important region.

Mr. Speaker, nothing can compensate for the loss of so many Armenians last century. But a prospering Armenia, at peace with its neighbors, and giving free rein to the natural abilities of this talented people, would mitigate the pain and sorrow we feel today.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, on the 86th anniversary of the Armenian Genocide, to lend my voice to this important debate remembering the Armenian Genocide. While Turkey's brutal campaign against the Armenian people was initiated almost a century ago, its impact lives on in the hearts of all freedom-loving people. That is why we must continue to speak about it. We must remind the American people of the potential for such atrocities against ethnic groups, because history lessons that are not learned are too often repeated.

The Armenian Genocide, conceived and carried out by the Ottoman Empire between 1915 and 1923, resulted in the deportation of 2 million Armenians from their homeland and the ultimate slaughter of 1.5 million of those people. The continued tensions in the Caucasus region are rooted in this history, and until they are forthrightly acknowledged among world leaders, the prospects for resolution remain dim.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize history, and to demonstrate that history is unkind to that abuse either rules of war or basic human dignity. I have fought in a war and understand each side feels compelled for its own reasons to fight. When that fight extends to civilian populations it is justifiable to both examine and condemn such occurrences.

The U.S. has some of the most extensive documentation of this genocide against the Armenian people, and there has been no shortage of corroboration by other countries. The Armenian genocide has been recognized by the United Nations and nations around the globe, and the U.S. came to the aid of the survivors. But perhaps we were not vociferous enough in holding the perpetrators of this genocide accountable, and for shining the light of international shame upon them. For it was only a few decades later that we saw another genocide against humanity: the Holocaust. That is why we must continue to tell the story of Armenian genocide. It is a painful reminder that such vicious campaigns against a people have occurred, and that the potential for such human brutality exists in this world. We must remain mindful of the continued repression of Armenians today, and challenge those who would persecute these people. If we do not, future generations may be destined to relive such horrors against humanity.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, today, I join my colleagues in commemoration of the 86th anniversary of beginning of the Armenian genocide. On April 24, 1915, under the direction of the Turkish Ottoman Empire, a campaign of Armenian extermination began. Armenian religious, political, and intellectual leaders from Istanbul were arrested and exiled—silencing the leading representatives of the Armenian community in the Ottoman Empire. From 1915 until 1923, 1.5 million Armenians were murdered, with another 500,000 forced into exile in Russia, ending a period of 2,500 years of an Armenian presence in their historic homeland. Today we remember this terrible period in human history, and commend the Armenian people for their ongoing struggle to live peacefully in their historic homeland.

Like the Jewish and Cambodian holocausts, and more recently, the Serbian ethnic cleansing in Kosovo, the Armenian genocide stands out as one of the world's most morally reprehensible acts. Unfortunately, some American Presidents have chosen not to recognize this atrocity as what it truly was—the attempted extermination of an ethnic group. Continuing our good relationship with Turkey has repeatedly been cited as the reason not to use the word genocide. Mr. Speaker, there is no word other than genocide to describe the systematic murder of a million and a half people.

Earlier this month, I joined 107 of my colleagues in asking President Bush to properly recognize the Armenian Genocide by using the word genocide, and I hope that Mr. Bush will become the first American president in 20 years to do that.

On this day, we remember those Armenians who died 86 years ago and send a message to the world that we will never forget what happened during that terrible period in history and that we reaffirm our resolve to ensure that no nation will ever again have the opportunity to participate in mass genocide.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, today, April 24, 2001, we solemnly mark the 76th anniversary of the Armenian Genocide. On this day in 1915, three hundred Armenian leaders, writers, thinkers and professionals in Constantinople (present day Istanbul) were rounded up, deported and killed on the orders of the Ottoman Imperial Government. By 1923, one and a half million Armenians had been killed and roughly two million deported.

Our country was one of the first major powers of the day to condemn the acts of the Ottoman Empire. Other nations lent their voices to the outcry. Nations allied to the Ottoman Empire, such as Germany and Austria, and those who found themselves politically opposed to the Empire, like Great Britain, France, and Russia, expressed their consternation at the clear policy of genocide.

Today, the United States should reassert its condemnation of the ignominious acts of over three quarters of a century ago. The Armenians Genocide has an infamous place in history as the first mass genocide of the 20th century. Tragically, it was not the last act of genocide the world witnessed that century. Had the Armenians Genocide been fully investigated and condemned in the years after its duration, perhaps. citizens of the world would have reacted sooner to the mass ethnic cleansings that followed.

I am sure that the victims of the Armenian Genocide would want us to not simply remember the historic travesty that befell them, but would want us to learn from these lessons of xenophobia and inhumanity. We remember the Armenian genocide, today, and we affirm its historical existence, not to inflame the passions of our friends in the modern day Republic of Turkey, but to remind all Americans of the horrible consequences of ethnic violence. Turks of all backgrounds heroically fought against the policy of genocide adopted by extremist elements controlling the Ottoman government during World War I. We commemorate their heroism and humanity just as firmly in our act of remembrance today.

Mr. Speaker, we must hope and pray that genocide never again is visited upon the human race. As we grow closer in commerce and communication, may we also grow wiser in our understanding of world history. May we heed the lessons that are there to be learned. And may we never forget the worst aspects of

that history, so that tomorrow's history may be all the better.

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, for the third consecutive year, to commemorate a people who despite murder, hardship, and betrayal have persevered. April 24, 2001, marks the 86th anniversary of the Armenian Genocide; unbelievably, an event that many still fail to recognize.

Throughout three decades in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, millions of Armenians were systematically uprooted from their homeland of three thousands years and deported or massacred. From 1894 through 1896, three hundred thousand Armenians were ruthlessly murdered. Again in 1909, thirty thousand Armenians were massacred in Cilicia, and their villages were destroyed.

On April 24, 1915, two hundred Armenian religious, political, and intellectual leaders were arbitrarily arrested, taken to Turkey and murdered. This incident marks a dark and solemn period in the history of the Armenian people. From 1915 to 1923, the Ottoman Empire launched a systematic campaign to exterminate Armenians. In eight short years, more than 1.5 million Armenians suffered through atrocities such as deportation, forced slavery, and torture. Most were ultimately murdered.

I have had the privilege of joining my colleagues in a letter to the President asking that the U.S. officially commemorate the victims of the Armenian Genocide and honor its 1.5 million victims. As a cosponsor and proponent of H. Res. 596 during the 106th Congress, I was deeply disturbed by the decision that prevented the House of Representatives from considering this resolution last October. This resolution recognized the suffering of nearly two million Armenians from 1915 through 1923, as the Ottoman Empire strove to wipe out an entire race of men, women, and children. Those who were not murdered were effectively removed from their homes of 2,500 years in what is now modern day Turkey.

The resolution called upon the President of the United States to do three things: (1) Ensure that U.S. foreign policy reflects consideration and sensitivity for human rights, ethnic cleansing, and genocide documented in U.S. records relating to the Armenian Genocide and the consequences of the Turkish court's failure to enforce judgments against those responsible for committing genocide; (2) recognize, during his annual commemoration of the Armenian Genocide on April 24th, that this was a systematic and deliberate annihilation of 1.5 million people, and reflect upon the United States' effort to intervene on behalf of Armenians during the genocide; and (3) in his annual commemoration of the Armenian Genocide, emphasize that the modern day Republic of Turkey did not conduct the Armenian Genocide, which was perpetrated by the Ottoman Empire. This was the second time H. Res. 596 had been pulled from consideration, despite pledges by the leadership that the U.S. would go on record to affirm their support for the Armenian genocide.

We should exhibit the same support as many of our friends in the international community who have refused to be bullied into silence. The European Parliament and the United Nations have recognized and reaffirmed the Armenian genocide as historical fact, as have the Russian and Greek parliaments, the Canadian House of Commons, the Lebanese Chamber of Deputies, and the French National Assembly. It is time for America to venerate Armenians who suffered at the hands of the Ottoman Empire. And let me stress that I am not speaking of the government of modern day Turkey, but rather its predecessor, which many of Turkey's present day leaders helped to remove from power.

As I have in the past, as a member of the Congressional Armenian Caucus, I will continue to work with my colleagues and with the Armenian-Americans in my district to promote investment and prosperity in Armenia. And, I sincerely, hope that this year, the U.S. will have the opportunity and courage to speak in support of the millions of Armenians who suffered because of their heritage.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to take part in an important annual event in the House of Representatives, the commemoration of the Armenian Genocide. I am proud that dozens of Members gather each year to mark this dark chapter in human history. Such devotion to memory is not a trivial matter. We know this to be true because, even today, there are those who would vainly try to deny the past, in order to influence the future.

We, as a moral people, cannot allow such wicked efforts to prosper. Even passive acceptance of such lies would be tantamount to participating in a second genocide. As we all know, surely and irrefutably, the first Armenian Genocide, occurred between 1915 and 1923, and resulted in the deliberate death of 1.5 million human souls, killed for the crime of their own existence. The second Armenian Genocide, which every year we must struggle against, is the ongoing effort by some to deny reality, to deny history, to deny one of humanity's darkest hours.

Mr. Speaker, the Armenian Genocide marked a critical point in history. We can look back now, with the wisdom of hindsight, and see in the deaths of a million and a half Armenians the first signs of the breathtaking cruelty of the last century. We can see technology and hatred converging toward the creation of a new phenomenon in human history, the apotheosis of evil, the creation of genocide, the organized attempt to annihilate an entire people.

The Ottoman Empire's campaign to eliminate the entire Armenian population existing within its borders was no accident, no mistake made by a bureaucrat. Genocide was official policy and 1.5 million Armenians died as a result. They were starved and shot, deported and humiliated. They were old and young, innocent and blameless. They were killed, not for what they had one, but for who they were.

Mr. Speaker, when we assemble here, in the House of Representatives, and remember the Armenian Genocide, we stand as witnesses to humanity's worst potential and promise to do better. To not stand by, impassive and confused in the face of horror. We commit ourselves to our common humanity and the precious rights enshrined in the U.S. Constitution. Genocide is incomprehensible, but not unstoppable.

For genocide to be removed from our world and banished forever, we must begin with teaching our children what has happened, and recalling, publicly and clearly, the unprecedented slaughter of the innocent in the 20th century; first in Armenian and then throughout Europe. As a just and honorable nation, we must do more than shrug our shoulders at atrocities. We must bear witness, year after year, and in doing so, commit ourselves to preventing history's repetition.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and I are here today for one simple reason: to remind our nation that eighty-five years ago one-third of the Armenian people, 1.5 million men, women and children, were put to death for the crime of their own birth. To deny this reality is to deny that genocide can happen again.

I want to thank America's citizens of Armenian descent for their unfailing commitment to their people's history and their unwavering struggle to ensure that the memory and history of their peoples' darkest hour is never lost. Thanks to them, the Armenian Genocide and its lessons will not be forgotten in our time and in our nation.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I didn't thank and commend my colleagues, Congressmen JOE KNOLLENBERG and FRANK PALLONE, the co-Chairmen of the Congressional Caucus on Armenian Issues. Thanks to their leadership, this House will again honorably fulfill America's commitment to memory and justice.

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in this commemoration of the anniversary of the Armenian Genocide. Each year, I join Members of Congress from both sides of the political spectrum to take part in this commemoration. We join together to raise awareness of a chapter in history so brutal and violent that it sadly deserves the horrific title of ''Genocide.''

Each year, as I rise to pay tribute to over 1.5 million Armenians who were killed in this tragedy, I am amazed at how the news of the Armenian Genocide was suppressed at the time and then shrouded from public view for generations. We all remember the question posed by Adolf Hitler at the beginning of World War II—he said ''who remembers the Armenians?'' Today, for the sake of justice and human rights, we answer: ''We do.''

The events that took place between 1915 to 1923, when Armenian men, women and children were systematically mistreated and killed, represent one of the darkest chapters of human history. Armenians were tortured, had their property confiscated, and died from malnutrition and starvation during long, forced marches from their homeland in Eastern Turkey.

When tragedies of this magnitude take place, we must ensure that they are not forgotten. Let us teach our children that attempted systematic annihilation of a people must be a fixture of the past. Let us teach our children to value diversity and promote peace and understanding. Theirs can be a better world than the world of the Armenians between 1915 and 1923—but only if they truly understand the cruelty that humankind can wreak upon its own.

There are survivors of the Armenian Genocide in my district, and the horror of this ordeal is forever etched in their collective memories. Every year, survivors participate in commemoration ceremonies in Boston, Lowell, and other parts of Massachusetts' Merrimack Valley. The commemoration offers participants an opportunity to remind the media and citizens around the world of the tragedy suffered by the Armenians at the hands of the Turkish empire.

I represent a large and active Armenian community in my Congressional district. They

are hard-working and proud of their heritage. With great respect for them and for Armenians throughout the world, let us renew our commitment here today that the American people will oppose any and all instances of genocide.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, we join here today to honor the memory of the Armenians who were massacred and the Armenian survivors who fled into exile during the Ottoman Empire's genocide from 1915 to 1923. On April 24th 1915, the Ottoman Empire began what can be called nothing less than a policy of ethnic cleansing. The U.S. Ambassador to the Ottoman Empire, Henry Morgenthau, stated that he was confident the treatment he observed of the Armenian people from 1915 to 1923 was the greatest atrocity the human race had ever seen. ''I am confident that the whole history of the human race contains no such horrible episode as this,'' Morgenthau stated.

We are very fortunate and blessed to have so many Armenian people connected to our Nation. In my home state, the Armenian community is great, and so too are the gifts and talents they bring to Rhode Island. Our Nation must continue to take the time to educate and remember the atrocities suffered by over one and a half million Armenians during the Armenian Genocide. Future generations must understand what the community has been through to truly appreciate and honor all the talents they share with our Nation.

Over eighty-six years later after the tragedy began, Turkey still denies the Armenian Genocide despite overwhelming documentation of these atrocities. We cannot allow such ethnic violence and genocide to simply be covered up or ignored. Continued Congressional support to provide assistance to the people residing in Nagorno-Karabagh and upholding section 907 of the Freedom Support Act sends a strong, powerful message to Turkey that we will not allow Armenian communities to be threatened again.

The Armenian Genocide serves as a reminder to us all that we must do more to protect peace and human rights for all those around the world.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I join voices with my colleagues today to recognize the 86th anniversary of the Armenian Genocide.

Between 1894 and 1923, approximately two million Armenians were massacred, persecuted,and exiled by the Turk government of the Ottoman Empire. Despite all the facts, eyewitness accounts, recognition by countries throughout the world, and the findings of their own post-war courts, the government of Turkey still refuses to acknowledge the genocide ever occurred. We cannot allow such blatant disregard and denial to go on. Earlier this year, France's National Assembly passed legislation labeling the Armenian Genocide as genocide. We in the United States should do no less.

I well remember a speech made by Elie Wiesel at the White House in which he described the perils of indifference to suffering: ''In a way, to be indifferent to that suffering is what makes the human being inhuman. Indifference, after all, is more dangerous than anger or hatred. Anger can at times be creative. One writes a great poem, a great symphony . . . because one is angry at the injustice that one witnesses. But indifference is never creative. Even hatred at times may elicit a response. You fight it. You denounce it. You disarm it. Indifference elicits no response . . . Indifference is always the friend of the enemy, for it benefits the agressor—never his victim, whose pain is magnified when he or she feels forgotten. The political prisoner in his cell, the hungry children, the homeless refugees—not to respond to their plight, not to relieve their solitude by offering them a spark of hope is to exile them from human memory. And in denying their humanity we betray our own.

Let us all take a moment to reflect on the anniversary of the genocide of the Armenian people. We have a duty to those who have died and to those who survived to help preserve this memory forever. We must raise our thoughts and our voices on behalf of those who have suffered and died, and pray that such suffering is never again visited on any people anywhere on the Earth.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and remember the 1.5 million victims of the Armenian genocide, who were systematically slaughtered solely because of their race. While there is never a justification for genocide, in this case there also regrettably has never been an apology, and the criminals were never brought to justice. Such an unconscionable act, however, can never be forgotten. It is our duty to remember.

I also rise in tribute to the Armenian people who have fully recovered from this atrocity by maintaining their proud transitions and culture, becoming an integral part of America, and nine years ago, forming the Republic of Armenia.

The Ottoman Empire's last, desperate act was one of profound cruelty, tragic and gruesome beyond description. During World War I—a tumultuous, revolutionary time of great societal transformations and uncertain futures on the battlefields and at home—desperate Ottoman leaders fell back on the one weapon that could offer hope of personal survival. It is a weapon that is still used today, fed by fear, desperation, and hatred. It transforms the average citizen into a zealot, no longer willing to listen to reason. This weapon is, of course, nationalism. Wrongly directed, nationalism can easily result in ethnic strife and senseless genocide, committed in the name of false beliefs preached by immoral, irresponsible, tyrannical leaders.

Today I rise not to speak of the present, but in memory of the victims of the past, who suffered needlessly in the flames of vicious, destructive nationalism. On April 24, 1915, the leaders of the Ottoman government tragically chose to systematically exterminate an entire race of people. In this case, as in the case of Nazi Germany, nationalism became a weapon of cruelty and evil. Let us never forget the 1.5 million Armenians who died at the whim of wicked men and their misguided followers.

The story of the Armenian genocide is in itself appalling. It is against everything our government—and indeed all governments who strive for justice—stands for; it represents the most wicked side of humanity. What makes the Armenian story even more unfortunate is history has repeated itself in all corners of the world, and lessons that should have been learned long ago have been ignored. We must not forget the Armenian genocide, the Holocaust, Cambodia, Rwanda, or Bosnia. It is our duty that by remembering the millions who have been victims of genocide, we pledge ourselves to preventing such acts from repeating themselves.

It is an honor and privilege to represent a large and active Armenian population, many who have family members who were persecuted by their Ottoman Turkish rulers. Michigan's Armenian-American community has done much to further our state's commercial, political, and intellectual growth, just has it as done in communities across the country. And so I also rise today to honor to the triumph of the Armenian people, who have endured adversity and bettered our country.

The Armenian people have faced great trials and tests throughout their history. They have proved their resilience in the face of tragedy before, and I have no doubt that they will endure today's tragic occurrence, recognize that a madman's bullet can never put an end to a people's dreams, and keep moving forward on the path of peace and freedom.

Mr. Speaker, let no one, friend or foe, ever deny that the Armenian genocide occurred. Let us not forget the heinous nature of the crimes committed against the Armenian people. Let us promise to the world, as American citizens and citizens of the world, that we will never again allow such a crime to be perpetrated, and will not tolerate the forces of misguided nationalism and hate.

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the memories of those who perished in the Armenian Genocide.

April 24, 1915 is remembered and solemnly commemorated each year by the Armenian community. On this date, eighty-six years ago, a group of Armenian political, religious, and intellectual leaders were arrested in Constantinople, sent further inland, and killed. In the following years, Armenians living under Ottoman rule were deprived of their freedom, property, and ultimately, their lives. By 1923, over a million Armenians had been massacred, and another half a million more people had been deported.

This genocide, which was preceded by a series of massacres in 1894–1896 and in 1909 and was followed by another series of massacres in 1920, essentially dispersed Armenians and removed them from their historic homeland. The persecution of the Armenian people left psychological scars among the survivors and their families. No person should have to endure the trauma and horrors that they did.

On May 2, 1995, I had the honor of meeting the former Armenian Ambassador to the United States, Rouben Robert Shugarian, at a Congressional reception commemorating the 80th anniversary of the Armenian genocide. Ambassador Shugarian introduced me to several survivors of the 1915 genocide. This experience was a deeply moving and personal reminder of the 1.5 million Armenians who perished during the systematic extermination by the Ottoman Empire.

It is important that we not only commemorate the Armenian Genocide, but also honor the memory of others who lost their lives during this time. We must remember this horrific and shameful period in world history so that it will never be repeated again.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 86th anniversary of the beginning of the Armenian genocide. I rise today to commemorate this terrible chapter in human history, and to help ensure that it will never be forgotten.

On April 24, 1915, the Turkish government began to arrest Armenian community and political leaders. Many were executed without

ever being charged with crimes. Soon after the government deported most Armenians from Turkish Armenia, ordering that they resettle in what is now Syria. Many deportees never reached that destination.

From 1915 to 1918, more than a million Armenians died of starvation or disease on long marches, or were massacred outright by Turkish forces. From 1918 to 1923, Armenians continued to suffer at the hands of the Turkish military, which eventually removed all remaining Armenians from Turkey.

The U.S. Ambassador in Constantinople at the time, Henry Morgenthau, stated ''I am confident that the whole history of the human race contains no such horrible episode as this. The great massacres and persecutions of the past seem almost insignificant when compared to the sufferings of the Armenian race in 1915.''

We mark this anniversary of the start of the Armenian genocide because this tragedy for the Armenian people was a tragedy for all humanity. It is our duty to remember, to speak out and to teach future generations about the horrors of genocide and the oppression and terrible suffering endured by the Armenian people.

Sadly, we cannot say that such atrocities are history. We have only to recall the ''killing fields'' of Cambodia, mass killings in Bosnia and Rwanda, and ''ethnic cleansing'' in Kosovo to see that the threat of genocide persists. We must renew our commitment never to remain indifferent in the face of such assaults on humanity.

We also remember this day because it is a time for us to celebrate the contribution of the Armenian community in America—including hundreds of thousands in California—to the richness of our character and culture. The strength they have displayed in overcoming tragedy to flourish in this country is an example for all of us. Their success is moving testimony to the truth that tyranny and evil cannot extinguish the vitality of the human spirit.

The Armenian struggle continues to this day. But now with an independent Armenian state, the United States has the opportunity to contribute to a true memorial to the past by strengthening Armenia's democracy. We must do all we can through aid and trade to support Armenia's efforts to construct an open political and economic system.

Adolf Hitler, the architect of the Nazi Holocaust, once remarked ''Who remembers the Armenians?'' The answer is, we do. And we will continue to remember the victims of the 1915–23 genocide because, in the words of the philosopher George Santayana, ''Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it.''

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in commemorating the Armenian Genocide.

Today we solemnly remember the April 24, 1915 onslaught of the Ottoman Government's eight-year campaign of terror against its Armenian population. We mourn the systematic destruction of Armenian communities, the murder of one and a half million men, women, and children, and the forced deportation of over nearly one million others.

This somber anniversary, however, also bears a stark warning. Eighty-six years ago, the world's willingness to ignore the bloodshed against Armenians set the stage for its complacency during Hitler's attempt to annihilate the Jews. Today, the world's resolve against historical revisionism of the Armenian Genocide will be a key determinant of our ability to stand against similar attempts at Holocaust denial.

I am proud to acknowledge the Armenian Americans in my district and across the country who have dedicated themselves to preserving the memory of those who were persecuted, and to publicizing the United States records documenting this period. I join them and my colleagues in renewing our commitment to stand against governments that persecute their own people, and to insuring that no act of genocide will ever again go unnoticed or unmourned.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to join my colleagues in commemorating the Armenian Genocide, one of the great tragedies of the twentieth century. I also want to thank Representatives Pallone and Knollenberg for calling special orders tonight to remember this terrible event.

Eighty-six years ago, in the Ottoman Empire, the Armenian Genocide began with the arrest and murder of many of the Armenian community's religious, political, and intellectual leaders. Their deaths would be followed by the massacre of one and a half million men, women, and children, and the displacement and deportation of hundreds of thousands more.

Today, we pause to remember and mourn their loss. As we enter a new century, we carry with us, seared into our memories, the bloodshed of the last hundred years. That century added a new and terrible word to our vocabularies—genocide, the attempt to wipe out not merely a life, but a people and a culture. The Armenian Genocide stands as the first chilling example of that crime against humanity.

History matters. It must be remembered, and it must be acknowledged. If our past is a blank slate, we have no identity, no sense of place or of self, and nothing from which to learn. Failure to remember, acknowledge, and learn from the Armenian Genocide would only increase the scope of this terrible tragedy. The murders of a million and half people must not be compounded by the erasure of their memory. That would be one more act of genocide, and that we can never allow.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the Armenian victims of the genocide brought upon them by the Ottoman Turkish Empire and to commend my colleagues, the gentleman from New Jersey, Congressman FRANK PALLONE, and the gentleman from Michigan, Congressman JOE KNOLLENBERG, for organizing this special order today so that Members of the House may take the time to remember this solemn occasion.

April 24th marks the beginning of the systematic and deliberate campaign of genocide perpetrated by the Ottoman Turkish Empire in 1915. Over the following 8 years, 1.5 million Armenians were tortured and murdered, and more than half a million were forced from their homeland into exile. Regrettably, in the years since, the Turkish Government has refused to apologize for these atrocious acts, or even acknowledge the Armenian Genocide, despite overwhelming documentation.

By recognizing the victims of the genocide, we commemorate both those who perished and those who were able to begin a new life in communities like my home State of Rhode Island, where many Armenian families continue to thrive today. I hope that recognition of this atrocity will help erase the remnants of an era in which propaganda and deceit held precedence over truth and human dignity. Our nation must never allow oppression and persecution to pass without condemnation.

Armenians are a strong, resilient people, struggling to heal the wounds of the past. However, until the Armenian genocide is officially acknowledged, these wounds will remain. We should not deny the Armenian people their rightful place in history. To do so would dishonor them, and blight our understanding of the past. It is the best interests of our nation and the entire global community to remember the past and learn from history.

Even as we remember the tragedy and honor the dead, we also honor the living. Out of the ashes of their history, Armenians all across the world have clung to their identity and have prospered in new communities. The State of Rhode Island is fortunate to be home to such an organized and active community, whose members contribute and participate in every aspect of civic life.

As an ardent supporter of the Armenian-American community throughout my public service career, I am proud to honor the victims of the genocide by paying tribute to their memory, showing compassion for those who have suffered from such heinous prejudice, and never forgetting the pain that they have endured. Let us never forget their tragedy, and ensure that such crimes are never repeated.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank our two distinguished cochairmen of the Caucus on Armenian Issues, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) for arranging this special order today. I also want to extend my concerns to the Armenian-American community on this somber occasion.

Armenian-Americans have every reason to be proud of their heritage and their accomplishments in this country as well as their efforts in preserving their culture their attention to the memory of their matryrs. I join Armenians and their friends throughout the world who gather this week to honor the memories of the countless men, women, and children who perished 86 years ago in the Armenian Genocide.

Future generations should not be around to forget such horrible crimes, much less to deny their existence. Moreover, we can not say with any certainty that the atrocities of the American Genocide are left to history. We only have to recall the Holocaust, the killing fields of Cambodia, the massacres in Rwanda, and the ethnic cleansing in Bosnian and East Timor. That is why, in addition to never forgetting the first genocide of the 20th century, we must make certain that the fate that befell the Armenian people will never again be repeated.

Yet there are many governments which fail to acknowledge the existence of the Armenian Genocide which is a great disservice to all peoples who have suffered persecution and attempted annihilation. It is important therefore that our nation recognizes the Armenian Holocaust as an historical fact and history is preserved.

Accordingly, it is fitting that we pause and join in this commemoration, and asking all Americans to join in it. We must understand the lessons of the tragedies of this century such as the Armenian Genocide, and most important to resolve to prevent their repetition.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the victims of one of history's most terrible tragedies, the Armenian Genocide.

The Armenian community commemorates this atrocity each year on April 24, the day in 1915 when 300 Armenian leaders, intellectuals, and professionals were rounded up in Constantinople, deported, and killed. From 1915 through 1923, one and a half million Armenians had been massacred, 500,000 more had been deported, and the survivors were systematically deprived of their property, freedom, and dignity.

In my district, there is a significant population of Armenian survivors and their families that showed heroic courage and will to survive in the face of horrendous obstacles and adversities. These survivors are an important window into the past. It is through their unforgettable tragedy that we are able to share in their history and strong heritage.

Mr. Speaker, in the Armenian consciousness, the events of 1915 through 1923 are a vivid and constant presence. I am pleased my colleagues and I have the opportunity to pay tribute to the Armenian community in order to ensure the legacy of the genocide is remembered.

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Speaker, today, we remember April 24, 1915 as one of the darkest days of the 20th century. It was on this day that 300 Armenian leaders, writers, religious figures and professionals in Constantinople were gathered together, deported, and brutally murdered. In addition, thousands more Armenian citizens were dragged out of their homes and murdered in the streets. Remaining citizens were taken from their homes and marched off to concentration camps in the desert, where many died of starvation and thirst. Following the horrific events of April 24, 1915, the Ottoman Empire systematically deprived Armenians of their homes, property, freedom, and ultimately, their lives. By 1923, 1.5 million Armenian citizens had been murdered, while half a million had been deported.

Today, we must overcome the obstacle of denial. To this day, the Turkish Government continues to deny that the Armenian genocide ever took place. It is the responsibility of the United States and the international community to overcome this denial and recognize the horror that took place between 1915 and 1923. In addition, it is the duty of all nations of the world to ensure that such atrocities are never repeated.

The Armenian people have spent the last 10 years courageously establishing an Independent Republic of Armenia. These efforts are a testament to the strength and character of the Armenian people. The United States will continue to work with Armenia to ensure the establishment of a safe and stable environment in the Caucasus region. Recently, President Robert Kocharian met with Azerbaijani President Heydar Aliyev and international mediators from France, Russia and the United States to discuss peace options on the Karabagh conflict. I am confident that Albania will work towards a positive outcome in the Nagorno Karabagh Peace Talks.

Today, I join my colleagues in recognizing the Armenian Genocide of 1915, and while this is indeed a day of mourning, we must also take this opportunity to celebrate Armenia's commitment towards democracy in the face of adversity.

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in commemorating the 86th anniversary of the Armenian Genocide.

On this day I call on my colleagues and on the President to remember the words of author, Holocaust survivor, and Nobel Peace Prize winner Elie Wiesel, ''. . . to remain silent and indifferent is the greatest sin of all . . .''

While few would disagree with these words, we in the U.S. Government have failed to heed the warning contained within. It is time for the Government of the United States to do what it failed to do 86 years ago and to officially recognize the slaughter of more than 1.5 million Armenians by the Ottoman-Turkish Empire from 1915 to 1923 as a deliberate and systematic attempt to destroy the Armenian people, their culture and their heritage, as genocide.

It began with the killing of the community leaders and intellectuals 86 years ago today. That was followed by the disarming and murder of Armenians serving in the Ottoman-Turkish army. And this was followed by attacks on Armenian men, women and children, whom the Ottoman-Turks drove into the desert where they were left to either die of dehydration or starve.

This deliberate and systematic assault on the Armenian population would continue for 8 years. Then-U.S. Ambassador to the Ottoman-Turkish Empire, Henry Morgenthau, Sr., witnessed these events first hand and reported them back to Washington. Later he would write that ''the great massacres and persecutions of the past are insignificant when compared to the sufferings of the Armenian race in 1915.''

Despite reports such as this, the United States failed to intervene. As horrible as not coming to the aid of the Armenian people in 1915 was, what strikes me today is that the United States, 86 years later, still fails to recognize these events for what they were, genocide.

Last year I joined with 143 of my colleagues in sponsoring H. Res. 398, which would have acknowledged the events in Turkey of 1915 to 1923 as genocide and called on the President to do the same. Yet this resolution was not allowed to come to a vote on the floor. Even today, when President Bush issued a statement to commemorate what he called ''one of the great tragedies of history,'' he did not use the word genocide.

Mr. Speaker, if we fail to acknowledge these events for what they truly were, we are, as Elie Wiesel has said, ''committing the most dangerous sin of all.'' In Turkey, Germany, Yugoslavia and Rwanda, we have either acted too slowly or failed to act at all. How many more genocides are going to occur before we raise our own awareness of these events and condemn them for what they truly are.

Mr. Speaker, finally I would like to thank Mr. KNOLLENBERG and Mr. PALLONE, the co-chairs of the Congressional Caucus on Armenian Issues, for organizing this special order tonight. Recognition and acknowledgment of the Armenian Genocide is an important step toward defeating that indifferent spirit which has allowed events such as these to occur again and again. I am glad that I am joined by so many of my colleagues who share this view tonight.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues tonight in somber remembrance of the Armenian Genocide. Early in the 20th century, during World War I and its aftermath, the Ottoman Empire attempted the complete liquidation of the Armenian population of Eastern Anatolia.

We must come down to the House floor tonight not only to remember this tragic event, but we must also proclaim that the Armenian Genocide is an historical fact. There are many who deny that this first genocide of the 20th century actually took place.

The American Ambassador to the Ottoman Empire in 1919 was an eyewitness. In his memoirs, he said, ''When the Turkish authorities gave the order for these deportations they were merely giving the death warrant to an entire race. They understood this well and in their conversations with me made no particular attempt to conceal this fact.''

He went on to describe what he saw at the Euphrates River. He said, as our eyes and ears in the Ottoman Empire, ''I have by no means told the most terrible details, for a complete narration of the sadistic orgies of which they, the Armenian men and women, are victims can never be printed in an American publication. Whatever crimes the most perverted instincts of the human mind can devise, whatever refinements of persecution and injustice the most debased imagination can conceive, became the daily misfortune of the Armenian people.''

We can never forget that 8 days before he invaded Poland, Adolf Hitler turned to his inner circle and said, ''Who today remembers the extermination of the Armenians?'' The impunity with which the Turkish Government acted in annihilating the Armenian people emboldened Adolf Hitler and his inner circle to carry out the Holocaust of the Jewish people.

It is time for Turkey to acknowledge this genocide, because only in that way can the Turkish Government and its people rise above it. The German Government has been quite forthcoming in acknowledging the Holocaust, and in doing so it has at least been respected by the peoples of the world for its honesty. Turkey should follow that example rather than trying to deny history.

It is also time—indeed it is far overdue—for our Congress to recognize the Armenian Genocide.

Mr. Speaker, I again call on my colleagues to recognize the Armenian Genocide and to urge my fellow Americans to remember this tragic event.

## EARTH DAY

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I take this moment to acknowledge Earth Day. We have made great strides in protecting our treasures, protecting our natural resources, and in protecting our environment. So, Mr. Speaker, since the first Earth Day in 1970, Americans have found many ways to promote the preservation of our environment and to focus a great deal of attention on the work that is left to be done.

Earth Day has always been a day to celebrate the environment and our natural heritage. It has also served to

mark the importance of environmental protection and responsible living. As the leaders of this great Nation, we must collaborate in a bipartisan fashion to promote environmental policies that make sense to this country. We do not want to continue to drink water that is contaminated and polluted. We do not want to breathe smoke-filled air. We do not want to develop life-threatening diseases from water, air, and other environmental hazards. Poor environmental management affects everyone, and environmental justice does, in fact, matter.

We ask, how many children must develop lead poisoning before we get serious about that issue. Do we want the Nation's most precious animals to perish from the Earth? Do we want to live in neighborhoods that are surrounded by nuclear power plants? Do we want to breathe a thick layer of smog from contaminated air before we feel that a clean air policy is important? Will there come a time when we must go to the local grocery store and purchase bottled air?

Many of our urban communities are currently in serious unrest due to many different environmental problems. Today we must make a new dedication toward bringing a more proper balance to the widening gap between community standards based upon their economic status. People in our poorest communities are struggling for environmental justice, from Louisiana's ''Cancer Alley'' to the Native American reservations' nuclear problems to the people along the border in the maquiladora region, and for the communities where I live on the south and west sides of Chicago.

Furthermore, millions of people live in housing surrounded by physical environments that are overburdened with environmental problems and hazards untold, waste, toxins, dioxins, incinerators, petrochemical plants, polluted air and unsafe drinking water. These factors all combine to pose a real and grave threat to the future of our Nation's public health.

So, as we mark the 31st anniversary of the first Earth Day, we glory in the progress that has been made, but must strive to continue to develop strong environmental policies that help protect our Earth.

## COMMEMORATION OF ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor on this very special and important day to join my colleagues and individuals throughout the world in commemorating the 86th anniversary of the Armenian Genocide. We must never forget the tragedy of the Armenian Genocide, and this commemoration makes an important contribution to making sure that we never do.

When most people hear the word ''genocide'' they immediately think of Hitler and his persecution of the Jews during World War II. Many individuals are unaware that the first genocide of the 20th century occurred during World War I and was perpetrated by the Ottoman Empire against the Armenian people.

Concerned that the Armenian people would move to establish their own government, the Ottoman Empire embarked on a reign of terror that resulted in the massacre of over 1.5 million Armenians, men, women and children. This atrocious crime began on April 15, 1915, when the Ottoman Empire arrested, exiled, and eventually killed hundreds of Armenian religious, political, and intellectual leaders.

Once they had eliminated the Armenian people's leadership, they turned their attention to the Armenians that were serving in the Ottoman army. These soldiers were disarmed and placed in labor camps where they were either starved or executed. The Armenian people, lacking political leadership and deprived of young, able-bodied men who could fight against the Ottoman onslaught were then deported from every region of Turkish Armenia. The images of human suffering from the Armenian Genocide are graphic and as haunting as the pictures of the Holocaust.

Why, then, it must be asked, are so many people unaware of the Armenian Genocide? I believe the answer is found in the international community's response to this disturbing event or, I should say, lack of response. At the end of World War I, those responsible for ordering and implementing the Armenian Genocide were never brought to justice, and the world casually forgot about the suffering and pain of the Armenian people, and that proved to be a grave mistake. In a speech that is now recorded, a speech made by Adolf Hitler just prior to the invasion of Poland in 1939, he justified his brutal tactics with the infamous statement, ''Who remembers the extermination of the Armenians?''

Tragically, 6 years later, the Nazis had exterminated 6 million Jews. Never has the phrase, ''those who forget the past will be destined to repeat it'' been more applicable. If the international community had spoken out against this merciless slaughtering of the Armenian people instead of ignoring it, the horrors of the Holocaust might never have taken place.

Mr. Speaker, as we commemorate the 86th anniversary of the Armenian Genocide, I believe it is time to give this event its rightful place in history. This afternoon and this evening, let us pay homage to those who fell victim to the Ottoman oppressors and tell the story, the story of the forgotten genocide. This, for the sake of the Armenian heritage, is certainly a story that must be heard.

ARMENIAN ASSEMBLY OF AMERICA
*Washington, DC.*

The Armenian Assembly of America, Commemoration of the Armenian Genocide

On April 24, we remember and mourn the victims of the Armenian Genocide of 1915. Not a single family went untouched; none were spared the pain of that brutal slaughter. Because its victims and witnesses were ignored and its lessons unlearned, the Genocide set the stage for the Holocaust and the genocides that followed. The 20th century's first genocide continues to cast its dark shadow over the 21st century.

The Turkish people and the Republic of Turkey should recognize that it is in their own best interest to come to terms with the role their Ottoman predecessors played in the Armenian Genocide and reject denial. No other country in the world should support Turkey's indefensible position. There is a growing awareness and understanding of this fact, even within turkey itself. We were encouraged this year by reports from Turkey that public discussion of the topic has increased significantly.

It is our hope that the Turkish people, confronted with international recognition and spurred by desire to finally join the European family of nations, will reconcile with their past. Such reconciliation will lay the groundwork to build a better future.

HIRAIR HOVNANIAN,
*Chairman, Board of Trustees.*
VAN Z. KRIKORIAN,
*Chairman, Board of Directors.*

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

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

## REMEMBERING THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

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

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend those who join me tonight in educating the world about the Armenian Genocide. I think I bring some special province to this occasion in that I am the grandson of Oscar Chaderjain, a first-generation Armenian American, and the son of Mary Chaderjain. So therefore, this is an issue that is near and dear to my heart.

Mr. Speaker, for those who question whether the genocide ever occurred in the first instance, I must say that I have no doubt that it did. My grandfather was a first-hand witness to the bloodshed. He often told us of his experience of holding his uncle's arms, with his cousin, as Turkish soldiers executed that grammar school teacher. He also told us that the world first took notice of the genocide on April 24, 1915, when 254 Armenian intellectuals were arrested by Turkish authorities in Istanbul and taken to the distant provinces of Ayash and Chankiri, where many of them were later massacred.

Throughout the genocide, Turkish authorities ordered the evacuation of

Armenians out of villages in Turkish Armenia and Asia Minor. As they were evacuated, the men were often shot immediately. Prisoners were starved, beaten, and murdered by unmerciful guards.

This was not the case for everyone, though. Not everyone was sent to concentration camps. For example, in Trebizond, many innocent people were put on ships and then thrown overboard into the Black Sea.

The atrocities of the Armenian Genocide were still being carried out in 1921 when Kemalists were found abusing and starving prisoners to death. In total, as has been pointed out, over 1.5 million Armenians were killed. This does not include the half a million or more who were forced to flee their homes and flee to foreign countries.

Mr. Speaker, together with Armenians all over the world and people of conscience, I would like to honor those who lost their homes, their freedom and their lives during this dark period. Many survivors of the genocide came to the United States seeking a new beginning, my grandfather among them. The experiences of his childhood so fueled his desire for freedom for his Armenian homeland that in the first world war he returned there where he was awarded two medals of honor for bravery in his fight against fascism.

It is important that we do not forget about these terrible atrocities because, as other speakers have said and as Winston Churchill said, ''Those who do not learn from the past are destined to repeat it.''

For those in America who think this is only a sad story, and it certainly is a sad story, they need to take note that Armenia has taken great strides in achieving its independence over the past 8 years.

□ 1915

Once it was a captive nation struggling to preserve its centuries-old customs. Today the Republic of Armenia is an independent, freedom-loving nation and a friend to the United States and to the democratic world.

Let us remember today, April 24, 2001, marks the 86th anniversary of one of the most gruesome human atrocities of the 20th century. Sadly, it was the systematic killing of 1.5 million Armenian men, women, and children.

Let us remember that prior to his invasion of Poland in 1939 and subsequent Nazi oppression, Adolph Hitler attempted to justify his own actions by simply stating, ''After all, who remembers the Armenians?'' As we do not ignore the occurrence of the Nazi Holocaust, we must not ignore the Armenian genocide.

I believe many people across the world will concede this is a very tender and difficult event to discuss. What we do tonight is not to condemn the Turkish people. Rather, it is to recognize the actions of the past and past wrongs in order to ensure that we do not repeat them.

However, as a strong, fervent supporter of the Republic of Armenia, I am alarmed that Turkish Government officials still refuse to acknowledge what happened, and instead are attempting to rewrite history.

It is vital that we do not let political agendas get in the way of doing what is right. I will continue to call upon the Turkish Government to accept complete accountability for the Armenian genocide. To heal the wounds of the past, the Turkish Government must first recognize its responsibility for actions of past leaders.

Nothing we can do or say, Mr. Speaker, will bring back those who perished; but we can honor those who lost their homes, their freedom, and their lives by teaching future generations the lessons of the atrocities.

## PAYING TRIBUTE TO THOSE LOST IN THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening, as my colleagues and I do every year at this time, in a proud but solemn tradition to remember and pay tribute to the victims of one of history's worst crimes against humanity, the Armenian genocide of 1929 through 1933.

The genocide began 86 years ago today. Mr. Speaker, I have long supported legislation that would put the U.S. House of Representatives officially on the record in recognizing the Armenian genocide.

Last fall, the bipartisan Armenian genocide bill was approved by the Committee on International Relations by a vote of 24 to 11. On October 19 of last year, the legislation was finally scheduled for a vote on the House floor. I am confident that if the vote had ever occurred, the Armenian genocide legislation would have passed with overwhelming bipartisan support.

In a last-minute effort to ensure the legislation never came to the floor for a vote, the Turkish Government sent a threat to President Clinton that American soldiers stationed in the region would be in jeopardy if a vote ever took place. This threat was enough for President Clinton to send a letter to the Speaker of this House requesting that the legislation be pulled from the schedule.

Essentially, the Speaker and President Clinton, and therefore the government of the United States, both executive and legislative, succumbed to the threats of the Turkish Government. I believe this was shameful. Italy and France did not give in to the Turkish Government last year when both these nations approved an Armenian genocide resolution.

I am also proud that State and local governments here in the United States are stepping out in front of the Federal Government on this issue. Earlier this month, Maryland approved an Armenian genocide resolution, becoming the 27th State to make such a recognition.

Congress, Mr. Speaker, should not be forced by a foreign government to deny or ignore the U.S. record and response to the events that took place in the Ottoman Empire from 1915 to 1923. Those of us who have been fighting for this recognition will not give up. We are committed, and we will not quit fighting until this Nation finally recognizes the Armenian genocide as genocide.

President Bush had a golden opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to recognize the genocide today in annual statements made by the President. From statements that candidate Bush made, one would have believed as President he would use the word ''genocide'' today. But sadly, today, the President chose not to use the word ''genocide,'' thus minimizing the events from 1915 to 1923 that we commemorate this evening.

I know many Armenian-Americans will feel betrayed because of President Bush's inaction today. In public statements and letters to Armenian organizations and individuals during his Presidential campaign, Bush said, ''The 20th century was marred by wars of unimaginable brutality, mass murders, and genocide. History records that the Armenians were the first people of the last century to have endured these cruelties.''

Bush went on to say, ''If elected President, I would ensure that our Nation properly recognizes the tragic suffering of the Armenian people.'' But it is unfortunate that the President did not stand by these words today.

I am trying not to be partisan here, Mr. Speaker. Obviously, I am disappointed with President Bush, as I was disappointed with President Clinton before him.

For anyone who has any doubts about the truth of the Armenian genocide, they can just go down the street to the National Archives, where volumes of historical records prove what really happened. Five years from now, we will have the opportunity to visit a genocide museum here in Washington. The museum, which will be located at 14th and G streets in the Northwest area of our Nation's Capital, will be a permanent reminder of the atrocities of 1915 to 1923.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the remarks of my friend, Ross Vartian, the director of planning for this new museum, who discussed this issue.

The statement by Mr. Vartian is as follows:

STATEMENT BY ROSS VARTIAN, DIRECTOR OF PLANNING, ARMENIAN NATIONAL INSTITUTE, KNIGHTS OF VARTAN TIMES SQUARE MARTYR'S DAY EVENT, APRIL 22, 2001

The Armenian National Institute, or ANI, extends its deep appreciation to the Knights of Vartan for once again organizing this year's Martyr's Day Commemoration. We recognize the leadership of Grand Commander Robert Barsam, this event's Chairman Sam Azadian, Martyr's Day Committee

members Hirant Gulian & Leon Nigogosian, and all the other dedicated volunteers who made it possible for us to be here today to remember our losses, celebrate our survivors and commit to a future without Genocide.

I am here today to talk about the future Armenian Genocide Museum and memorial. When complete, this complex in our nation's capital just two blocks from the White House will be the first ever Museum and Memorial about the Armenian Genocide anywhere in the Diaspora.

On behalf of the Armenian National Institute, I am pleased to outline our vision for what will be in the not too distant future a state of the art museum and memorial complex dedicated to Armenian Genocide remembrance, research and education, as well as serving as another powerful voice for Genocide prevention.

Washington is justifiably renown for the quality of its museums, and we have set as our standard to match the best that our nation's capital has to offer. Therefore, we warmly welcome the solidarity and support of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum, whose superb exhibits and programs have inspired and empowered millions.

In all candor, we have just begun our work. The acquisition of this marquee property in the heart of Washington, DC has served as the catalyst to undertake a comprehensive, multi-year planning,design and development process. We are currently reviewing proposals from competitive teams or architects, museum designers and property developers to recommend the best space utilization option for the properties we have acquired. We are aware that only the best professional talent will suffice for our purposes.

The Armenian National Institute accepts the privilege and responsibility of creating a physical complex second to none and of creating exhibits and programs that will be as inspirational and empowering as those in the Holocaust Memorial Museum and other leading interactive museums around the world.

ANI is also aware of the special responsibility of completing the first ever Armenian Genocide Museum and Memorial outside Armenia. Fully recognizing that the entire community will wish to engage, ANI will seek the active participation of our incredibly diverse Armenian Diaspora and ancestral homeland. This is, after all, a presentation about all Armenians for humankind. No organization would have the right to present the modern Armenian saga without first seeking out the resources and perspectives of the entire community.

The museum and memorial complex will be a permanent place for generations of visitors that will be made possible by all Armenians, joined by others of good will who appreciate its universal moral implications.

Our project is timely. Those who would deny the Armenian Genocide are now limited to Turkish officials and those beyond Turkey who invoke political and economic rationales for their support.

In the academic arena, the uncontestable fact of the Armenian Genocide has been overwhelmingly affirmed. Similarly, in secondary schools and universities throughout the western world, students of Holocaust and Genocide studies routinely examine the case of the Armenian Genocide to learn its specific and universal lessons.

Nevertheless, the struggle continues between remembrance and denial—and remembrance and indifference.

It is our hope that this center will serve as the nexus to broaden awareness of the Armenian Genocide throughout the academic and educational communities whose focus is human rights, the responsibility of majorities towards minorities, and the horrified consequences for peoples and groups at risk in the absence of safeguards.

But it is also our hope that this place will provide public officials with a greater degree of moral conviction, courage and vision so that they summarily reject the incessant threats that emanate from Turkish officials to sever diplomatic and economic relations when any government dares to affirm the Armenian Genocide. The public officials with you today have demonstrated by their presence and other official actions that they reject Turkey's denials and threats.

Ladies and gentlemen . . .

Through this facility, we will remind the world of Hitler's chilling cynicism on humankind's predilection to forget.

Through this facility, we will enthusiastically support collaborative work between turks and Armenians. We have seen in this great country the redemptive value of facing history squarely, and we will promote a dialogue to secure the same benefits for our two peoples.

Through this facility we will promote international condemnation of and action against any government of people that attempts to do what was done to our people at the beginning of the last century.

We must succeed in this unprecedented effort in the name of our martyred millions, in tribute to those who survived and established new Armenian communities throughout the world, and in honor of countless non-Armenians who protested this crime against humanity and who saved tens of thousands from oblivion.

Finally ladies and gentlemen, we will succeed not only to remember the past but also to enhance the security of the people of Armenian and Karabagh—and to help insure that the world never forgets the cataclysmic price of indifference and inaction.

We look forward to this historic challenge and we welcome all who wish to join us. Thank you in advance for your generous support.

Mr. Speaker, the Armenian genocide is a painful subject to discuss for me and others. We must never forget, though, what happened, and never cease speaking out. We must overcome the denials and the indifference, and keep alive the memory and truth of what happened to the Armenian people in the past, as we work to see in this tragic history that it never be repeated.

---

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

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

---

## RECOGNIZING THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

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

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I also rise here this evening to speak of one of the great horrors of our century, and that is the Armenian genocide. As a member of the Congressional Caucus on Armenian Issues, I once again join a large number of colleagues in recognizing the great tragedy of the Armenian people.

As we all know and has been stated here several times tonight, this genocide occurred in 1915 when the Ottoman Empire began to force Armenians from their homeland, and it lasted until 1923. These 8 years saw the deaths of 1.5 million innocent victims and 500,000 exiled survivors.

Despite the tremendous magnitude of the genocide, the world stood by as families were torn asunder and millions of lives were taken. Therefore, today, as we stand in recognition of the victims of this Armenian genocide, we also stand in recognition of the guilt of complicity of all nations that turned away when faced with this great tragedy.

There is no doubt that calling events by their rightful name, genocide, is an important element of this recognition of responsibility.

Had we heeded the lessons that emerged from the massacre, perhaps we could have avoided other great tragedies in this century. In quietly letting the sorrow of the Armenian people go unresolved, however, we allow their tragedy to repeat itself over and over again in Germany in the 1930s and 1940s, in Rwanda in the 1990s, and elsewhere throughout the world.

Today, as we once again honor the victims of the Armenian genocide, on behalf of the Sixth District of Massachusetts, I also honor the commitment and perseverance of Armenian-Americans who have tirelessly struggled to ensure that the great sorrow of their people becomes known to all people.

As we in Congress continue to confront issues of international peace and security, we would do well to remember this message: never forget.

---

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

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

---

## HONORING THE MEMORY OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

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

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by thanking the Armenia caucus for bringing us together to honor the memory of the greatest tragedy of Armenian history. This tragedy holds a valuable historical lesson for all of us.

I myself in California growing up got to know several Armenian families. One man, one elderly man in one of the families that I knew, he was the sole survivor of the Armenian genocide. So the lessons are not just for those that were directly involved; it is for all of

us. It is for all of us to know it is important that we as Americans acknowledge this genocide. That is what we are talking about today.

Some 56 years ago, my father entered Dachau concentration camp in Germany with the Seventh Army. He took photographs there that day of those surviving that genocide, those starving people that the American troops fed and liberated.

He remembers the quote from Adolph Hitler when Hitler was cautioned by the German chiefs of staff about his genocidal plans. Of course, as we have heard tonight, Hitler's retort was, ''Who remembers the Armenians?''

Well, 86 years ago today, the Ottoman Empire set out on a well-orchestrated campaign to exterminate a race of people. On that day, they began the campaign by focusing on the Armenian religious and political and intellectual leaders that they arrested in Constantinople, and they murdered them.

In the years that followed, Armenians living under Ottoman rule were systematically deprived of their property, their individual rights, and ultimately, of their lives. As we have heard, between 1915 and 1923, the number of deaths was horrific. Some 1.5 million Armenians were murdered and 500,000 were deported from their homeland; and at the end of these 8 years, the Armenian population of Anatolia and western Armenia was virtually eliminated.

Henry Morgenthau, the U.S. ambassador to the Ottoman Empire at the time, characterized this as a death warrant to a whole race. Morgenthau recognized that this campaign was ethnic cleansing. It is unfortunate that the Turkish Government to this day does not recognize this. Willful ignorance of the lessons of history all but ensures that those mistakes can be made again.

In the last Congress, I joined 143 of my colleagues to cosponsor a congressional resolution recognizing the Armenian genocide. The resolution expressly differentiated between the Ottoman Empire and the modern day Republic of Turkey. We understand these are not the same governments.

Unfortunately, despite hard-fought efforts, the resolution was never able to come to the House floor last Congress because of concerns, in my mind concerns without merit, with Turkey's reaction. I believed then, as I do now, that it remains important for the Congress to go on the record.

Beyond affirming the U.S. record on the Armenian genocide, the resolution encouraged awareness and understanding of what genocide is, and this crime against humanity has been compounded to this day by those who refuse to recognize it. The victims and their families, many of whom live in the United States, are owed this recognition. That is why we must have this resolution pass this floor.

In my home State of California, the State Board of Education has incorporated the story of Armenian genocide in the social studies curriculum. California is doing the right thing.

As of last September, California law now permits victims of the Armenian genocide and their heirs to use California courts to pursue unpaid insurance claims. The tentative settlement reached between heirs of Armenian genocide victims and New York Life Insurance over claims that New York Life failed to honor are an estimated 2,500 valid insurance claims. That is a good start.

The Armenian genocide is not simply a problem of the past; it has implications for the future. Our actions now will lay the groundwork for addressing genocide whenever it threatens to erupt again.

Many of the survivors of the genocide and their descendents now live, as I say, in the United States, many in California. This 85-year-old tragedy is more than an event in history. By recognizing and learning about the crime against humanity, we can begin to honor the courage of its victims and commemorate the strides made by its survivors.

□ 1930

## HIV AND AIDS PANDEMIC HAS DEVASTATED MANY COUNTRIES IN AFRICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Michigan). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise before my colleagues to talk about the HIV and AIDS pandemic. The AIDS pandemic has devastated many countries in Africa, leaving few men and women and children untouched. Sub-Sahara Africa has been far more severely infected by AIDS than any other part of the world. In 16 countries, all in sub-Sahara Africa, more than 1 in 10 adults is affected by the HIV virus.

According to a joint report issued by the United Nations Program on HIV and AIDS, one-half or more of all 15 year-olds will eventually die of AIDS in some of the worst areas affected such as Zambia, South Africa, and Botswana. Over 34 million HIV/AIDS cases are in the world, and 24 million or 70 percent are in Africa.

I recently visited Botswana to see up close the destruction this disease has caused. Approximately 35 percent of Botswana's adult population is affected by HIV. AIDS has cut the life expectancy in Botswana from 71 years to 39, according to Karen Stanecki of the United States Census Bureau during an appearance at an international AIDS conference held in South Africa in July of 2000.

The visit that I made strengthened my conviction to do my part in bringing the awareness to this issue and to work with my colleagues in Congress, national governments, State and local governments, and activists around the world to do more for the people who have the virus and to do more to stop the spread of the disease.

Soon after I returned from Botswana, I sponsored an HIV/AIDS roundtable discussion in my district that consists of public health officials, community activists, HIV/AIDS case managers, community health providers, doctors, individuals suffering from HIV/AIDS. I sponsored this roundtable because my district in eastern North Carolina has a high incidence of HIV/AIDS.

Eastern North Carolina, which includes more than my district, all on the south side of 95 North, the Interstate, about 25 counties indeed have 30 percent of the State's HIV disease. That only represents, by the way, only 20 percent of our population. Clearly this is an issue that is affecting us both domestically as well as internationally.

Given the loss of lives AIDS has caused, the destruction of entire communities, the long-term impact of economic growth, we must step up our effort to fight the devastating disease. With children dying at the age of 15 and the life expectancy in most of Africa of 45 years for children born in some countries, something must be done. Indeed, children being born in these countries cannot expect to live long. There is very little future.

To ignore the problem is to our own peril, but to know the impact of AIDS and then to ignore it is to our own shame.

I applaud the pharmaceutical companies for dropping the lawsuit to prevent South Africa from importing cheaper anti-AIDS drugs and medicines. Now we must increase efforts to provide affordable anti-AIDS drugs to all who need them. I challenge the pharmaceutical industry, countries worldwide, and the United States government to engage in a collected effort to get the necessary drugs to people infected with HIV/AIDS.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD two publications on this issue, one from The New York Times and the other from The Washington Post, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 21, 2001]

DESPITE LEGAL VICTORY, SOUTH AFRICA HESITATES ON AIDS DRUGS

(By Rachel L. Swarns)

JOHANNESBURG, April 20.—With the Champagne consumed and the celebration over, advocates for AIDS patients today turned their attention from the South African government's legal victory over the drug industry and looked to the future.

With sinking hearts, many concluded that the next big barrier to expanding access to AIDS drugs might well be the government itself.

The drug industry conceded South Africa's right to import cheaper brand-name medicines, but the governing African National Congress was not aggressively charting the way forward.

Instead, in its online newspaper, the party was ticking off countless reasons why the country should think twice about providing lifesaving AIDS cocktails.

In this, the ruling party was echoing the health minister, Dr. Manto Tshabalala-Msimang, who dashed the hopes of her allies on Thursday when she made it clear that providing AIDS drugs was not a government priority, even though the drug industry had just dropped its objections to a law that allows South Africa to import brand-name drugs at the lowest prices available.

When pressed about her plans for treating the nation's 4.7 million people infected with H.I.V., Dr. Tshabalala-Msimang insisted that the government was already offering adequate care without costly AIDS drugs.

Mark Heywood, a lawyer who helped organize the street protests that applied pressure on the drug industry to drop its lawsuit against South Africa, said today that the minister's remarks felt ''like a stab in the back.'' And her comments and those from the A.N.C. have revived concerns about the government's commitment to providing the medicines in a country with more people infected with H.I.V. than any other.

This morning, Mr. Heywood and other advocates for AIDS patients gathered to consider a new campaign to pressure drug companies to lower prices of AIDS drugs in the private sector. But they also decided to focus on the government, and to turn up the heat if necessary, to persuade health officials to work harder to bring the AIDS drugs readily available in the West to the poor in South Africa.

''Our work on the court case shows our willingness to enter into partnership, but we will not shirk from very difficult engagements with the government,'' Mr. Heywood said. ''Yesterday was an important and empowering victory. But we're measuring success by bringing real medicines to real people.''

On Thursday, 39 drug companies agreed to drop a lawsuit intended to block a law that would expand access to cheaper medicines. Among other things, it would allow the government to buy brand-name drugs that advocates say are sold more cheaply in India and Brazil than in South Africa.

But the law, which will take effect in several months, is unlikely to expand access significantly. The drugs are still expensive for South Africa, and the health care system here, particularly in rural areas, is still largely unprepared to administer such complicated medicines and to monitor patients.

Advocates for AIDS patients acknowledge those obstacles. Still, many had hoped to hear a sense of urgency from the government about addressing them.

Other African countries that are poorer than South Africa and that have even weaker health systems have already moved ahead with pilot programs that provide anti-retrovirals at a low cost. The countries include Ivory Coast, Uganda and Senegal.

Botswana, a relatively wealthy African country, hopes to provide the medicines to all of its citizens who need them by the end of the year.

Many people here hoped South Africa would be next. AIDS activists want the government to consider financing plans, to start training nurses and doctors and upgrading local hospitals and to put together a national treatment plan.

Other activists are pressuring the government to apply for special permission to import cheap generic versions of the patented AIDS drugs, which would finally bring the ''cocktails'' within reach.

But the government is clearly reluctant to take the preliminary steps to get those drugs to the dying.

Some suspect this reluctance may come from President Thabo Mbeki, who has publicly questioned the safety of the drugs and whether H.I.V. causes the disease. After being assailed here and abroad for his stance, Mr. Mbeki withdrew from the AIDS debate last year.

And in recent months, the government has taken positive steps, announcing a pilot program to distribute anti-retrovirals to pregnant women to prevent transmission to newborn; accepting a drug company donation to treat opportunistic infections; and developing guidelines for the proper use of anti-retrovirals in the private sector.

But Dr. Thabalala-Msimang emphasized that programs to provide anti-retrovirals for adults were not coming anytime soon.

''For the moment, the best advice is to treat opportunistic infections,'' she said on Thursday. She added that such treatment, along with improved diet and counseling, would ''allow people with H.I.V. to manage their lives and participate adequately.''

''We are indeed treating people who are H.I.V. positive,'' Dr. Thabalala-Mismang continued, in response to repeated questions about when anti-retroviral programs might be available. ''It is not correct to say that just because we do not provide anti-retrovirals that we are not treating people.''

---

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 23, 2001]

GLOBAL AIDS STRATEGY MAY PROVE ELUSIVE; MORE FUNDS AVAILABLE, BUT CONSENSUS LACKING

(By Karen DeYoung)

After a string of victories in the long battle for lower-priced AIDS drugs in poor countries, health care experts, AIDS activists and major donors are facing what might be an even tougher challenge—agreeing on a unified strategy to fight the pandemic.

''Now is when the hard part starts,'' said Johnathan Quick, head of the essential medicines division of the Geneva-based World Health Organization.

One debate among health experts and activists concerns whether to concentrate new resources on sophisticated treatment—even at newly reduced prices—to improve and prolong the lives of those in advanced stages of the disease, or on AIDS prevention, less expensive treatment of AIDS-related diseases and basic health programs aimed at stopping the disease's spread. More than 36 million people worldwide, the vast majority of them in sub-Saharan Africa, are infected with the human immunodeficiency virus (HIV), which causes AIDS.

Resolving this and other differences has taken on new urgency as donors have indicated willingness to provide substantial new funds for a global AIDS campaign. Uneasy about a lack of coordination, some donors, led by Britain's Department for International Development, this month issued what some described as an ultimatum to UNAIDS—the consortium of U.N. agencies and the World Bank that oversees international AIDS efforts.

''They told us they want something put on the table,'' said a senior representative of a UNAIDS member. ''They challenged us to have a common view.''

At a meeting in London today, members of UNAIDS are scheduled to present a broad proposal for an international AIDS trust fund administered by both contributing and recipient countries. Participating in the meeting will be delegates from the United States, Britain and other members of the Group of 8; the Scandinavian countries and the Netherlands; and major private donors, including the Gates Foundation. Questions about how to spend the money would be decided by a joint governing committee formed of donors and aid recipients.

Getting various organizations and countries in line for a common approach has not been easy. The United Nations was thrown into an uproar late last month when Carol Bellamy, executive director of the U.N. Children's Fund, declared in a New York Times op-ed article that ''UNICEF is prepared to step forward as the lead United Nations agency in the procurement of anti-retroviral drugs on behalf of individual countries.''

That offer, reportedly not cleared with U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan, upset WHO Director General Gro Harlem Brundtland, who saw it as a premature policy proposal, as well as a public challenge to WHO's primacy on AIDS. U.N. agencies in charge of development and population, among others, voiced disapproval, even as they, too, clamored to claim a share of money that is not yet available.

''They are sort of like sharks when there's blood in the water,'' said one close observer of the U.N. process. ''There is money in the air.''

Apart from the United Nations, others have proposed uses for new funding. Early this month, Harvard economist Jeffrey Sachs proposed establishment of a massive global AIDS fund to purchase anti-retroviral drugs for Africa. AIDS activists criticized the proposal, which would involve patent-holding pharmaceutical companies, for not favoring generic producers who have offered even cheaper prices.

Two days later, Microsoft founder Bill Gates called a news conference to warn that the treatment emphasis risked undermining prevention efforts. Gates's family foundation has given hundreds of millions of dollars to the international fight against AIDS—the most of any single donor.

After years of being shamed by international pressure, the major pharmaceutical companies are now offering the three-drug anti-retroviral AIDS ''cocktail'' to some poor countries for less than a tenth of the developed world's $10,000 per patient per year starting price. Patent-busting generic producers have offered even lower prices.

Nongovernmental activists riding high after humbling the pharmaceutical industry on the price issue are calling on African governments to immediately start positioning themselves to provide the drugs. They point to Brazil, whose government produces its own anti-retrovirals and distributes them for free.

''I think the big decisions are not with the co-opted northern bureaucrats,'' said James Love of the Washington-based Consumer Project on Technology, a Ralph Nader-affiliated group that analyzes drug pricing. Love, who along with other activists advocates bypassing the big companies and going straight into import and production of generic drugs, called on African governments to ''have the guts'' to move forward with new authorizing laws.

But some have warned that such a strategy is ultimately counterproductive. They point out that Africa has neither the health infrastructure nor the personnel to support widespread use of the complicated treatment regime. There are currently 14 anti-retroviral drugs, patented by a handful of major companies, used in various combinations to compose the three-drug cocktail. New drugs will be needed as existing compounds become less effective, and many companies are involved in the search for a vaccine.

The companies have argued that generic producers do not pay for research and development, and unless the world trade system can guarantee that future patents will be protected, research funds will be diminished.

Many Africans say they don't want to be pushed. ''We wouldn't like any further delay'' in caring for South Africa's more than 4 million HIV-infected people, Foreign Minister Nkosazana Dlamini-Zuma said last week as the major pharmaceutical companies withdrew from a three-year lawsuit to

prevent her government from authorizing import and production of generic drugs. ''But regulations have to be done before any laws can be implemented. We'll do what we can, not because of pressure, but because we think it's right.''

Other African seemed caught between their desire to get to the front of the line for new funding and early resentment of the expected new onslaught of advice and dictates from developed countries. ''A Ugandan colleague told me that the biggest epidemic lately is the epidemic of initiatives,'' one European aid official said.

The proposal that was to be outlined today in London leaves open the question of how much should be spent on drugs. UNAIDS has estimated that a minimum of $3 billion a year is needed to establish basic HIV prevention and non-anti-retroviral treatment in sub-Saharan Africa alone. Adding the anti-retroviral drugs, even at bargain-basement prices, would bring that total to about $10 billion.

International contributions currently total less than $1 billion a year. According to a General Accounting Office report released last month, Africa expenditures in the fight against HIV/AIDS in fiscal 2000 by the U.S. Agency for International Development—the largest national donor—totaled $114 million. The GAO report noted that amount ''translated into per capita expenditures for 23 sub-Saharan African countries'' ranging from $0.78 in Zambia to $0.03 in the Democratic Republic of Congo.

In its budget resolution passed this month, the Senate voted to increase total international AIDS spending to $1 billion over the next two years, although President Bush's budget proposes only a small fraction of that amount.

The European Union, as well as its individual members, and Japan have said they are prepared to provide major new funds.

But nobody believes that $10 billion is a realistic expectation for the near or middle term, and choices will have to be made.

''The exclusive focus on the issue of patent rights and prices of drugs really has overridden the much more fundamental question of how you actually get these services out and how you blunt the epidemic itself,'' said one international health official who asked not to be identified. ''If all of these resources go to treating the terminally ill, then we can in fact see this process turn into one that's really negative for the development of effective prevention programs.

''It's so politically incorrect to say, but we may have to sit by and just see these millions of [already infected] people die,'' he said, acknowledging that this was an option that would be considered unacceptable in the developed world. ''Very few public health professionals are willing to take on the wrath of AIDS activists by saying that. But a whole lot of them talk about this in private.''

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned the life expectancy of some in Africa of 45. To continue to watch this disease shorten the lives of most people, again, is a challenge to us morally; and it is to our peril if we do not understand the implication it has, not only on global trade, but also in national security.

South African government also now has an opportunity and also a challenge. They must respond to the victory of the pharmaceutical companies withdrawing their lawsuit by seeking medications for the 4.3 million people. They cannot stand by and do nothing.

In the United States, people have been living longer with HIV virus and with AIDS. While not a cure for AIDS, certainly the drugs have allowed many American citizens and citizens living in developing countries to live longer. These drugs are out of reach to most in Africa. Until we find a cure for AIDS, treatment must be affordable and accessible. Treatment can prolong life, indeed give substantially more quality of life. In the United States, we now have AIDS-related treatments and that has added to the mortality.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to act on this.

## TRIBUTE TO WEST POINT CADET JOHN HEINMILLER

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

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, the people of Eden Prairie, Minnesota are in mourning today as they grieve the loss of a favorite son, West Point Cadet John Heinmiller.

There are no words to adequately convey our sympathy to Cadet Heinmiller's family. Our hearts and prayers go out to John's father John, his mother Julie, and younger brothers and sister Joe, Jimmy and Sue, on Cadet Heinmiller's tragic death early Sunday in Garrison, New York.

John's loving family and countless friends are in shock over the passing of this remarkable young man who ''left an indelible mark on friends, coaches and teachers,'' to quote from today's front page article in the Star Tribune.

Mr. Speaker, John's death is not only a great tragedy for his wonderful family, but also a great tragedy for Eden Prairie High School and the United States Military Academy. John was loved and respected by everyone who knew him. Of the several hundred service academy nominations that I have made over the past decade, John truly stands out for his remarkable personal qualities.

John was not only a star in hockey, football and the classroom, John was a star in the way he conducted his life. As I said, when I nominated John to West Point: ''John Heinmiller is destined for success at the Military Academy and beyond because he has it all: highly intelligent, a great student athlete, personally charming, a quick wit and, most importantly, integrity and character that we need in our future leaders.''

It is not easy to stand out, Mr. Speaker, the way John Heinmiller did at a high school renowned for its athletics with more than 3,000 students. An honors student, John was so highly respected for his leadership qualities that his teammates at Eden Prairie High School voted him senior captain of both his football and hockey teams. He also earned his school's highest athletic honor the Scott Ryski Award.

As his Eden Prairie High School football coach Mike Grant put it best, ''John was a good football player, but above that, he was an outstanding person. This is a devastating loss to our school, our community and our city. This is a kid who would have been leading our country someday.''

Eden Prairie's boys' hockey coach, Lee Smith, also coached John and said, ''He was also the kind of person that if you spent 2 minutes around, you would see dedication, love, charisma and energy. John was one of the greatest role models who has ever gone through our high school.''

At West Point, John was a freshman hockey player and was called up to play with the varsity this past season. From all reports by West Point officials and coaches, John had already distinguished himself and was headed for great success.

Above all, Mr. Speaker, John Heinmiller loved his family very dearly. His younger brothers and sister were his best friends. As John's dad told me yesterday, ''His mother and I could not have asked for a better son in every way.''

Mr. Speaker, my prayer today is that Cadet John Heinmiller's legacy will inspire all of us to greater heights. We thank God for the way John lived his life and the wonderful role model he was. We are also grateful to John for his service to country at West Point.

May John Heinmiller's spirit continue to live in each of us and may God bless his family and friends.

## ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to once again reflect on the atrocities suffered by the Armenian people at the hands of the Ottoman Turks 86 years ago.

Little did anyone know that, on this very day, April 24, 1915, that day would forever signify the beginning of a Turkish campaign to eliminate the Armenian people from the face of this Earth.

Over the following 8 years, 1.5 million Armenians perished. Hundreds of Armenian religious, political, and intellectual leaders were massacred. More than 500,000 were exiled from their homes. Armenian civilization, one of the oldest civilizations, virtually ceased to exist.

Sadly, little attention is paid to this tragic episode of 20th century history. But that is why I join my colleagues, as I have each year since I was elected to Congress, to remember one of the most tragic events that humankind has ever witnessed.

But, unfortunately, as time wears on, so much of it has faded into memory, and people begin to forget what occurred during that horrific time. Even worse, as time passes, and people are distracted from the atrocities, naysayers and revisionists have the opportunity to change this generation's understanding of the Armenian genocide.

Just as outrageous is that this genocide has gone unpunished, and an international court has yet to condemn the massacre of an entire nation. In part, this is because the current leaders in Istanbul will not acknowledge the crime committed.

That is why it is imperative that the United States House of Representatives becomes a voice in the campaign to recognize and acknowledge the Armenian genocide. That is why we must support the Bonior-Radanovich resolution.

Mr. Speaker, despite the unspeakable tragedy, Armenians remain a compassionate, proud, and dignified people. An Armenian civilization lives on and thrives. In fact, every proud Armenian that walks the Earth worldwide is the product of generations of perseverance, courage and hope. Thankfully, this Armenian spirit lives on within our own borders, especially in my home State of California.

On behalf of Armenia and on behalf of all of our Armenian friends, neighbors, and colleagues, I urge the House of Representatives to recognize our responsibility to learn from the past and to speak out in order to prevent similar atrocities in the future.

This could well be the most important lesson each of us takes away from such an atrocious global experience.

---

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

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

---

## ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, as a proud member of the Armenian Congressional Caucus here in Washington, and we have over 90 members, and as a representative of a very large and vibrant community of Armenian Americans, I rise today to join many of my colleagues in the sad commemoration of the Armenian genocide.

Today we remember the tragedy where more than 1.5 million Armenians were murdered at the hands of the Turks and more than 500,000 others were deported.

□ 1945

Unfortunately, there were others included in this massacre, including Assyrians and Pontic Greeks, bringing the number to well over 3.5 million lost lives.

Today, April 24, marks the 86th anniversary of the beginning of the genocide. It was on this day in 1915 that more than 200 Armenian religious, political and intellectual leaders were gathered together and murdered in Constantinople. This was the beginning of an organized, brutal campaign to eliminate the Armenian presence from the Ottoman Empire. This campaign lasted for over 8 years. During this time, Armenians were systematically uprooted from their homeland of over 3,000 years and eliminated through massacres or deportation. But Armenians are strong people, and their dream of freedom did not die. More than 70 years after the genocide, the new Republic of Armenia was born as the Soviet Union crumbled.

Today, we pay tribute to the courage and strength of people who would not know defeat. I was privileged to meet with many of these people this past weekend on Sunday in my district where Sam Azadian along with Archbishop Barsamian and many others held a meeting where we remembered the massacres. One of the survivors, Sano Halo, was there. Her daughter has written a book about her life entitled ''Not Even My Name.'' It tells the story of Ms. Halo who, at the age of 10, was uprooted with her family with thousands of Pontic Greeks and forced by the Turks on a brutal death march. Ms. Halo saw her entire family die of starvation and disease in front of her eyes, or assault and murder by the Turks. Through circumstances, she was able to survive and has come to the United States and now lives in my district.

Unfortunately, even with the truthful, thoughtful accounts from people who experienced the genocide such as Ms. Halo, there are those who question the reality of the Armenian slaughter. That is why it is so important that in this Congress we must finally pass the resolution documenting the Armenian genocide. We must follow the moral leadership of France and Italy whose national assemblies unanimously passed a bill that officially recognizes the genocide of 1.5 million Armenians in Turkey during and after World War II. And we must follow the leadership of many of our State legislatures. Over 27 legislatures have passed proclamations, resolutions, bills recognizing the genocide.

For the people of Armenia, the fight still continues today, particularly for the Armenians of Nagorno-Karabakh, who are impacted by modern day Turkey and Azerbaijan's aggression toward Armenia in the continued blockade. I am hopeful that the recent talks in Key West between the Armenian and Azerbaijan presidents will move them one step closer toward peace. A peaceful solution is important to United States interests.

We have supported Armenia with direct assistance and with confidence-building allocations. I strongly support the efforts of the Armenian community to dedicate a museum and memorial commemorating the victims of the Armenian genocide. This year, their dream became a reality with the purchase of a building near the White House. Nothing we can say will bring back those who perished, but we can honor their memories with everlasting meaning by teaching the lessons of the Armenian genocide to the next generation.

As the great philosopher George Santayana once said, ''Those who do not remember the past are condemned to repeat it.'' Let us learn our lesson and never forget the Armenians.

---

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGERS of Michigan). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

---

## EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

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

There was no objection.

---

## ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

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

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few minutes to add my voice and join my colleagues in remembering and paying tribute to those Armenians who lost their lives and national identity during one of the 20th century's tragic examples of persecution and intolerance, the Armenian genocide of 1915–1923.

Many Armenians in America, particularly Indiana, are the children and grandchildren of survivors. In fact, tonight I may represent the fewest number here. I think I have either two or six Armenians in my district. But some 20 years ago my friend, Zohrab Tazian, did a presentation to a Rotary Club as I watched the historical film in the background of how the Armenians were destroyed and chased, and listened to his personal story of how his family fled down to Lebanon; and eventually he made his way to the United States. It touched me, as do other human rights tragedies such as this.

We commemorate this tragedy because it marks the beginning of the persecution, ethnic cleansing of the Armenian people by the Ottoman Turks on April 24, 1915. Armenian political, intellectual and religious leaders were arrested, forcibly moved from their homeland and killed. The brutality continued against the Armenian people as families were uprooted from their homes and marched to concentration camps in the desert where many would eventually starve to death.

In 1919 when recalling the event, the U.S. Ambassador to the Ottoman Empire, Henry Morgenthau, Sr. said, ''I

am confident that the whole history of the human race contains no such horrible episode as this. The great massacres and persecutions of the past seem almost insignificant when compared to the sufferings of the Armenian race in 1915.'' As we heard Hitler say when he moved into the Holocaust period, ''Who remembers the Armenians?''

By 1923, the religious and ideological persecution by the Ottoman Turks resulted in the murder of 1.5 million Armenian men, women and children and the displacement of an additional 500,000 Armenians.

The 20th century has borne witness to many acts of brutality and savagery by despotic regimes who sought to deny people human rights and religious freedoms. Examples abound, such as Stalin against the Russians, Hitler against the Jews, Mao Tse-tung against the Chinese, Pol Pot against the Cambodians, and currently Bashir against the Sudanese.

Genocide has devastating consequences for society as a whole because of the problems created by uprooting entire populations. It is bad enough to see the persecutions that we see in Tiananmen Square, where governments do not acknowledge the shooting of civilians; but when you uproot entire subgroups based on their background, as has happened in Bosnia, as Serbia was trying to do, and clearly on a massive scale in Turkey vis-a-vis the Armenians, it is tragic. The survivors become the ones who carry the memory of the suffering and the realization that their loved ones are gone. They are the ones who no longer have a home and may feel ideological and spiritual abandonment.

Part of the healing process for any victims of genocide, including Armenian survivors and families of survivors, involves acknowledgment of the atrocity and the admission of wrongdoing by those who perpetrated the persecution. It is only through acknowledgment and forgiveness that it is possible to move beyond the past.

Unfortunately, those responsible for ordering the systematic removal of the Armenians were never brought to justice, and the Armenian Genocide has become a dark moment in history, even an unacknowledged moment.

It is important that we remember this tragic event and show strong leadership by denouncing the persecution of people due to their differences in political and religious ideology. Who can visit the Holocaust Museum and not be personally touched? By establishing and continuing a discourse, we are acknowledging the tragedies of the past and remembering those awful moments in history so they will not be repeated.

As my friend the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG) says, history may not repeat itself but often it rhymes. Acknowledgment of the Armenian Genocide by Turkey will help to remove this decades-old barrier and allow greater cooperation and understanding between these two people.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank all those Members who have come down here tonight to recognize and make sure that regardless of what Turkey does and regardless of what this Congress does, that the American people still hear a voice on behalf of the Armenians in this country and remember the Armenian Genocide of 1915 to 1923, as well as our thanking all the Armenian organizations who have worked so hard to keep this issue at the forefront of our minds to serve as an example of the brutality of man against man.

## EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time of the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

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

There was no objection.

## REMEMBER THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, each year I am deeply humbled when we gather in the United States House of Representatives to honor the memory of the 1.5 million Armenians who perished and the 500,000 survivors who were forcibly exiled from their ancestral homes in Ottoman Turkey during the years 1915 to 1923. Some of those survivors, Mr. Speaker, are part of my own community in Worcester, Massachusetts. I had the opportunity to meet with several of them on Sunday during a special program in the historic Armenian Church of Our Savior.

It is difficult to fathom a greater evil than the massacre and willful destruction of a people. Those who deny that a holocaust took place when there are recorded accounts of the barbarity are complicit and often perpetuate a cycle of violence. This is the injustice much of the world has committed against the Armenian people.

Elie Wiesel, Nobel laureate and Holocaust survivor, has called denial of genocide a double killing: The denial of genocide seeks to reshape history in order to demonize the victims and rehabilitate the perpetrators and is, in effect, the final stage of genocide. Nobel laureate and South African Archbishop Desmond Tutu in the Preface to the Encyclopedia of Genocide, which was published in 1999 by the Institute on the Holocaust and Genocide in Jerusalem, writes, ''It is possible that if the world had been conscious of the genocide that was committed by the Ottoman Turks against the Armenians, the first genocide of the 20th century, then perhaps humanity might have been more alert to the warning signs that were being given before Hitler's madness was unleashed on an unbelieving world.''

And last year, Mr. Speaker, Israeli Minister of Education Yossi Sarid said publicly, ''I will do everything in order that Israeli children learn and know more about the Armenian Genocide. Something happened that cannot be defined except as genocide; 1.5 million people disappeared. It was not negligence. It was deliberate.''

And so scholars and eyewitnesses, Nobel laureates and Armenian survivors have spoken for 86 long years. And now we have entered the 21st century. After a long silence, governments are beginning to respond. They are beginning to acknowledge formally the Armenian Genocide. The European Parliament, the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe and the United Nations now recognize and reaffirm the Armenian Genocide as historical fact. In the last 5 years alone the parliaments of Belgium, Canada, Cyprus, France, Greece, Italy, Lebanon, Russia and Sweden have passed resolutions officially recognizing the Armenian Genocide.

Last November, Pope John Paul II issued a communique condemning the Armenian Genocide as a ''prologue to horrors'' that would follow in the 20th century. Earlier this year, French President Jacques Chirac signed into law a bill stating that France publicly recognizes the Armenian Genocide of 1915. And authorities in Paris have voted to erect a memorial to the genocide of the Armenian people.

Sadly, Mr. Speaker, France has achieved the moral leadership that the United States Congress and the White House have failed to fulfill. Last year, for the first time, the Congress moved forward on a resolution officially recognizing the Armenian Genocide, a resolution I proudly cosponsored. Unfortunately, the politics of denial and political expediency combined to thwart that effort. Bowing to pressure from the current Turkish Government, the measure was kept from coming to the House floor.

So, we begin again this year. In the House, I am an original cosponsor of a new resolution to have the United States officially recognize the Armenian Genocide. Thirty of our States, including Massachusetts, have passed resolutions officially recognizing the Armenian Genocide. We have a new President, who pledged during his campaign that he would officially recognize the Armenian Genocide. I have joined with over 100 of my colleagues, Republicans and Democrats alike, in sending a letter to President Bush asking that he honor his pledge. I believe in my heart that we can build on the progress made last year and perhaps this year, 2001, will be seen as the year when Congress finally debated and approved this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I am blessed to represent a district that includes a vibrant Armenian American community. They have educated the broader

Worcester community and indeed all of Massachusetts about the history and heritage of Armenian Americans, for out of one of the greatest tragedies of the 20th century came this community, made up of survivors of the genocide and the families and children of survivors. They have created houses of worship, community centers, neighborhood activists and dedicated workers in every profession. They are the living legacy. The Armenian nation survives in Europe, and the heritage of Armenia thrives in America.

I will work with my colleagues to make sure that the United States will officially recognize the Armenian Genocide and that all of our children will learn this history and understand why it is part of America's history and culture.

## ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MORELLA. Madam Speaker, I rise this evening as a member of the Congressional Caucus on Armenian Issues, as have many of my colleagues, to commemorate and affirm the Armenian Genocide, one of the darkest chapters of the 20th century.

□ 2000

We have heard this repeated, and I think it is worth repeating because it is important that it is indelibly implanted in our minds. April 24, 1915, is remembered and solemnly commemorated each year by the Armenian community and people of conscience throughout the world. On that day, a group of Armenian religious, political and intellectual leaders were arrested in Constantinople, taken to the interior of Turkey and murdered. In the 8 years that followed, 1.5 million Armenians were murdered and 500,000 were deported because of the Ottoman Empire's decision to attempt to eliminate the Armenian people living under their rule.

Through our bipartisan congressional efforts, we have and we must continue to acknowledge and to remember the killing and the suffering inflicted on the Armenian people during those 8 years at the beginning of the last century. Real people died and the results were and are still shocking.

The Armenian genocide is a historical fact. There is a nonpartisan academic consensus that between 1915 and 1923, 1.5 million Armenians perished at the hands of the crumbling Ottoman Empire. I deeply regretted the decision made by this body last year not to consider House Resolution 596, legislation recognizing the Armenian genocide. If we in the Congress continue to react with silence regarding these events and are unwilling to stand up and publicly condemn these atrocities, we effectively give our approval to abuses of power such as the Armenian genocide.

We must let the truth about these events be known and continue to speak out against all instances of inhumanity against one another. To this day it is still denied by the Turkish Government, just as the Nazis 2 decades later denied the Holocaust. Both of these atrocities could have been prevented or at least mitigated if the public had been aware of them. Sadly, it was only after the world learned of the Holocaust and the depths to which human beings could sink in their treatment of each other that the massacre of the Armenian population of Turkey gained attention as genocide.

Responding to this horror, governmental bodies throughout the world have passed resolutions and declarations affirming the Armenian genocide, including Canada, Argentina, Belgium, Lebanon, Vatican City, Uruguay, the European Parliament, the Russian Duma, the Greek Parliament, the Swedish Parliament and the French National Senate.

Additionally, 27 States, more than half, have also passed resolutions condemning the Armenian genocide. I am very pleased that on April 9 of this year my own State of Maryland enacted the Maryland Day of Remembrance of the Armenian Genocide. I, as had some others, had written to members of the Maryland Assembly urging their support of the resolution. I believe this measure will help educate others about this crime against humanity and send an appropriate message to the thousands of Maryland residents of Armenian descent who have been profoundly and personally affected by the Armenian genocide and who have made tremendous contributions to our State in the areas of business, agriculture, academia, government, and the arts.

We salute the proud people of Armenian who spent 70 years fighting Stalinist domination and who have finally, in the past decade, achieved freedom. However, these freedoms must never allow them or us to forget the hardships suffered by their ancestors. Our universal respect for human rights must instill in all of us the continued condemnation and acknowledgment of the Armenian genocide, one of history's darkest chapters of the 20th century.

## THE PRESIDENT HAD IT RIGHT THE FIRST TIME, THAT OUR COMMITMENT TO OPEN TRADE MUST BE MATCHED BY A STRONG COMMITMENT TO PROTECTING OUR ENVIRONMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, this morning constituents of our Ninth District of Ohio woke up to reports of more job cuts at our local Jeep plant. The Toledo Blade ran two headlines. One reads, ''Jeep reductions: Firm warns up to 2,035 Toledo jobs to be cut.'' The second headline read, ''Expanded PT Cruiser Output Bypasses City of Toledo for Mexico.''

Welcome to post-NAFTA America. Here we have a company shifting production from the United States at the expense of our workers. Make no mistake, these are excellent jobs we are talking about. These are not minimum-wage jobs with no benefits. These are not low-tech jobs. They are the type of jobs that any community in America would fight for. These are middle-class jobs. That is what Toledo and the State of Ohio did, in fact. They went out and fought for the Jeep jobs. The taxpayers invested hundreds of millions of dollars to keep those jobs in Ohio and in the United States, and now Chrysler is cutting 2,000 jobs in Toledo at the same time as it is adding production lines in Mexico to make the popular PT Cruiser.

Now President Bush wants to expand NAFTA, he tells us. Is this the promise of NAFTA, 2,000 more families out of work and good jobs in our country? Is this what the future looks like under a hemispheric NAFTA known as Free Trade of the Americas, FTAA? Is this what you get with Fast Track?

President Bush went to Quebec City last week to push for NAFTA's expansion to the free trade of the Americas. He made some interesting claims about what his version of free trade envisions. There was some talk about labor rights and environmental standards and democracy. That sounds well and good, but we need to see concrete action to back up the rhetoric.

In Quebec City, President Bush said it is clear to me that ours is a hemisphere united by freedom. How about the freedom of workers to earn a living wage and to know that they are protected against workplace injury and guaranteed the right to organize the worth of their labor? How about the freedom for families to know what is in their food? How about the freedom of a mother on the border in Mexico knowing that the water is safe to drink and the air fit to breathe? How about the freedom for Members of Congress to have access to all the working documents and drafts of these agreements, not only the multinational giants that helped to negotiate the agreement that we are likely to consider?

In Quebec City, President Bush said, ''Our commitment to open trade must be matched by a strong commitment to protecting our environment and improving labor standards.'' But then he did a pirouette and he said, ''We should not allow labor and environmental codicils to destroy the spirit of free trade.''

He had it right the first time.

Those of us on the other side of the argument have been saying for years that these trade agreements should give individuals the same rights as multinational corporations. The President was wrong when he said labor and

environmental provisions would destroy free trade. If free trade cannot accommodate labor and environmental concerns, it does not deserve to be known as free.

If the extension of the right for labor to organize, the right to free speech and the right to a safe and livable environment are things that would destroy a trade regime, maybe we should reconsider our trade priorities. Adding labor and environmental rights as a side agreement or included with fig-leaf compromises is completely unacceptable. We learned our lesson with NAFTA, the hard way.

President Bush said, and I quote, ''I am confident I will have trade promotion authority by the end of the year because I think most people in the United States Congress understand that trade is beneficial to our hemisphere.

''It is in our Nation's best interest to have the President have trade promotion authority,'' he said.

Congress does understand that trade can be beneficial to our hemisphere. We also know it can be unbeneficial. We do not need Fast Track to create a trading system that is fair to all nations and workers. We need a trading system that will lift up workers everywhere and help us maintain our standard of living in America. We need a trade agreement that will lift workers up, not leave behind 2,000 more families in Toledo while factories in Mexico gear up to meet a demand for a very popular vehicle on the backs of an exploited workforce that works for slave wages.

Madam Speaker, our rallying cry as we approach the Free Trade Agreement of the Americas debate must be free trade among free people and no less.

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 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 gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. BROWN of Florida addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

## WE MUST CONTINUE TO STRUGGLE AGAINST FORGETTING THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

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

Mr. CROWLEY. Madam Speaker, I stand in strong support of the Special Order commemorating the Armenian genocide; and I commend my colleagues, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG), for putting this Special Order together and for keeping the issue of the Armenian genocide at the forefront here in Congress.

The tragic occurrence perpetrated against the Armenian people between 1915 and 1925 by the Ottoman Turkish Empire is of great concern to me and members of my constituency. During this relatively brief time frame, over 1.5 million Armenians were massacred and more than 5,000 were exiled. Unfortunately, the Turkish Government has not recognized these brutal atrocities as acts of genocide. Nor is it willing to come to terms with these horrific events of the past that many of their ancestors participated in.

Prior to the Armenian genocide, these brave people with a history of over 2,500 years in the region were subject to numerous indignities and periodic massacres by the sultans of the Ottoman Empire. The worst of these massacres prior to 1915 occurred in 1895 when as many as 300,000 Armenian civilians were murdered, and those who survived were left completely destitute.

Despite these events, Armenians have survived as a people and a culture throughout Europe and now throughout the United States. The Turkish Government needs to come to terms with the past and work towards improving the future. Turkish groups have suggested that since Turks were also killed during that time frame it should not be considered a genocide.

Genocide is the systematic, planned annihilation of a racial, political, or cultural group. It happened to the Jews in Germany, and it did happen to the Armenians in the Ottoman Empire.

I am well aware of the importance of Turkey as an ally in an unstable region and a frontline NATO state. However, the Turkish Government must officially recognize the atrocities of its predecessors in the Ottoman Empire. I believe that by failing to recognize such barbaric acts one becomes complicit in them.

Milan Kundera, the once-exiled Czech novelist, has written, ''The struggle of man against power is the struggle of memory against forgetting.''

I believe that we, too, must continue to struggle against forgetting. This Special Order begins that process. This genocide and its lessons must never be forgotten.

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

(Mr. WEINER 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 California (Mr. SHERMAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SHERMAN 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 Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. SCHAKOWSKY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. ESHOO addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

## APRIL 24, 1915, ANNIVERSARY OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

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

Mr. FERGUSON. Madam Speaker, I join my colleagues today to remember a horrific atrocity in history, the Armenian genocide. April 24 is recognized as the anniversary date of this genocide, when Armenian intellectuals and professionals in Constantinople were rounded up and deported or killed.

From 1915 to 1923, a million and a half Armenians were killed and countless others suffered as a result of the systematic and deliberate campaign of genocide by the rulers of the Ottoman Empire.

Half a million Armenians who escaped death were deported to the Middle East. Some were fortunate enough to escape to the United States.

Madam Speaker, I am thankful that more than a million Armenians managed to escape the genocide and establish a new life here in the United States. In my Seventh District in New Jersey, I am proud to represent a number of Armenian-Americans. They have enriched every aspect of New Jersey life, from science to commerce to the arts.

Our statements today are intended to preserve the memory of the Armenian loss and to honor those descendants who have overcome the atrocities that took their grandparents, their parents, their children, and their friends. We mark this anniversary each year to remind our Nation and to teach future generations about the horrors of genocide and oppression endured by the Armenian people.

We must commit ourselves to ensuring that America remains a beacon of tolerance and openness and diversity.

Madam Speaker, I commend the commitment of Armenian-Americans who continue to strive for world recognition of one of the greatest atrocities of the 20th century.

## EARTH DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, as one who came to Congress committed to having the Federal Government be a better partner in making our communities more livable, making our families safe, healthy and economically secure, this last weekend in the celebration of Earth Day was a special time.

Every April 22, around the world, there is recognition of the Earth Day celebrations. This was an undertaking that was founded in 1970 by then U.S. Senator Gaylord Nelson, who proposed a nationwide environmental protest to, quote, shake up the political establishment and force this issue on to the national agenda.

Well, Senator Nelson succeeded, I think, even beyond his expectations, as he was able to encourage this recognition internationally. I think it was appropriate that he was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom for his role as the founder of Earth Day.

This year, as we reviewed the news accounts, there was a great deal of energy, excitement and indeed some good news for the environment around the world. Part of it was the environmental activism itself. There were over 800 rallies held across the United States, and internationally there were more than 100. In honor of Earth Day, the Wilderness Society named the White House as an object of their future concerns about national parks and monuments.

There was in Washington, D.C. a forum on solar energy held to celebrate the advances made in the technology, economics and prospects for the use of solar energy. There was a massive Trees Are My Friends campaign that helped to educate urban residents about the value of street trees in the urban forest canopy, helping residents connect with tree care and planning activities in their community.

This last weekend, I joined with people in my community in Portland, Oregon, to celebrate a successful tree-planting undertaking. They have successfully planted now 207,000 trees. During the month of April, citizens in a variety of cities in the West, including Portland, Seattle and Denver, were engaged in races and walks to raise the awareness of climate change, to help stop global climate warming.

□ 2015

There were rallies in India by cycling organizations to push for the creation of no vehicle zones in major cities. Additionally, there were events to protest deforestation in Mexico, children rallying for the protection of endangered species in Estonia and Russia; and there were tree plantings in Burmese refugee camps in Thailand.

There was good news on the State level. One in particular that caught my attention was in the State of California where the Department of Fish and Game has issued draft regulations to protect sea otters and other marine mammals from deadly gill nets. These regulations are going to make a huge difference in the protection of marine mammals.

In Massachusetts, that State will become the first on a State level to limit carbon dioxide emissions from power plants under their own clean air rules. The new standard, which will go into effect in June, will also limit mercury emissions, acid rain causing sulfur dioxide, and smog-causing nitrogen oxide. It will apply to the State's dirtiest power plants that are contributing to global warming.

There were very significant developments in the Pacific Northwest, including in British Columbia where the government of that province, in coordination with environmental groups, logging companies and the first nations of Canada announced the plan to prohibit or defer logging on 3.5 million acres of the Great Bear Rain Forest, an area 4 times the size of Rhode Island.

This is one of the largest rain forest conservation efforts in North American history and will protect the only home of the white Spirit Bear, a rare subspecies of the black bear.

Madam Speaker, on occasion I have taken to this floor because I have taken offense with some of the activities of this administration as it relates to the environment. Admittedly, I was more than a little concerned when some of our predictions were borne out with the release of President Bush's recommended budget. He has decided to recommend major cuts in the EPA enforcement budget and to slash by 87 percent a global tropical forest program which he had endorsed on the campaign trail, I believe pledging $100 million.

The budget also shows that the President has a mixed reaction to what is proposed as an energy crisis by recommending that the Department of Energy research on renewables be slashed by nearly 50 percent and that energy efficiency funding be cut by 23 percent. It simply, from where I stand, is a little disappointing to say the least; but I must confess that there have been a number of announcements and activities from this administration in the course of Earth Day, Earth Week activities that do, I think, bear commendation; and I think we should come forward and express appreciation for steps that are, in fact, positive.

The President announced that he will sign the international agreement on persistent organic pollutants to halt the worldwide spread of these dangerous chemicals, such as dioxins. I think that is a positive step.

On Saturday, April 21, the day before Earth Day, at a meeting on free trade in Quebec, the President promised to link trade with a strong commitment to protect our environment, a movement that reinforces the work done by his trade representative, Ambassador Zoellick, who is working hard to see if we can reach some bipartisan accord to protect environmental values in the area of trade, and I commend them.

The administration has at least agreed to attend the next round of international talks on global climate change, even though they continue their opposition to the Kyoto protocol and have not expressed a willingness to compromise and a willingness to move forward. I hope cooler heads hopefully will prevail because it is inappropriate for the United States to abrogate leadership in the international arena.

I appreciated the fact that the President has decided to allow a ban on snowmobiles in Yellowstone and Grand Tetons National Park to take effect. It was my pleasure recently to meet with Mike Finley, the outgoing superintendent of Yellowstone National Park, who has done an outstanding job for the Park Service. This ban was an important part of Mike's legacy and will phase out snowmobiles in these critical parks in the next 3 years.

The administration has also decided to uphold a Clinton administration rule to dramatically expand reporting requirements for the emissions of lead. This is a step in the right direction to deal with a serious toxic metal which is linked to learning and behavior problems.

In the area of wetlands, the administration announced last week that it will uphold a wetlands development regulation that requires developers to get an Army Corps of Engineer's permit for various activities that would modify the wetlands.

And in the area of home appliances, the White House will keep Clinton administration energy conservation rules on washing machines and water heaters, measures which will make clothes washers become 22 percent more efficient by 2004, 35 percent more efficient by 2007, and will make a big difference in terms of saving energy and conserving water.

While I was disappointed that the administration is weakening the air conditioning rule by some 50 percent, nonetheless it still represents a substantial improvement and a move in the right direction.

Madam Speaker, I notice that I have been joined by my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), a gentleman known for his zeal and concern for protecting the environment and his environmentally sensitive State, and I would yield to the gentleman for some comments.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Oregon who has always played such a

leadership role on environmental issues for organizing this special order this evening. It is 2 days after Earth Day, but this is the first day that we have been back and can talk about Earth Day.

I want to express my disappointment with the Bush administration and what has been happening for the last 3 or 4 months since President Bush took office with regard to environmental issues. Sunday was the 31st anniversary of Earth Day, and I took part in those first Earth Day celebrations when I was in college at that time in Vermont.

I have watched pretty much over the 30 or 31 years since the first Earth Day, we have seen significant progress on environmental concerns. I know in my own district we have done a lot to clean up the ocean along the Jersey shore. We have seen the Clean Air Act and the Clean Water Act, Endangered Species Act, all of these major pieces of legislation which have made significant progress in cleaning up the environment.

So it is very disappointing to see President Bush in the actions that he has taken in the last few months basically, I think, try to reverse that trend in very negative ways. I am joining the gentleman from Oregon tonight in saying that not because I am looking to attack President Bush and just say the Republicans are bad and be partisan about it, that is not my goal.

Madam Speaker, what I want to do is see this administration change course and basically recognize that the environment is a major concern of the American people and that these problems are not going to go away and we need to take progressive steps to improve the quality of our environment.

But it is disappointing, and I want to outline if I could maybe in 5 minutes or so where I see major problems in what the President has done in the last few months, but at the same time kind of show a bit of optimism about what I think we can do to change it so that he does not continue on this course. And I want to talk about energy policy first and then talk about some other environmental issues.

With regard to energy policy, and you already mentioned it, this signal about not really caring about global climate change, scrapping the Kyoto treaty and maybe suggesting that we not talk about it much in the future, I think is a grave concern.

Also the President's switch on carbon dioxide, to say that is not one of the air emission controls that we are going to put in place. And although we have not really received the report, I guess, of Vice President CHENEY's energy task force, that is going to come around mid-May, we keep hearing that the energy goals of this administration are more production of fossil fuels rather than conservation, and they do not talk about increased technological efficiency or much about the use of renewables.

Much attention has been focused on ANWR, that we should start drilling in ANWR and possibly other offshore areas around the United States.

□ 2030

Mr. Speaker, I find it particularly unfortunate, because we keep seeing signals at the same time that President Bush is saying these things and doing these things, these negative things, we keep seeing signals that the consensus, not only the American people, but the Congress I think, is very much to the contrary of most of his public pronouncements.

I got a little whiff of that again, if you will, this weekend when my former governor, now the EPA Administrator, Christie Whitman, suggested that the Bush administration may be backing off from drilling in ANWR. But as has been the case so often with Mrs. Whitman, the White House came back after she made those statements and sort of scolded her for her comments and said that they are going to continue the effort to try to drill in ANWR and to get congressional authorization to do so.

I think that Whitman was really basically commenting on the political reality, that the votes are really not there for ANWR in the Senate and probably not in the House as well. Basically, I think she was indicating that there really is a consensus in the Congress, I believe in both Houses, not to drill in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

I see so many things like that, when we think about every one of Bush's major pronouncements that I have been critical of: the Kyoto Treaty, the CO2 emissions. We have to realize that over the last 6 months or over the last year, there has really been a bipartisan consensus of most Democrats and some pro-environment Republicans, who have expressed support for the global climate change talks. We have recognized that this is an issue that we have to deal with.

With regard to CO2 emissions, we have had a number of pieces of legislation introduced in this House on a bipartisan basis that would address the CO2 emissions through market trading legislation. I have introduced a bill like that. I think also, if we look around at some of the utilities in various parts of the country, including in my home State of New Jersey, we have seen them start to implement new technologies that would actually cut down on carbon dioxide emissions. So it is just very unfortunate.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that these positive forces, these pro-environmental forces here in the Congress, have not gone away, and maybe they are underground right now; but hopefully, over the next few months or certainly this session of Congress, we will see them come forward with the support of the American people and demand that we address global climate change, demand that we address CO2 emissions, and not allow drilling in the ANWR.

I just wanted to express to my colleague with regard to those energy issues that I really am a lot more optimistic about what is going to happen here, even though I keep hearing these negative pronouncements on the environment from the Bush administration.

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to talk about a couple of other areas that are not energy-related, but fall within the rubric of my subcommittee. I am the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Commerce, Environment and Hazardous Materials, and we have jurisdiction over Superfund, over Brownfields, over safe drinking water, and if I could just comment briefly on some of those issues. It was very disappointing to me to see President Bush's efforts to tear down the environment and the good legislation and the good initiatives that we have had in the past also translated into his budget. I mean, if we look at the budget, it is a cutback in the Department of Energy, it is also a cutback in the EPA, the Environmental Protection Agency. In my home State, we have more Superfund sites than any other State in the country, so we really care about Superfund and whether the funding is going to be there to actually do cleanup.

What President Bush proposed in his budget is that for the next fiscal year, we could clean up only 65 Superfund sites as opposed to the 85 sites on the average that we have cleaned up in the last 4 years under the last administration. But even more important, he did not include the Superfund corporate tax in the budget as a method of paying for cleanup.

Now, that may have been okay in the last few years when the Republicans cut it out of the budget that President Clinton submitted, because we still have money in the trust fund to pay for a significant portion of Superfund cleanups. But if we do not reauthorize the corporate tax this year or even next year, we are simply going to run out of money in 2003. There will not be any money from the Superfund Trust Fund to pay for cleanups. I do not see us going ahead and allocating money out of general revenue sources to pay for it. So that program is also seriously threatened.

Mr. Speaker, I know the gentleman from Oregon mentioned our problem with safe drinking water. Again, I could talk about what this administration is doing not only with standards with regard to arsenic, but also with the infrastructure. We have heard about the way he just threw out the arsenic standard and basically was not willing to change the status quo down to the 10 parts per billion that was recommended by President Clinton and also by the National Academy of Sciences. Well, again, I guess in part because the President and this administration realize that this is a problem that the American people do not like to ingest arsenic, over the last week or so we have seen the EPA Administrator, Mrs. Whitman, come out again

and say, oh, no, we are going to set up a new rule, we are going to take a year and study this, but I promise that by the next year, we will impose a rule that cuts back at least 60 percent on the existing standard.

Well, I can figure out what 60 percent is of 50 parts per billion, but I know it does not get down to the 10 parts per billion that President Clinton proposed. So, again, they are playing games.

She came out and said that she has convened this new panel at the National Academy of Sciences and asked them to look at the arsenic standards, but again, I get the impression from what I read and from what people tell me that this panel is somewhat rigged and that it is not inclined to adopt a more strict standard.

In the same way, I saw Mrs. Whitman come before our subcommittee a couple of weeks ago and talk about the tremendous need for resources, Federal or otherwise, to address the backlog of infrastructure needs for clean water in various States and various communities around the country. There was a report that she mentioned actually that came out in February that identified $102.5 billion in infrastructure needs for safe drinking water. But when we looked at the Bush budget and when it came out a couple of weeks ago while we were back in our districts, it actually level-funded the amount of money that would be available for these infrastructure needs. So we have $102.5 billion in needs and authorization in Congress for $1 billion, and Bush's budget comes in at $823 million.

So needless to say, there is a real gap between what the Bush administration has said in the past or during the campaign about environmental issues and what the EPA Administrator continues to say about concerns that she has for environmental issues, and what this administration actually does and its actions to address those issues.

I am also concerned about the fact that we have reduced the amount of funding at the EPA. We are not going to see enforcement of a lot of the good environmental laws that are on the books. However, again, I do not think the public is going to stand for this.

I really believe that ultimately this Congress will heed the public's wishes and not go along with a lot of these pronouncements that are coming out of the White House. But I know that we have to continue to identify all of these different negative actions that are being taken by this administration against the environment, and we have to speak out and we have to tell people over and over again what they mean, because a lot of them are not easily explainable and they are happening so quickly over the last 3 or 4 months of this administration that it is even hard to keep track of them.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Oregon again for his part and what he is doing to try to bring attention to this. I think we have an obligation not only today in remembering Earth Day, but throughout the next 2 years of this session, to constantly focus on what this administration is doing to gut environmental concerns.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's observations, the hard work that he has done in protecting the environment, and the admonition that we need to be vigilant not just on Earth Day, but this is an ongoing effort. I must confess that I share the gentleman's observation. My assessment is that our commitment is to protect the environment. I have deep concerns about some of the administration's policies, as the gentleman mentioned. I hope, however, that we can on this floor reach common cause across party lines, geographic and philosophical divides, because the American public desires that we are able to move forward and be productive in this fashion.

Mr. Speaker, I came from a very environmentally aware State. I think we both share that kinship and that consensus. In our State, in Oregon, much of the environmental leadership transcended party politics. It came from an era, particularly in the 1970s, where half the time there was a Republican governor who was working with Democrats in the legislature; and when the Democrats took control of the State house, the governorship, it continued on.

Most of the major pieces of legislation that we are working on actually have bipartisan support, and if we could ever get them to the floor of this chamber, I think we would find that there would be strong votes, including significant Republican support.

I think it is important for us to walk that line, to fight back when there are items that are at odds with what the American public wants. As the gentleman pointed out with the budget, we need to acknowledge some of the positive things that are not where that takes place, and Congress must be willing to step up and lead by example in terms of walking the walk.

I had a couple of other observations that were positive in nature that I wanted to share, because I thought they were very significant. Joe Albaugh, the new director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, FEMA, maybe created some waves the last couple of days when there was high water around Davenport, Iowa, but I think he raised an important issue about the responsibility of the Federal Government to help, but not to continue to step in and subsidize areas where it appears as though people are not moving out of harm's way. There are in this country over 8,000 properties that have a history of repeated loss claims from floods. Over the last 8 years, we have lost over $89 billion of damage as a result of flooding. We have lost over 800 lives. And there are still a number of people who live with Federal subsidy in places where God has repeatedly shown that he does not want them to live.

I appreciate that this administration is willing to raise the issue. In the budget there are some budget savings that have been claimed as a result of modifying and reforming the Federal flood insurance program. The gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) and I have legislation that we have introduced, the ''Two Floods and You're Out of the Taxpayer Pocket,'' which would help provide a mechanism to claim the savings that the administration is interested in; and I appreciate what the FEMA Director is doing, and I know there will be support in Congress to come forward to try and make that important reform.

Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure earlier this week to share a platform with General Robert Flowers, the head of the Corps of Engineers, who made, I thought, an extraordinary, extraordinary statement. I commend people to perhaps go to the Web site, to the Corps of Engineers, look at General Flowers' statement. It was one that I think any Member of the House of Representatives would have been proud to make. The General committed to environmental sustainability, that all Corps of Engineers work will be based on the need for people and nature to coexist in a healthy, supportive, diverse and sustainable condition; to recognize the interdependence of activities, that we will recognize interdependence with nature, we will consider the possibility of second- and third-order effects on his projects; that the Corps would be responsible for cumulative impacts.

The Corps would accept responsibility for the consequences of planning, design, and construction decisions upon the continued viability of natural systems and human life. The Corps would be committed to long-term public safety, creating engineered objects of long-term value; that it would support a systems approach in all aspects of design and construction.

The Corps will evaluate and optimize the life cycle of products and processes so that as much as possible, we approach the natural state of systems in which there is no waste; to understand and utilize the dynamic nature of the environment. Their products will continue to rely to the fullest extent possible on renewable energy sources and recyclable products, and to seek continuous improvements, seeking constant improvements by sharing, promoting, collaborating and integrating knowledge.

Mr. Speaker, I thought it was an outstanding statement by General Flowers, and I, for one, am standing willing to help him achieve that with the Corps of Engineers in terms of policy and budget and to make sure that Congress is supporting, rather than interfering.

□ 2045

I wanted to acknowledge that as, I thought, one of the most important

statements that I had heard in the course of the week of Earth Day celebrations.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, he is bringing up, I think, a very important issue. In sort of a general sense, when we talk about the environment, there are a lot of new technologies and new ways of doing things that really can make a difference.

That is one of the reasons I find what I have been seeing from this administration so disappointing, because I really believe that the environment and industry or business can work together, and that there is no reason why a pro-environment position cannot be also a pro-jobs creation, or a pro-economic development position.

Certainly, when we talk about new technologies, that is so true. Last week during the congressional recess we did a bus tour, I guess it was last Wednesday, where myself and the gentlemen from New Jersey, Mr. HOLT and Mr. PASCRELL, went to various parts of the State to highlight some of the concerns we had with what the Bush administration was doing.

One of the stops was in Linden, New Jersey, which is a town that has a number of utilities and also refineries. We were there with Public Service Electric and Gas, which is one of our major utilities in the State. They were actually building a new plant that was going to be gas-fired, natural gas-fired, and that was replacing some older oil-burning plants to generate electricity. They estimated that the new plants would cut down on the amount of carbon dioxide by one-third.

I just could not help it, I am standing there and talking to these business leaders, people representing the utility, who by no means would be perceived as Democrats or liberals or anything like that, and they are just explaining why this can be done and how easy it is to do, how it saves money and cuts down on carbon dioxide.

For the life of me, I do not understand the theory of this administration. The gentleman talked about the energy efficiency of air conditioners, as the gentleman mentioned before. We can talk about so many ways. In fact, the United States really is taking the leadership in terms of new technologies that would cut down on air emissions, and make it so that not only us but other countries would not continue to contribute so much to the problem of global climate change.

These are new technologies that we can sell to other parts of the world that would create jobs here at home because they are high-tech. There is absolutely no reason to perceive that environmental initiatives are somehow going to be too expensive or lose jobs or hurt industry. I think it is just the opposite. It is just another reason why I am very concerned about what is happening with this administration.

We talked about the budget. I think the gentleman mentioned renewables. I believe that with regard to research on renewable resources, solar power, wind power, that the budget the President came in with cuts the amount of research money in half.

This morning I was down with the group of American Indians that are concerned about the environment, I think it is called the National Tribal Environmental Council. I spoke with them. It is amazing to me, they were talking about how, with wind resources in the Great Plains area, we would actually be able to generate enough power through wind on the Great Plains to produce enough electricity for the whole continental United States, the 48 States outside of Alaska and Hawaii, if we were to take that initiative.

The ability and the will is there if only this administration would wake up. I do not want to keep harping on it, but the gentleman said it when he pointed out that historically these issues, these environmental concerns, have been bipartisan.

The great conservationist leader was Teddy Roosevelt. It was Richard Nixon who signed so many of the environmental laws that we are talked about tonight in the seventies.

I think what happened, and frankly I am going to be partisan, now, when we had the changeover in the Congress from Democrat to Republican and we had Newt Gingrich come in as the Speaker, all of a sudden there was this great interest on the part of the Republican leadership to do the bidding of big business, big oil, big mining companies.

That is what we are seeing with President Bush as well. Most of the decisions that he is making seem to be contrary to a lot of the Republicans in his own party, but he is catering to the big oil and the big mining and these other special interests that are very shortsighted about the future and what can be done.

So again, I know we have to keep up the effort here, but I think there is good reason to feel that we can change things, because what is being done by this administration is not only not in the best interests of the country, but it does not even make sense from an economic development point of view or a money point of view, ultimately, I do not think.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. I thank the gentleman, Madam Speaker.

I was particularly taken by a comment the gentleman made about the opportunities to build the environment, to create jobs, to build the economy; that these are things that can be done concurrently and actually add value, being able to help make our families safe, healthy, and economically secure.

I had an opportunity this last week to tour a location where actually what the gentleman is talking about could have a tremendous effect. In the metropolitan Portland area, across the river, it is not in my district or in my State but it is a very short journey, there is a large formerly-used defense facility called Camp Bonneville, 3,800 acres that has been used for the better part of this last century for military purposes.

The community has a plan where they would like to take this area that has been off limits, that has not been subjected to development. It has a potential for wildlife, for recreation, that is almost unsurpassed, just a few minutes from the core of a major metropolitan area, but it is going to require that the Department of Defense step up and provide the resources to decontaminate the area.

We do not know what is on the 3,800 acres. There is not money budgeted, although we recently had a reversal of a decision by the Department of Defense to go in and help us with that survey. It is critical that we examine areas like this.

When they first went in, there were 105-millimeter shells on the ground that they could find. These are items of high explosives, 7½ pounds of blasting powder, that could do tremendous damage. Now we have an opportunity perhaps, if the Department of Defense, the Corps of Engineers, and this Congress steps forward, to be able to make a difference for the people in the metropolitan area of Portland-Vancouver-Washington. But it is an example of what we can do to balance the environment, provide jobs, and give back precious resources in terms of open space and redevelopment possibilities.

But while we were on recess this last week, there was finally the long-awaited report from the General Accounting Office that deals with the environmental liabilities of just training range cleanup costs. The report was rather startling. It indicated that while the Department of Defense thought that its liability for the cleanup of training ranges was about $14 billion, they find that other estimates show that liability could well exceed $100 billion just for training range cleanup. Without complete and accurate data, it is impossible to determine whether these amounts represent a reasonable estimate, or what the implications are.

We have not performed a complete inventory of the ranges, identifying the types and extent of the unexploded ordnance and the associated contamination. We have a long list of areas that are formerly-used defense sites, training sites, base closures. We do not have the top management focus and leadership necessary even to get reliable report estimates at this point, and sadly, there is no specific program for unexploded ordnance remediation policy, goals, or program.

Now, we have been writing as Members of Congress, bringing this to the attention of the appropriators, to our fellow Members of Congress. This is a situation that affects not just metropolitan Portland, but it is something that touches people all across the country.

Two weeks ago, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) and I led a trip to the American University campus and Spring Valley residential development here in the District of Columbia, where they are still excavating the hillside, removing arsenic. There is a child care center on the campus of American University that was closed because of intolerably high arsenic levels.

In our Nation's Capitol, from coast-to-coast, border to border, we have over 1,000 of these sites that need to be addressed that represent a threat to the public safety and health, and if done properly, represent an opportunity to have a transformational effect on communities in terms of the economic activities associated with cleanup and then the reuse of these facilities.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, in my State, of course, we have so many opportunities like that. The list is endless.

I mentioned that we have more Superfund sites than any other State. I think we have over 6,000 hazardous waste sites that have been identified by the State of New Jersey outside of Superfund, most of which would be eligible for a brownfields initiative. Obviously, the Federal government needs to do more in that respect, as well.

I would like to think of ways, as the gentleman is pointing out, to do progressive things on Superfund, on brownfields, on other hazardous waste and other types of environmental cleanup. That is really what I hope that the gentleman and I and others who are concerned about the environment would be concentrating on. We do not want to spend our time trying to prevent good laws from being gutted, which is essentially what we have been doing for the last couple of months.

My district, I think the gentleman knows, a significant part of it is along the Jersey shore, along the ocean. When I was first elected in 1988, I was really elected on an environmental platform, because that was the year when all of the beaches were closed. The tourism industry is number one in New Jersey. People think of New Jersey as the petrochemical State, but we actually earn more dollars in New Jersey from tourism than even from the petrochemical industry. I think we were losing $5 billion that summer because the beaches were closed.

A number of initiatives have been taken since then in Congress on a bipartisan basis, as well as in the State legislature. When the current EPA administrator, Ms. Whitman, was the Governor of New Jersey, she presided over a lot of these initiatives to clean up the ocean. Yet now we see the opposite happening here on the Federal level.

One of the things that happened in New Jersey that was used as an example nationally, and now faces a budget cut, was the Beaches Act. New Jersey was the first State in the country that passed a law that said that we had to do testing on a regular basis during the summer months when people can swim at the Jersey shore. We have to test the beaches, and if they do not meet a certain Federal standard, then the beach has to be closed. Rather, we have to test the water, and if it does not meet a certain standard, the beach has to be closed and it has to be posted that one cannot bathe. This was a result of the wash-up of all the debris in 1988.

We put this into effect, and I and some Republicans on the other side, the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY) was a sponsor with me, we actually moved a bill in the last session of Congress called the Beaches Act that implemented that nationally. It was signed by President Clinton I guess in October, before the end of the last session.

That said that now every State would be mandated to do the same type of testing for water quality, and close beaches and post signs and publicly announce if the water quality was not up to snuff.

We authorized $30 million under that legislation that was signed last fall to implement that program. Again, our EPA administrator, Ms. Whitman, was touting that program early in this administration, about how it was a great program and it was modeled after New Jersey. Then when I saw the budget a couple of weeks ago, I saw that the President's budget, instead of appropriating $30 million, it appropriated something like $2 million or $3 million, which would not even allow more than a handful of States to implement the program.

So again, it just seems so unfortunate. I do not want to keep harping and being so partisan about it, but it just seems so unfortunate that at a time when there are a lot of progressive things that could be done, proactive things that could be done around here, like what the gentleman just described, we still have to talk about just trying to make sure that things do not get worse.

I do not want to be pessimistic because I am still optimistic, but it is unfortunate to see what we have had to contend with in the last few months.

□ 2100

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's somber reflections because we need to look at this in a balanced and objective fashion. I would just conclude my remarks this evening on a note of optimism and hoping that we will be able to work in a bipartisan fashion to do something about having the Federal Government step up and lead by example.

The United States Government is the largest Superfund polluter in the United States, the government itself. The military waste, the toxics and explosives that we have littering the landscape constitute a battle right here on American soil 26 years after the Vietnam war, 56 years after the conclusion of World War II, 83 years after World War I. It involves mines and nerve gases and toxics and explosive shells. It has claimed at least 65 lives that we know of, most of them since World War II.

There is a strong likelihood, I am told, that there are more people who have lost their lives that we just as yet do not know about, and there are many more who have been maimed and injured.

What, I guess, shocked me the most were two young boys who were killed as a result of an explosive shell that they found in a field in a subdivision in their hometown of San Diego that was a formerly used military defense site. Three boys found the shell. They were playing with it. They detonated it, and two of them were killed. This danger continues every day. If we are not careful, at the rate we are going, it could last for another 500 or 1,000 years.

Now, this toxic waste of military activities in the United States could potentially contaminate 20 to 25 million acres, and some estimates are as high as 50 million acres. As I pointed out, we do not have a good inventory. We do not know. But what we do know is, at the current rate of spending in a budget that is not yet adequate, it will take centuries, potentially 1,000 years or more to return the land to safe and productive use and to protect children who may be playing, wildlife.

Fire fighters in the forests who were a couple of summers ago in a forest fire in New York State, all of a sudden they were out in the forest, and there were huge explosions because buried shells from artillery practice that did not explode were suddenly being detonated by the forest fire.

Congress needs to report for duty. It needs to provide the administrative and financial tools that are necessary. What I am talking about here is not going to affect active ranges and readiness. My concern is for closed, transferred, and transferring ranges where the public is already exposed or soon will be.

I hope that we can make every Member of Congress, every aspect of the Department of Defense, the Corps of Engineers understand what is going on in each and every one of our States, because every State is at risk.

We can make sure that somebody is in charge, that there is enough funding, and that we get the job done so that no child will be at risk of death, dismemberment or serious illness as a result of the United States Government not cleaning up after itself.

In the course of our conversation this evening, we have talked about some positive elements and some that were perhaps a little disconcerting, but I

think this is an area that we can commit ourselves to working in a bipartisan way. I can think of no more positive aspect for claiming the true purpose and spirit of Earth Day than acting to make sure that the Federal Government is doing all it can in this important area.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, if the gentleman will yield a little time, I would say this. The gentleman from Oregon talked about optimism. I am going to be optimistic in the last thing that I say here this evening. When I mentioned over the weekend to my children who are fairly young, I have a daughter who is 7 and a son who just turned 6 and another daughter who is 3, and when I mentioned to them that it was Earth Day on Sunday, of course they got all excited about it.

But it really dawned on me that they are all in school in some way, either school or preschool at this point. I have watched over the last few years that they just have an incredible sort of environmental consciousness, more so than I do. I do not think it comes from me. I think it mostly comes from what they learn in school and what they see on TV. They remind me that one has to recycle this or that. They talk about the ocean and how it has got to be kept clean. They participated in a couple of cleanups that we have at this time of year, either along the beach or in some of the wooded areas.

So I mean there are many things that came out of Earth Day since 1970, the last 31 years, but I think maybe the most important thing is the education aspect that people, particularly the younger generation, younger than me, are very environmentally conscious. We talk about how younger people maybe are not as conscious or politically conscious, but I definitely believe that they are environmentally conscious.

So I just think that any effort to try to turn back the clock on the environmental movement is ultimately doomed to failure. So that is my optimism, and I know that we are here to make sure it is not doomed to failure, and we are going to keep it up.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Indeed.

## ECONOMY, ENERGY, AND THE DEATH TAX

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MCINNIS. Madam Speaker, good evening. Welcome back to Washington. As my colleagues know, we have all had about a 2-week recess. I spent my recess back in the district going around, as many of my colleagues have done, to town meetings, talking with people on the street and talking with the different interest groups out in our district and taking kind of a general overview of several things.

One of them of course is our economy. I had plenty of opportunity to discuss with people our economy.

I also discussed with many of my constituents our situation with the energy crisis that we are coming upon. As many of my colleagues know from their own constituents, we have seen gasoline prices just explode in the last couple of weeks.

Then of course I heard from a number of people in regards to the death tax. I went out firsthand and again witnessed the punitive action that the estate tax, the death tax, has worked upon people of this country, that has worked upon people of my district, the devastating results of people who have already paid their tax, who have the unfortunate situation of a death in their family, and here comes Uncle Sam to finish the devastation as if the family had not had enough.

So I want to visit about these three issues tonight, about the economy, about energy, and about the death tax.

Let me start off, first of all, talking on the economy. We have seen a lot of criticism lately about President Bush. I was listening to public radio. I listen to public radio quite a bit. I was driving in my district. Now, mind you, my district is larger geographically than the State of Florida so I do a lot of drive time in my district. I was listening to public radio. It is interesting. One of the commentators on public radio or one of the guests on public radio was talking very critically of President Bush and how he has soured the economy. President Bush has been in office, what, 12, 13 weeks. President Bush was handed this bad economy.

Now, this economy could get a lot worse if we do not do something pretty quickly. Frankly, I think the responsibility to do something about this economy falls to some extent on our shoulders in these Chambers. It falls to also an extent on the shoulders of the President of the United States. I do not think this President has shunned that responsibility. In fact I think President Bush has stood up to the challenge. He started off by proposing a tax cut.

Let me tell my colleagues this tax cut that the President has proposed, let us put it in its proper proportions. The President has proposed over a 10-year period, not a 1-year period, over a 10-year period, a $1.6 trillion tax reduction. Now in addition to that, what he said is that this tax reduction should benefit the people who pay taxes. It is not a welfare program intended to go to people who do not pay taxes. It is a tax reduction program intended to be more equitable and fair to the taxpayer of this country.

As all of my colleagues and I know in these Chambers, we do not earn that money. We do not go out and create capital. We do not come up and figure out a better idea or a better mousetrap. All we do is go out to those people who toil, who come up with a better mousetrap, who come up with a better idea, all we do is go out, reach into their pockets, and tax them. That is where the revenue in here comes.

When we have reached too deep into their pocket, which we have done over the last few years, do not my colleagues think they ought to be considered? That is what this tax cut does. It considers that. It says, if one is a taxpayer, we think there ought to be a little something in it for one. Now, one does not get the whole piece of pie. That would be much too imaginative for someone to think that, when the government taxes one, one is going to get a big chunk of the pie as a taxpayer. But the President has said one deserves a part of the pie.

Now, what part of the pie is that. Over the next 10 years, to put this in proportion, over the next 10 years, and the estimates vary a little bit, but approximately there is going to be $33 trillion coming to the government from these people out there, the taxpayers, the citizens of this country who go to work every day, who come up with a better idea, who put in their shifts, who pay their taxes fairly and pay their taxes on a timely basis. $33 trillion will be gathered from those people in the next 10 years.

Of that, if we take a look at the spending that we now have, we take a look at the spending that is forecast, our guess is we are going to spend about $28 trillion of that.

So if we have about $33 trillion, and we are going to spend about $28 trillion, that leaves us about $5 trillion in surplus. Of that, the President has asked for 1.6, $1.6 trillion. About a third of that goes back to the taxpayer. Now is that too much to ask?

When I was out there visiting with my constituents over this last recess, I do not think my constituents thought that was too much to ask. In fact, I found my constituents saying, how do you justify the level of taxation that you have placed upon us, especially when we talk about things like the marriage penalty, especially when we talk about things like the death tax. Are we getting a bang for our dollar back there in Washington, D.C., Mr. Congressman? That is what those people wanted to know.

Now as we know, the President's tax policy is a long-term policy. This plan was designed when he was running for President. It has been fine-tuned since he has been elected to President. But as we know, we also need, on top of that, we may need an additional stimulant to put into the economy.

In order for us to avoid a downward or a spiral so to speak that gets out of control and takes this economy into a recession, we need to come up with a strategy. That strategy really is multileveled.

The first level of that strategy is the President's tax reduction, and everybody in these Chambers ought to be giving serious consideration to it. I would tell my colleagues, especially the liberal side of the Democratic Party that opposed any kind of tax reduction, then came out with their

Presidential candidate, and I think the gentleman proposed a $400 billion tax reduction. Then the next level was $600 billion. My guess is that before this is over, especially in light of the current economic situation, that even the liberal Democrats are going to have to step forward; they are going to have to step forward and help us institute a tax credit or a tax reduction back into this economy. We have got to get some stimulation.

On top of that, if this economy continues to sour on us, I think there is a very justifiable basis for a capital gains reduction; and many, many millions and millions of people in this country will benefit almost immediately from a reduction in capital gains taxation, say, from 20 percent down to about 15 percent.

So the first strategy that we need to invoke to take on this souring economy is some type of tax reduction.

Now, some of my constituents actually were swayed by this; they have been swayed by the argument that leaves the money in Washington, D.C., that all of us sitting in these Chambers will leave our hands off it. As I said in countless meetings, it is like leaving a jar of Girl Scout cookies in the room with me, and I am hungry, and telling me not to touch them while you go out for a couple of days. Of course they are going to get eaten. Any money left in Washington, D.C., I guarantee you, do not let them try to persuade you that it will go to additional expenditures like education.

□ 2115

This money will be utilized to provide more pork. This money is being heavily lobbied for right now, as we speak, by special interests in this city. Throughout the rest of America where you are providing these tax dollars for the city of Washington, D.C., where your Federal Government is located, I can assure you that a lot of those tax dollars are funding, in fact, lobbyists of special interest organizations who want to spend those dollars.

Do you think there are a lot of people in Washington, D.C. that want to see the taxpayer get some of those dollars back? Of course they do not. They want to take those dollars and enhance their special interests. And they know that in order to convince the American public that those dollars ought to stay in Washington, D.C., instead of a small fraction of those dollars going back to the people that paid them and sent them here to Washington, D.C., in order to do that, they put up very persuasive marketing efforts. Do not kid yourself; they are not going to come out to the taxpayers in Colorado or Wyoming or Utah or California or Washington; they are not going to come out to those taxpayers and say, ''Hey, we've got a bad program in Washington, D.C. we want you to fund. We want to buy drunks a new car or we want to tear down the forest with a bunch of money.'' That is not what these programs are like.

These programs sound good, education, this, that, motherhood and apple pie. Frankly one of the problems we face back here is a lot of these programs are in fact good. But the reality of the situation is, we do not usually have a lot of choices between good and bad programs back here in Washington. Our choices are generally between good programs and good programs, and it is a tough decision. But we, in fact, have to say no. We cannot fund everything that comes into our office.

As many of my colleagues know on a daily basis, we have requests for lots and lots of money. We have got to take a serious look. We have got to tighten our belts just like everybody else, just like the working families of America have to tighten their belts with this economy beginning to slow down as it has.

So the first strategy, the first layer of that multilayered strategy that we must put into place is some type of tax cut that means something. While we are on that point, do not send out a $300 billion tax cut to the American taxpayers. That does not do any good for the economy. You have got to have a tax reduction that means something. You have got to have something like a capital gains reduction that means something, getting rid of the marriage tax, which means something out there, eliminating the death tax which means something out there. A tax cut that reduces the liability of the taxpayer, not the person that does not pay taxes but of the taxpayer; make it mean something. That is how your first layer of a tax cut will help impact this economy in a positive fashion.

The second thing we have got to see happen, and it is happening as we speak, is reduction of the interest rate. Now, Alan Greenspan and the Fed surprised everyone last week with a half a percent reduction in the prime lending rate, in the prime rate that the Feds put out. Why is that a surprise? Why do you think it was handled over a telephone call? Why do you think it was unexpected? Because the Feds, they sense we have got problems ahead and we need to address it now and we need to put stimulation into the economy now. So those interest rates are going to have to come down again.

But how much more room do we have on the interest rates? You can continue to lower the rates, but at some point the lending institutions in this country have to have a margin. They cannot loan at zero. Who is going to put their money out there to loan it at 2 percent where it has got risk? So at some point the banks, instead of loaning at prime, will have to loan at prime plus 1 or prime plus 1½, et cetera. So the advantage of the reduction in rates can only go so much further. But so far I think Greenspan is doing a good job.

Now, some will say he should have done it 6 months ago. But I can tell you 6 months ago, a lot of people were thinking that everything Greenspan was doing was perfect. So in the world of finance, hindsight is always perfect. The fact is, Alan Greenspan is participating, he is addressing this thing I think in a fashion that will help us slow down this slowdown or level off this slowdown and put us back into a recovery stage.

The third step that we have to take on this multilayered strategy is that we have got to control spending. We cannot allow the government to continue to spend as we spent last year. The 11 percent, 12 percent spending rate, which by the way is a much higher spending rate than almost every taxpaying family in America got to enjoy last year, cannot continue forward with this government. This is not a government that should continue to spend and spend and spend and spend.

Many of the critics of President Bush's budget and many of the critics of President Bush's tax reduction are special interest groups in Washington, D.C. Do not kid yourself. Everybody has got special interests. I have special interests. Water, I worry about water in the West. I worry about land issues in the West. I worry about education for my three children. I have a special interest in those areas.

But every special interest is going to have to help participate in our government attempt to try and level off this slowdown in our economy. I do not think it is too much to go out, and President Bush has not gone out and asked a lot from the government. President Bush has gone out to the government and said, Look, you get to keep all the money you had last year, Government. But as your leader, as the President of the United States, I am telling you we cannot continue on this spending spiral. We cannot go on like that.

I am not asking you to go down. I am asking you at the government level, let's just knock it down a little. You can go ahead and have everything you have this year, governmental agencies, but next year we are going to keep it to a 4 percent increase, 4 cents on the dollar.

I asked when I was in my district how many of my constituents were going to have a 4 percent increase in their budget next year from their employer. I did not have very many of them that said they would. I did not have very many of them that expected they would. So I think it is entirely reasonable that the President ask that the government agencies, they too tighten their belts and they too live within a reasonable spending increase.

Let me tell you one of the favorite ploys that is utilized by special interests in Washington, D.C. I will use the board here as an example. This is an old-time trick used in budgeting and used by special interest groups. Let us say, for example, agency X received $10 in last year's budget and let us say that agency X this year asked for $20. They got $10 last year. This year they are asking for $20. Let us say that the President comes out with his budget

and says that agency X should get $15. They got $10 last year, agency X, they are going to get $15 this year under the proposed budget, but they wanted $20.

Now, the average American out there calls that a $5 increase. Last year they got $10; this year they are going to get $15. Do you know what they do, the lobbyists and the special interests for agency X? They go out and say, wait a minute, they go out to our constituents, they go out to the general public and they say, We are getting our budget cut. You have got to write your Congressman. You have got to call your Congressman. They are cutting education or they are cutting water or they are cutting highways or they are cutting the school lunch program. You name it. You have got to call them. They are cutting us.

Ask them what they really mean by cutting. Has the President in his budget and have we in Congress really cut their budget or have we reduced what they have asked for? I think you will find in most cases the reductions they are talking about are reductions in what they have asked for, not reductions in what they actually received last year. In fact, in many of those cases, you will find they actually got an increase over last year.

Again, there are really three strategies that we have to deploy now. Again, one of them is to reduce those Federal interest rates. That is happening.

The second one is to put into place the President's tax cut proposal. It is going to be modified, but we have got to have it close enough to his proposal that it is going to make a difference in our economy. And I think that is going to happen.

And the third thing that we have to do is control government spending. That is going to be our challenge on this House floor. That is the one burden that is on the shoulders of each and every one of us. We have got to have enough leadership on both sides. Both sides of the aisle have to come together.

Now, I realize that the Democrats, especially the liberal leadership of the Democratic Party, the liberal side of that party, feels that they are an opposition government and may not join with us; but I can assure you that there are a number of conservative Democrats, as well as the Republicans, that will come together to try and control that government spending. We have got to do it, because if we do not, everyone in this Nation suffers as a result of this economy slowing down worse.

The last thing you want this economy to do is to slow down to the extent that we begin to lose consumer confidence. Last month consumer confidence was up, but the news released today tells us that consumer confidence is back down. The consumers have confidence when they have trust in their government, that government is going to control spending, when they know they are going to have more dollars in their pocket as a result of a tax cut and when they know that the interest rate that they finance their home, that they pay their credit cards, that they pay for their new car, that that interest rate is going down. That is what restores or holds consumer confidence. That is the key ingredient out there for this economy.

Now, let me tell you about a missile we have got in the air. We really have two missiles right now in the air dealing with the economy. One is the hoof and mouth disease. Many of you have heard about the hoof and mouth disease. Let me tell my colleagues, let me distinguish at the very beginning of these remarks about the hoof and mouth disease. That is not the mad cow disease. There is a distinct difference between the mad cow disease and the hoof and mouth disease. The mad cow disease is a terrible disease. But the hoof and mouth disease, which is the one we are expecting sooner than later to appear somewhere in this country, humans do not contact it.

Now, humans can spread it. Humans can spread it simply through touch. It can be on the bottom of their shoes. This disease can actually spread through the air for, I think, 10 or 15 miles. But the hoof and mouth disease is not the deadly mad cow disease.

So when—I am not saying ''if'' because I think it is going to happen, but when there is an outbreak in this country of the hoof and mouth disease, the citizens of this country and our constituents should not panic. We have our Federal agencies coordinating. We have Joe over at the FEMA, we have the Department of Agriculture, we have the CIA, we have the Department of Interior. We are putting a lot of resources into trying to figure out when it hits, how to attack it, how to eliminate it, how to localize it and how to keep the public relations on it in such a way that people do not think it is the mad cow disease that has come into our country.

Now, if in fact we have that hoof and mouth disease and if in fact we let a phobia come out of that that creates some kind of lack of consumer confidence or some kind of panic amongst our consumers in regards to the beef industry, it could have a very negative, dramatic impact on our economy. I think it is incumbent upon all of us out there, and our constituents, not to panic if that hoof and mouth disease ends up in this country, to address it.

It is kind of like responding to a fire. I used to be a volunteer fireman and I used to be a police officer. The worst thing you can do as a police officer or a volunteer fireman, or any fireman, is to panic when you go to the scene of an accident or you go to the scene of a fire. We have got to remain calm.

Do not panic if this hoof and mouth disease shows up. One, you should rest assured that at least the government is going to do what we can do. What we are learning from what is happening over in the United Kingdom, fortunately we were not the first ones out of the chute this time. We are learning from their trials and tribulations dealing with this hoof and mouth. So I think we are going to be able to address it. But we need help from you, we need help from your constituents and we need help from the consumers of America. Do not panic. Understand what it is.

Now, this leads me into the second so-called missile we have in the air. That is our energy crisis. During my meetings, and even the preceding speakers before I arrived here this evening, I heard criticizing the President about the energy policy. What kind of energy policy did Clinton have? He did not have an energy policy. There has not been an energy policy in this country for years. President Bush has only been in office for, what, 12 or 13 weeks and one of the first mandates this President placed on the American people was the fact we have to have an energy policy.

□ 2130

There are some things we should take a look at. We should have a big table, and we should place everything on the table. It does not mean it is going to happen, but it means we ought to talk about it. It means energy ought to be in most discussions we have in this country when we talk about the economy, when we talk about the health of the country.

What are our energy needs today? What are our energy shortages today? How are we going to mesh the two of these into the future? What are we going to do about California?

President Bush on a number of occasions has talked about California. Now I will say, I do not have a lot of sympathy for California. They have not allowed a power plant out there for 15 years. They have not allowed a natural gas transmission line for 8 years, 10 years. Some of the hardest-hitting radical environmental organizations in the country come out of California.

We have not had an inland refinery, which these organizations have opposed, built in this country for 25 years. I do not know how many years ago a nuclear facility was built.

My point is this: while you may not feel much sympathy for California, and I do not because they have kind of adopted the not-in-my-back-yard theory, the fact is that we have to put those emotional angers or lack of sympathy for a State like California aside. California is a State in the United States, and a lot of times what hurts California is going to hurt the rest of us. A lot of times what is bad for California is bad for the United States. We have to stand side by side with California. We have to stand side by side with every State in this Union and, as a team, determine what our energy policy will be.

That is exactly what the President of the United States has said. This is the United States. This is a country which

as a country must come up with some type of energy policy. One does not come up with a credible energy policy by pretending to address things, and not addressing them, that are somewhat painful. The fact is we are going to have to explore for more resources.

Conservation is an important issue and conservation can provide some of that gap that we have today, some of it, but not all of it. When we sit down and we talk frankly with each other, we know that we have to find some additional supplies of energy.

Now I heard a quote, I even wrote it down, from one of the previous speakers. Apparently he has visited some farm where they have enough wind generation; and he said if we could put this wind generation in place, it would supply the energy for all of the United States.

Come on. Give me a break. Show me where that is going to happen. If we had that capability, you do not think we would not have wind generation in this country right now in vast quantities?

I read an interesting thing, I think in the Wall Street Journal, today about wind generation. Some of our environmental organizations, and I think justifiably, are saying about wind generation, you are killing birds. Unfortunately, you are in a migration path and a lot of birds are going into your propellers on the wind mills and you can have acres and acres and acres and acres of wind mills and we are not producing much energy. Now that is not to say that we should not consider wind mill-generated power. We should. We should consider solar-generated power.

The fact is, we have a gap that we have to fill fairly quickly. The first way to begin to close that gap is conserve. We all are conserving right now.

The second way is to put an energy policy in place. Now let me mention to you why I am saying we are all conserving right now. I do not know about you, but a year and a half ago at my house, and I live high in the Rocky Mountains so in the winter it is cold, we need that heat, I can say that a year and a half ago, I admit it, I probably had my temperature on 68 degrees, 70 degrees in most of my house; and if I was chilled, I went into my house, and I did not think anything about moving the gas thermometer up to 80 or 85 to warm up for 30 minutes or so.

Well, that is not happening today. In fact, my wife just called me. She just called me about 2 hours ago and she said, Guess what our public service utility bill was for last month? 130 bucks.

A month ago it was 500-and-some dollars. We have changed our policies at our house, at my own home. Now when you go in a room in our house, we have thermometers that are set at 50 degrees, and maybe one is at 68 degrees. So I think across America all of us are beginning to conserve. It is an important part of it.

As the President has said, we need to figure out a new source of energy. Now the President says put it on the table. Let us talk about ANWR. Let us talk about drilling off the Florida coast. Let us talk about where we can go and what can the Federal Government do to help with this energy crisis. Let us talk about lifting sanctions off Iraq and sanctions off some of the other countries we have that are oil-producing countries, that might put more oil on to the market as a result of those sanctions being lifted.

The President did not say let us adopt it. The President did not issue an executive order which were the favorites of the last administration we have, I might remind my liberal colleagues. The President did not say put it in place. He did not issue an executive order that said do it. He said let us consider it, put it on the table, put it up for debate.

What happens? How interesting. He puts it on the table, the President puts it on the table for debate; and the first thing we do is hear criticism after criticism. Worst environmental President we have ever had; it is a damage to the environment.

How interesting. These people that are screaming the loudest probably have their thermometers at 70 degrees at their house. They probably drive a car. They are probably wearing clothes that were produced by machinery. I mean, there is lots of energy consumption in this country by the very people that are being the most critical of this President who is saying, look, I am not saying we necessarily have to go with ANWR. I am not saying we necessarily should go off the coast of Florida. I am saying put it on the table and let us discuss it, because reasonable people can come to reasonable conclusions and reasonable conclusions lead to reasonable solutions. That is what we have to do.

This energy thing is nothing to laugh about. The situation in California, sure a lot of us may have chuckled about, well, California they got what they deserved; but the fact is it hurts California and it hurts the United States. We need to help California because, in turn, it helps us.

Take a look at the amount of agriculture that comes out of the State of California. I read a statistic the other day, and I think my recall of it is that if California were a country it would be like the third economic power in the world if it was a country of its own. We cannot simply disregard California. We cannot discount the problems that California is having. Nor can we discount the problems of the smallest State in the Union.

The fact is, we are a Union and we have to come together with an energy policy; and we expect our President to put forward some kind of structure so we can have that energy policy, and that is exactly what this President is doing.

Do you think the liberal Democrats are giving him credit for that? No, of course they are not. Do you think some of these environmental organizations, Earth First and some of those type of characters, are giving him credit? No. They are out there fund-raising by screaming wolf, crying wolf.

Look, this is going to be a disaster. Where the disaster is going to come is if we sit and we do not put anything on the table for discussion and as a result we do not end up with an energy policy. This country needs it, and I think the President is exercising sound leadership in going forward.

I noticed a couple of my colleagues criticized, for example, the Kyoto Treaty. A lot of us now have heard about the Kyoto Treaty. This is not something that is new, by the way. What should be pointed out, President Bush did not kill the Kyoto Treaty. The Kyoto Treaty went down on a 99 to 0 vote. There was not one Democrat Senator, there was not one Republican Senator, who voted on Kyoto last year or the year before when it came up for a vote. Ninety-five to 0 is my understanding, or maybe it was 95 to 0; but I think it was zero in support of Kyoto.

Why? Because it was not balanced. Why? Because it was not fair to the United States. Why? Because it put such a burden on the United States that the United States would be at a distinct disadvantage in this world. That is why.

So the President, in talking about this, all of a sudden they see an opportunity to hang something on the President as being anti-environment. The people out there that are crying against the President on this environment, they better be prepared to come forward and have something to put on the table for our energy policy. I invite them to do that, by the way. I think all of us need to come to that table, but have something that is going to work.

I noticed that some people criticized the President's reduction in research in some alternative energy methods. Do you know why? They are not producing. Research is a nice, magical word; but after all of these years, after all of the billions of dollars they have put into particular research, if it is not giving production, if results are not received out of it, something different has to be done. That is what the President is proposing.

The easiest thing to do is say, well, I am for more research. It is easy for every one of us to go back to our districts and say, I am for more research. I am going to vote for more research for alternative energy. Count on me. I am going to solve the problem.

That is nothing but a stall. Every one of your constituents ought to say to you, hey, if you are going to support this research, what research are you supporting? What kind of results have you gotten? What kind of date in the future are we going to have this product? What is it going to mean to the energy gap that we have today? What is it going to mean for the energy gap that we are going to have tomorrow? You ought to be able to justify, you

ought to be required to justify, the research dollars that you are spending out there. If you cannot justify it, stand up.

That is how we got to the car, that is how we got to the airplane, that is how we got a person to the Moon, that is how we developed medicine, through research. But many people in the history of this country have had enough guts to say, look, the money we are spending on research today is not giving us what we need. Let us try a different path. Let us use a different approach. Do not keep throwing good money after bad money.

I think this President has stood up and taken leadership in that regard.

Now the easiest thing to do would be for the President to say, well, let us just do like the previous administration, no energy policy. Let us just pretend that California can work out of this on their own and it is not going to be a crisis. Let us just pretend that the research is going to give us the answers, because certainly I can stall it through the next 8 years of the Presidency. But this President is not that way. This President is a doer, and he wants something done about the energy crisis, and many of my colleagues on this House floor want something done about this energy crisis. But we better take it serious because it is serious out there. The disease, the energy disease, or whatever you want to call it, the energy shortage or the energy crisis that is in California today could be on your doorsteps tomorrow.

We need to conserve and we need to explore. We need to find other sources of energy. We need to look for alternative energy. There has got to be a combination, and you begin that with a map. It is just like a road map. We need to take a trip, and we have some pretty tough terrain to get over. The easiest way for us to take that trip is to have a road map; and if we do not have a road map, and in this case we do not have a road map, we do not have an energy policy, we need to make a road map. That is exactly what this President is proposing. It does not mean we are going to go over this mountain or that mountain, but every mountain ought to be laid out on our map. Every mountain ought to be laid out. Every trail ought to be looked at, to see whether that is the trail that we should take. That is exactly what the President is saying we should do. I support the President in regards to those efforts.

THE DEATH TAX SHOULD BE ELIMINATED

Mr. McINNIS. Madam Speaker, I have talked about the economy. I have talked about the hoof and mouth disease, and we visited a little about energy. Let me visit a little about another issue that has come up consistently throughout my district, consistently in my travels throughout this Nation, and I think most of my colleagues have experienced it as well. I intend to follow up on my remarks tomorrow evening from the House floor here, but that is this death tax.

Now some may think that I am being repetitive about this, but there are some people out there that just do not get it. There are some people out there that are being swayed by the advertising of the billionaires who, by the way, not all billionaires but a select group of billionaires who have taken out ads in the Wall Street Journal and said we do not need this. To the person, every one of those people that signed on that Wall Street Journal article or advertisement that there should be a tax on death, every one of those families has already done their trust planning, their legal planning. They have had their attorneys figure out how they pay the least amount, how to protect them from those taxes upon their death.

□ 2145

In my opinion, they are acting very hypocritically. After they have provided protection for themselves and the death tax, they turn around to us representing the government, they say you should continue this tax against the rest of America. That is pretty inequitable.

Madam Speaker, I think when you talk about the death or estate tax, the first step you need to take is ask what is its history. What is its justification? Should death be a taxable event? Because somebody dies, should that be a reason for the government to jump in and tax on property, by the way, which has already been taxed. This property that we are talking about in my discussions on the death tax, this is not property which has escaped taxation, this is property which has been taxed already once but in some cases, two or three times; in some cases, for multigenerations.

So the first question you ask, should death be a taxable event. I venture to say that it should not be, no more than we should have a marriage penalty tax because you get married. This should be a country that encourages marriage. This should be a country that encourages one family farm, one generation to move it to the next generation, that one family business go to the next generation. That is what this country is about. This country, after all, is built on capitalism. This country is built on private property rights. This country is built on the concept that the government works for the people, the people do not work for the government.

So I do not think that you can justify death as a tax. Do you know where the history of this came about? It was in the days when people wanted to move this government towards a socialist-type of domineerance, to punish the people that were successful, to go after the Carnegies and the Rockefellers that amassed all of this wealth, and take that money back for redistribution of wealth. The old theory that you do not allow a person to be paid based on what they are worth, they are paid on what they need.

It brings to mind the Ayn Rand book, Atlas Shrugged. Read that book, colleagues, or listen to Books on Tape. Is that the direction that we want to go with this death tax. It has certainly been the direction we have gone since the death tax has been put into place.

Let me say I was at a meeting the other day, and a gentleman asked, Why do you worry so much about the death tax. Those kids are taken care of anyway. They do not need all of that money.

That is exactly the point. I am not talking about the billionaires that signed the ad in the New York Times, I am talking about the family, the small contractor who owns a pickup, a backhoe, maybe a shed to do his maintenance in and if he is killed on the job, what about the family's opportunity the next day to continue that small business. That is who I care about. That is who I am talking about. And the very point is those people do need it. Those people do need that business to continue on to the next generation, and in many cases the families are dependent upon that business.

I have an entire group of letters here, some of which I am going to read this evening who are impacted, not billionaires, how this has affected a lot of your neighbors, especially in an area like my district. In the Colorado mountains, our real estate values have continued to spiral at an increasing rate. So we have seen a challenge the likes we have never seen in the past on our family farms and our family ranches.

This death tax is not right. I was at another meeting and I had a lady who was very justified in her thoughts and very professional in her approach. She said what right do the children have to inherit this property. I said they have every right, but now I have had second thoughts about it. Under our concept of government, it is not the children's right to inherit, it is the parents' right to determine where their property, which they have accumulated by following the laws, by working hard, they have accumulated property, it is their right of private property which is a basic, fundamental part of our Constitution, a fundamental part of the government that we enjoy is the right of private property. It is without question, in my opinion, the right of the person who owns the property to determine where property will go after their death.

I do not think the government, who did not put out the risk, and the government had something to do with somebody obtaining property, I admit that, we have a government of laws, you do not have to worry about somebody stealing, but that is why you pay taxes. So the government has already gotten its share of taxes off the private property. I think it is the right of the owner of that property to determine to whom and in what amounts that property should pass after that person's death.

Let me tell you that the hardships, and I have experienced some of those hardships, I have seen them in the

communities, the hardships that are put on communities cannot be overlooked in this argument of whether or not a death tax is justified.

These people will argue, this New York Times ad and some of these multibillionaires that signed this ad, who have already protected or minimized the impact on their wealth, one of the points they make is that it only impacts the upper 2 percent of our society.

Let us put aside my arguments, do you have a right to tax death. Let us put that aside. Let us put aside the inequity of that, and let us say that 2 percent actually pay it. Take a look at what it does to the communities that those 2 percent live in. That money leaves those communities. If you have a small community in Iowa, and you have a family who has had a family farm for a couple of generations and they have seen a small escalation in property values, and the husband and the wife team that have made that farm a going operation pass away, and the government comes in and taxes that property and forces the sale of the farm, what do you think happens to that money of those 2 percent. Do you think that it stays in that small town in Iowa? Of course it does not. It is sucked out of that town in Iowa to Washington, D.C. A small percentage of it may stay with the State of Iowa. But by far the largest chunk, 75 percent or greater, goes to Washington, D.C.

Do you think the people in these Chambers or these Federal agencies put those dollars back into that farming community in Iowa? Of course they do not. That money is taken out of these communities. For all practical purposes, it is taken from the community forever. Those are local dollars that go to local charities that provide savings in our local banks, that allow for productivity, for creation of capital.

Why should the government come in after they have taxed these people during their entire lifetime, come back and once again upon their death seize this money. I do not think that you can justify it.

Let me read you a couple of letters that I think kind of hit home.

''Dear sir, My name is Chris Anderson. I am 24 years old, and I currently run a small mail-order business. I am not a constituent of yours. I currently reside in New Jersey.'' That is interesting because the previous speaker was from New Jersey.

''However, I have listened with great interest as you spoke this evening on the topic of the death tax, as you called it. I in all likelihood will not face, will not be impacted by the problems you were outlining, at least not in the near future. I am not in line to inherit a business. However, I am soon to be married, and I look forward to having a family and perhaps one day my children will want to follow in my footsteps with my business. I hope and pray that they will not face the additional grief caused by the death tax.

''A 55 percent tax is, at best, a huge burden on a family business and the loved ones of the deceased. At worst, it can be a death blow that ruins what could otherwise have been the future of yet another generation. This letter is not a plea for help. I just want to let you know that although I am not a victim of this tax, I appreciate and applaud your efforts against it. I firmly believe that Congress and the government at large needs to recognize that America's future is and will always be firmly rooted in the success of small business. Many of these businesses are family owned and need the next generation to continue them into the future. I spent a few years working for a small family-owned business, and not just myself but several workers depended on the income that they derived from working for this small business. I fear for those workers when the tax man comes knocking.

''This tax has claws that rip at many people, and many more people than the immediate family of the deceased. It is also a huge impact on the employees of small businesses. I hope you do the best you can to eliminate or to do something about this death tax.''

Now, let me read another one. Tomorrow evening, by the way, I want to go into much more detail about the death tax and other impacts that it has on a community.

This evening as I read these letters, I begin to feel the hardships that these families have out there. And every one of you here, you know of an example where the death tax has devastated a community or devastated a family. You know how unjustified it can be.

Let me read another letter. ''Roberta and I just finished watching your death tax speech. We were both very proud to watch you as you stated some real concerns and problems that we face with this unfair taxation.''

I want to tell you, Mr. and Mrs. Schaffer, it is an unfair taxation. It is not only an unfair taxation, it is the most unjustified taxation in our entire system.

''As you so well know, farming and ranching out here is no slam-dunk. If our farm is ultimately faced with this death tax, there is absolutely no way that we could ever afford and justify holding on to our family farm. This in turn will prevent us from allowing this farm to go on to future generations. It will keep our farm from becoming one more development out in the country. In other words, keep it as open space, and most of us have deep appreciation for open space. It will not keep it available to the wildlife, the deer and the elk. In fact, for your interest, we saw over 600 head of elk on the farm this morning. It will not keep it available for unencumbered natural gas productions.

''Scott, we are only able to meet the daily operating costs of our farm under the present economic conditions of agriculture. Unless there is a positive action taken by Congress on this death tax problem, we will start having to make necessary plans to arrange our affairs so that our family can somehow struggle to make it to the next generation. By the way, there is no way we are going to let you,'' meaning Washington, ''and the IRS come and take it from us. The government does not deserve it. Of course, in order to protect our land, it will make it necessary to begin destruction of the land: The development of one of the largest open space areas of our county. Our land is quite valuable if it were broken up into subdivisions, and the only way we can keep the government's hands off it, if you do not do something about this death tax, is to break up our farm and sell it as a subdivision; therefore, having the money to once again pay taxes to the government on property which has already been taxed.''

Let me read you the next one. Mr. Allen says, ''I am writing to encourage you to keep up the repeal of the death tax on the front burner.''

Mr. Allen goes on to say, ''As the owner of a family business, it is extremely important that upon our death, the business be able to be passed on to our son and daughter, both of whom work in this business, without the threat of having to liquidate our business, to sell our business off to pay inheritance taxes on assets which have already been taxed by the government. Of all of the taxes we pay, the death tax truly represents double or triple taxation.

''I am aware that several wealthy people, i.e. William Gates, Sr., George Soros, and other multibillionaires, have come out against a repeal of the death tax. This is one of the most self-serving demonstrations I have ever seen. They have theirs in trusts. They have theirs in foundations. They have theirs in offshore accounts. They have hired a fleet of attorneys to protect their interests; and of course they will pay little or no tax because they have protected their assets. Whatever their political motivations are, they certainly do not represent or speak for the vast majority of small farmers and business owners in this country. Again, I urge you to push for repeal of the death tax.''

□ 2200

This is from Mr. Happy. ''I am watching you as you are talking about the death tax and the marriage tax. I wish there was some way I could help you to get these taxes eliminated.''

Mr. Happy goes on to say, ''They are the most discriminatory taxes and socialistic taxes that our entire system could envision. I can't for the life of me understand how they got put into place to start with.''

Well, as I mentioned, Mr. Happy, they got put into place because it was a way to go after the Carnegies and the Rockefellers. It was when this country was moving towards a socialistic government. They certainly did not go into place, Mr. Happy, as a result of the theory of capitalism.

''How could anyone advocate taxing somebody twice and three times. I don't care if it is a millionaire or a pauper. It is not the government's money.'' And in this letter, Mr. Happy has in this, ''It is not the government's money'' in capital letters.

Let me repeat what he said: ''How could anyone advocate taxing someone two or three times. I don't care if it is a millionaire or a pauper. It is not the government's property. The taxes have been paid,'' and once again, in full capital letters, the word ''paid.'' ''The taxes have been paid. I have been considering divorcing my wife of 48 years and just living together, filing single tax returns because of the marriage penalty, or just filing separately. Why should a family who have been together for 45 years, who have paid taxes on time every year, be forced into the position of losing the property that they have spent their entire life accumulating, or be penalized because they have a marriage of 48 years? Can you answer that?''

Mr. Happy, I cannot answer it, other than the fact to tell you that there are some people here who believe in the redistribution of wealth, who believe somehow in justification of a death tax or tax upon somebody's death.

Let me just wrap this up with one other letter, and then I intend to continue this later this week, because I feel so strongly about the fact that the government should not be taxing death. Mr. Frazier writes me: ''I was encouraged by the State of the Union and the President's $1.6 trillion in tax relief. We have operated a family partnership since the 1930s,'' that is what Mr. Frazier says, since the 1930s they have operated a family ranch. ''My parents died about 5 years apart in the 1980s and the estate tax on each of their one-fifth interest was three to four times more than what they paid for the ranch when they purchased it in 1946.'' In other words, his father and mother, who only owned one-fifth interest in this ranch, each paid more taxes on their one-fifth interest than they paid when they originally bought the ranch.

''Eliminating the death tax and the marriage penalty and reducing tax rates across the board will go a long ways in providing jobs. This, in turn, will enable hard-working families in our cattle country to pass their heritage on to the next generation and to continue to provide safe, wholesome beef to consumers around the world.''

Remember, a lot of these people, they are not so interested in the business, it is the heritage of their farms, the heritages of their businesses that they want to pass to the next generation. That is something our country should encourage. Heritage has a lot of value. ''I have three sons involved in our operation and a grandson starting college next fall, and it is important that we keep agriculture viable, to keep our beef industry from becoming integrated. We need to make it possible for our youth to be able to stay on our ranches and farms.''

These are not letters that I put together over at my office. These are letters that have been sent to my office by families in America, not the multibillionaires that signed that New York Times ad who have already protected their wealth from government taxation. These are people whose lives will be devastated because the government continues on its path of considering death a taxable event.

Well, I have enjoyed my time this evening. We started out by discussing the economy and we have a multistage strategy that we must deploy in regards to our economy. We have to continue to have Mr. Greenspan lower the rates. He is going to do that to the extent that he can. We have to put a tax cut into place, and we have got to control government spending.

I moved from our economy to our energy policy this evening. I said that we need an energy policy. The previous administration did not have one; this administration in its first few days in office said, we need an energy policy, and they are willing to stand up and put everything on the table. Now, that does not mean it is going to be utilized, but it does mean we can discuss it and we, all of us as a team, Democrats and Republicans, must come together for an energy policy.

Finally, I have wrapped up with the discussion on the death tax. I intend later this week when I have an opportunity to speak again to go into more detail on the severe impact that this death tax has on American families. It is severe.

## WAKE UP, AMERICA: ENGAGEMENT WITH CHINA HAS FAILED

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FERGUSON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER) is recognized for half of the remaining time until midnight, approximately 58 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, one month ago, the Communist regime that controls the mainland of China attacked an American surveillance aircraft while it was in international waters. After being knocked out of the sky, 24 American military personnel, the crew of the surveillance craft, were held hostage for nearly 2 weeks. The Communist Chinese blamed us and would not return the crew until the United States was humiliated before the world.

Wake up, America. What is going on here? Large financial interests in our country whose only goal is exploiting the cheap, near-slave labor of China have been leading our country down the path to catastrophe. How much more proof do we need that the so-called engagement theory is a total failure? Our massive investment in China, pushed and promoted by American billionaires and multinational corporations, has created not a more peaceful, democratic China, but an aggressive nuclear-armed bully that now threatens the world with its hostile acts and proliferation. Do the Communist Chinese have to murder American personnel or attack the United States or our allies with their missiles before those who blithesomely pontificate about the civilizing benefits of building the Chinese economy will admit that China for a decade has been going in the opposite direction than predicted by the so-called ''free traders.''

We have made a monstrous mistake, and if we do not face reality and change our fundamental policies, instead of peace, there will be conflict. Instead of democratic reform, we will see a further retrenchment of a regime that is run by gangsters and thugs, the world's worst human rights abusers.

Let us go back to basics. The mainland of China is controlled by a rigid, Stalinistic Communist party. The regime is committing genocide in Tibet. It is holding as a captive the designated successor of the Dalai Lama, who is the spiritual leader of the Tibetan people. By the way, this person, the designated new leader, is a little boy. They are holding hostage a little boy in order to terrorize the Tibetan people. The regime is now, at this moment, arresting thousands of members of the Falun Gong, which is nothing more threatening than a meditation and yoga society. Christians of all denominations are being brutalized unless they register with the state and attend controlled churches. Just in the last few days, there has been a roundup of Catholics who were practicing their faith outside of state control. Now they are in a Chinese prison.

There are no opposition parties in China. There is no free press in China. China is not a free society under anyone's definition. More importantly, it is not a society that is evolving toward freedom.

President Richard Nixon first established our ties with the Communist Chinese in 1972 at the height of the Cold War. That was a brilliant move. At that particular moment, it was a brilliant move. It enabled us to play the power of one dictatorship off the power of another dictatorship. We played one against the other at a time when we had been weakened by the Vietnam War and at a time when Soviet Russia was on the offensive.

During the Reagan years, we dramatically expanded our ties to China, but do not miss the essential fact that justified that relationship and made it different than what has been going on these last 10 years. China was at that time, during the Reagan administration, evolving toward a freer, more open society, a growing democratic movement was evident, and the United States, our government and our people, fostered this movement. Under President Reagan, we brought tens of thousands of students here, and we sent

teams from our National Endowment for Democracy there. We were working with them to build a more democratic society, and it looked like that was what was going to happen. All of this ended, of course, in Tiananmen Square over 10 years ago.

Thousands of Chinese gathered there in Tiananmen Square in Beijing to demand a more open and democratic government. For a moment, it appeared like there had been an historic breakthrough. Then, from out of the darkness came battle-hardened troops and tanks to wipe out the opposition. The people who ordered that attack are still holding the reins of power in China today and, like all other criminals who get away with scurrilous deeds, they have become emboldened and arrogant.

My only lament is that had Ronald Reagan been President during that time of Tiananmen Square, things, I think, would have been different; but he was not. Since that turn of events about 12 years ago, things have been progressively worse. The repression is more evident than ever. The belligerence and hostility of Beijing is even more open. Underscoring the insanity of it all, the Communist Chinese have been using their huge trade surplus with the United States to upgrade their military and expand its warfighting capabilities.

Communist China's arsenal of jets, its ballistic missiles, its naval forces have all been modernized and reinforced. In the last 2 years, they have purchased destroyers from the former Soviet Union. These destroyers are armed with Sunburn missiles. These were systems that were designed during the Cold War by the Russians to destroy American aircraft carriers.

Yes, the Communist Chinese are arming themselves to sink American aircraft carriers, to kill thousands upon thousands of American sailors. Make no mistake about it, China's military might now threatens America and world peace. If there is a crisis in that part of the world again, which there will be, we can predict that some day, unlike the last crisis when American aircraft carriers were able to become a peaceful element to bring moderation of judgment among the players who were in conflict, instead, American aircraft carriers will find themselves vulnerable, and an American President will have to face the choice of risking the lives of all of those sailors on those aircraft carriers.

Mr. Speaker, how is it, then, that a relatively poor country can afford to enlarge its military in such a way, to the point that it can threaten a superpower such as the United States of America?

□ 2215

Even as China's slide into tyranny and militarism continued in these last 12 years, the United States government has permitted a totally indefensible economic rules of engagement to guide our commercial ties with the mainland of China.

While China was going in the right direction, permitting that country to have a large trade advantage and thus providing a large reserve of hard currency may or may not have made sense, as long as China was going in the right direction and going towards democracy. Maybe we would like to build up a freer China that way.

But it made no sense, and it still makes no sense, for the United States to permit a country that is sinking even deeper into tyranny and into anti-Western hostility to have a huge trade surplus as a resource to call upon to meet their military needs.

In effect, the Communist Chinese have been using the tens of billions of dollars of trade surplus with the United States each year to build their military power and military might so some day the Communist Chinese might be able to kill millions of our people, or at least to threaten us to do that in order to back us down into defeat without ever coming to a fight.

We have essentially been arming and equipping our worst potential enemy and financing our own destruction. How could we let such a crime against the security of our country happen? Well, it was argued by some very sincere people that free trade would bring positive change to China, and that engagement would civilize the Communist regime.

Even as evidence stacked upon more evidence indicated that China was not liberalizing, that just the opposite was happening, the barkers for open markets kept singing their song: ''Most-favored-nation status, just give us this and things will get better.'' It was nonsense then and it is nonsense today. But after all that has happened, one would think that the shame factor would silence these eternal optimists.

Perhaps I am a bit sensitive because, first and foremost, let me state unequivocally that I consider myself a free trader. Yes, I believe in free trade between free people. What we should strive for is to have more and more open trade with all free and democratic countries, or countries that are heading in the right direction.

I am thus positively inclined towards President Bush's efforts to establish a free trade zone among the democratic countries in this hemisphere. I will read the fine print, but my inclination is to facilitate trade between democracies.

When I say, ''I will read the fine print,'' I will be especially concerned with a free trade agreement, and I will be looking to that free trade agreement to make sure that we have protection that our sensitive technologies, which can be used for military purposes, will not be transferred from the countries in our hemisphere, democratic countries in our hemisphere, to China or to any other countries that are potential enemies of the United States. This will have to be in that free trade agreement.

There will have to be protections against the transfer of our technology to our enemies. This is more of a concern following new science and technology agreements that were signed by China and countries like Brazil and Venezuela recently. Dictatorships are always going to try to gain in any agreement that they have with us, and they are always going to try to manipulate other agreements and the rules of the game so they can stay in power.

When one applies the rules of free trade to a controlled society, as we have been told over and over again, more trade, and let us have free trade with China, that is going to make them more dependent on us and they will be freer and more prosperous, more likely to be peaceful people, well, if we apply the rules of free trade to a dictatorship, ultimately what happens is that it is only free trade in one direction.

On one end we have free people, a democratic people who are not controlled by their government, and thus are basically unregulated and are moving forward for their own benefit. But on the other end, the trade will be controlled and manipulated to ensure that the current establishment of that country stays in power.

Never has that been more evident than in America's dealing with Communist China. In this case, it is so very blatant.

Those advocating most-favored-nation status, or as it is called now, normal trade relations, have always based their case on the boon to our country represented by the sale of American goods to ''the world's largest market.'' That is their argument. Here on this floor over and over and over again we heard people say, ''We have to have these normal trade relations because we have to sell our products, the products made by the American people, to the world's largest market.''

That is a great pitch. The only problem is, it is not true. The sale of U.S.-produced vacuum cleaners, refrigerators, autos, you name the commercial item, are almost a non-factor in the trade relationship between our countries. They are a minuscule amount of what is considered the trade analysis of these two countries.

During these many years that we have given China most-favored-nation status or normal trade relations, the power elite there never lowered China's tariffs, and in fact increased the tariffs in some areas, and erected barriers to prevent the sale of all but a few U.S.-made products.

So while we had low tariffs, and intentionally brought our tariffs down by most-favored-nation, for over a decade, even as China was slipping more into tyranny, they were permitted to have high tariffs and block our goods from coming in.

Beijing would not permit its own people to buy American-made consumer items. They were not looking for a trade relationship with the United States for their people to be able to

buy American products. That is not what they were looking for. That is not what it was all about. They knew it, but yet our people were told over and over and over and over and over again, ''Oh, we have to have most-favored-nation status and normal trade relations in order to sell American products to the world's largest market.''

That is not what was going on. It is not what the reality was. Instead, the Communist Chinese were out to get American money, lots of it, and American money to build factories, and they wanted the Americans to build the factories with our technology and our money in their country.

By the way, many of the factories that were built there were not built in order to sell products to the Chinese people. Those factories were built to export products to the United States.

The system that developed with the acquiescence of our government, and this is no secret, what I am talking about tonight is no secret to anyone except to the American people, our government acquiesced to this for years, this policy put the American people, the American working people, on the losing end of the transformational action in the long run and sometimes even in the medium run.

The Chinese, because of our low tariffs, flooded our market with their products, and blocked our goods from entering China, and all the while we were hearing over and over again, ''We must have most-favored-nation status in order to sell American products in the world's largest market.''

They droned on year after year that most-favored-nation status was so important to selling our products in the world's largest market. I will just repeat that four or five times, because we must have heard it a thousand times on this floor, and every time said, I am sure, in complete sincerity by the people who were expressing it, but were totally wrong. A very quick look into the statistics could have indicated that.

By the way, just to let Members know, the people of Taiwan, numbering 22 million people, buy more from us annually than the 1.2 Chinese on the mainland. The Taiwanese, with 22 million people, buy more consumer products from us than do 1.2 billion Chinese in the mainland.

What has happened? What has happened as a result of these nonsensical counterproductive policies, anti-American policies to some degree, even though our own government has acquiesced in them? It has resulted in a decline in domestic manufacturing facilities in the United States. In other words, we have been closing down our factories and putting our people out of work.

By the way, that does not mean the company is put out of business. Those factories spring up someplace else. There is this flood of Chinese products, the factory closes down, and guess where it reopens? It reopens, yes, in Communist China, using our modern technology and our capital, which is what the Chinese want to have invested in their country.

Adding insult to injury, our working people, some of them, whose jobs are being threatened by imports, our working people are being taxed in order to provide taxpayer-subsidized loans and loan guarantees for those corporate leaders wishing to close down their operations in the United States and set up on the mainland of China.

Even if China was a free country, that would not be a good idea. I do not believe we should be doing that even for democratic countries. But for us to do that to a Communist dictatorship or any kind of dictatorship, to have the American taxpayer subsidize these investments, taking the risks on the shoulders of the American taxpayer in order to build the economy of a vicious dictatorship, this is insane. This is an insane policy. This is not free trade between free people. It has nothing to do with free trade. It is subsidized trade with subjugated people.

Companies that were permitted to sell their product to the Chinese in these last 10 years, and there have been a few, companies like Boeing who have attempted to sell airplanes to China, have found themselves in a very bad predicament. As part of the deal enabling them to sell planes now to Communist China, they have had to set up manufacturing facilities in China to build the parts, or at least some of the parts for the airplane.

Thus, over a period of time, what the Chinese have managed to do is to have the United States just build factories and pay for them. Or, as part of an agreement to sell the airplane, we have set up an aerospace industry in China that will compete with our own aerospace industry.

I come from California. I come from a district in which aerospace is a mighty important part of our economy. I just want to thank all the people who have permitted this policy, this blackmail of American companies, to go on under the name, under the guise of free trade. It is going to sell out our own national interest 10 years down the road when these people will have a modern aerospace industry building weapons and being able to undercut our own people. Gee, thanks.

Making matters worse, many of the so-called companies in China that are partnering with American industrialists, and American industrialists, when they are going to build in China, are often required to have a Chinese company as their partner as a prerequisite to them investing in China, in short order these so-called partners end up taking over the company. So many of American companies have been there and have been burned.

Guess what, we look at these private Chinese companies that were partners with our American firms, we look at them, and what do we find out? They are not private companies at all. Many of them are subsidiaries of the People's Liberation Army. That is right, the Communist Chinese army owns these companies. These are nothing more than military people in civilian clothing. Their profits end up paying for weapons targeting America, and we are paying them to build the companies that make those profits.

Perhaps the most alarming betrayal of American national security interests surfaced about 5 years ago when some of America's biggest aerospace firms went into China hoping to use Chinese rockets to launch American satellites.

□ 2230

They were trying to make a fast buck. It did not cost them a lot more to launch satellites here.

Yes, the Chinese were insisting that any satellites we put up for them be put up on their rockets. I personally thought that, as long as we made sure there was no technology transfer, that was an okay policy. As long as we just launched our American satellite which helped them set up a telephone system or something in China, that is fine if they never got ahold of it, and that would be okay.

I was guaranteed, along with the other Members of this body, there would be incredible safeguards. The last administration briefed us on the safeguards. Then as soon as we approved of letting these satellite deals go through and our satellites be launched on Chinese rockets, the administration trash canned all of the safeguards. I do not understand it. I do not understand why people did this.

But when all was said and done, the Communist Chinese rocket arsenal was filled with more reliable and more capable rockets, thanks to Loral, Hughes and other aerospace firms. Communist Chinese rockets, which were a joke 10 years ago, when Bill Clinton became President of the United States, they were a joke, one out of 10 failed, exploded before they could get into space. Today they are dramatically more likely to hit their targets, and they even carry multiple warheads. Where before they had one warhead and nine out of 10 would explode, now about 9 out of 10 get to their target, and some of them are carrying multiple warheads.

The Cox report detailed this travesty. We should not forget the Cox report. Unfortunately, there has been innuendo after innuendo as if the Cox report has in some way been proven wrong. There are no reports that indicate that what the gentleman from California (Mr. COX) and his task force proved has in some way been discredited. In fact, there was a transfer of technology to the Communist Chinese that did great damage to our national security and put millions of American lives at risk that did not have to be put at risk.

Yet, even with all this staring Congress in the face, we have continued to give Most Favored Nations status to China and even now vote to make them

part of the World Trade Organization. Why? One explanation, well just bad theory. Expanding trade, of course, they believe will make things better. But expanding trade did not make things better. Expanding trade with a dictatorship, as I have mentioned, just expands the power base and solidifies the bad guys in power.

Of course the other explanation of why all this is going on, why we end up seeing our national security trashed is pure greed on some individuals' parts.

Our businessmen have been blinded, not by the dream of selling U.S.-made products to China as they would have you believe in the debates here on the floor of the House, but rather blinded by the vision of using virtually slave labor for quick profits on the mainland of China.

With little or no competition, no negotiators, no lawyers, no environmental restrictions, no unions, no public consent, it sounds like a businessman's dream to me. Yes, it is a businessman's dream if you just blot out the picture of a grinding tyranny and the human rights abuses that are going on and the horrible threat to the United States of America that is emerging because of the things that are going on and the things that are being done.

Because you are a businessman, because you are engaged in making a profit as we are free to do in the United States does not exempt you from being a patriot or being loyal to the security interests of the United States of America.

Today's American overseas businessman quite often is a far cry from the Yankee clipper captains of days gone by. In those days, our Yankee clipper ships sailed the ocean, cut through those seas, the Seven Seas. They were full going over, and they were full coming back. They waived our flag. Our flag was flying from those clipper ships, and our flag stood for freedom and justice. Those Yankee clipper captains and those business entrepreneurs were proud to be Americans.

Today, America's tycoons often see nationalism, read that loyalty to the United States, as an antiquated notion. They are players in the global economy now, they feel. Patriotism they believe is old think.

Well, we cannot rely on the decisions of people like this to determine what the interests of the United States of America is to be. Yet, the influence of these billionaires and these tycoons, these people who would be willing to invest in a dictatorship or a democracy, they could care less which one, they do not care if there is blood dripping off the hand that hands them the dollar bills, those individuals influence our government. Their influence on this elected body is monumental, if not insurmountable at times.

I believe in capitalism. I am a capitalist. I am someone who believes in the free enterprise system, make no mistake about it. But free is the ultimate word. People must be free to be involved in enterprise. We must respect the basic tenets of liberty and justice that have provided us a country in which people are free to uplift themselves through hard work and through enterprise.

Today, more often than not, we are talking about how people are trying to find out ways of manipulating government on how to make a profit, not how to build a better product that will enrich everyone's life and make a profit by doing that, which is the essence of the free enterprise system.

More and more people are not even looking again to this great country and considering this great country for the role that it is playing in this world and how important it is and how we should never sacrifice the security of this country. Because if this country falls, the hope for freedom and justice everywhere in the world falls. No, instead they have put their baskets, not in the United States of America, put their eggs in the basket of globalism. Well, globalism will not work without democratic reform.

China will corrupt the WTO, the World Trade Organization, just as it has corrupted the election processes in the United States of America. You can see it now 20 years from now, maybe 10 years from now, the panels of the WTO, you know, made up of countries from all over the world, Latin America, Africa, Middle East. There are members of those panels making these decisions, they will not have ever been elected by anybody, much less the people of the United States of America, yet we will be expected to follow their dictates. Communist China, they will pay those people off in a heartbeat. Why not? They did it to our people.

Remember the campaign contributions given to Vice President Gore at the Buddhist Temple? Remember the money delivered to the Clinton's by Johnny Chung? Where did that money come from? We are talking about hundreds of thousands of dollars. Where did it come from? It originated with Chinese military officers. These military officers were wearing civilian clothes. They were top officers in that part of the People's Liberation Army that produces missiles. That is where the money came from, all this while our most deadly missile technology was being transferred to Communist China. One wonders why the Communist Chinese leaders are arrogant and think that American leaders are cowards and corrupt when we let this happen.

Our country has, in short, had a disastrously counterproductive policy. We have, over the last 10 years, built our worst potential enemy from a weak, introverted power into a powerful economic military force, a force that is looking to dominate all of Asia. When I say worst potential enemy, that is not just my assessment. That is what the Communist Chinese leaders themselves believe and are planning for.

Why do you think Communist Chinese Boss Jiang Zemin recently visited Cuba? He was in Cuba with Fidel Castro who hates our guts when he released the hostages, the American military personnel that he was holding hostage. What do you think that was all about? He was telling the whole world we are standing up to the United States of America, and they are our enemy. He was involved with an activity that was declaring to the world his hostility towards the United States.

Why, when you have a country like this who are professing hostility to the United States and doing such as this, why are we permitting them to buy up ports that will effectively give them control of the Panama Canal, which is what they did a year and a half ago.

The Panama Canal, the last administration let the Chinese, the Communist Chinese, through bribery, tremendously expand its power in Panama and, through bribery, let it get control of the port facilities at both ends of the Panama Canal. Why would we let such a thing happen?

In many ways, we are repeating history. In the 1920s, Japanese militarists wiped out Japan's fledgling democratic movement. That it did. In doing so, it set a course for Japan. Japan then was a racist power which believed it, too, had a right to dominate Asia. Japanese militarists also knew that only the United States of America stood in their way. This is deja vu all over again as Yogi Berra once said.

The Communist Chinese, too, are militarists who seek to dominate Asia. They think they are racially superior to everyone. They are unlike their Japanese predecessors, however, willing to go slow, and they have been going slow. But make no mistake about it, they intend to dominate Asia, all of it. And even know, their maps claim Siberia, Mongolia and huge chunks of the South China Sea.

The confrontation with our surveillance plane must be reviewed in this perspective if the damage to the United States and the imprudence and arrogance on the part of the communist Chinese are to be understood.

China's claim on the South China Sea includes the Spratley Islands. I have a map of the South China Sea with me tonight. Hainan Island. Our airplane was intercepted, knocked out of the sky somewhere in here. But what we are not told about and what the media is not focusing on and no one has been talking about is this plane was precisely in the waters between Hainan Island and the Spratley Islands.

For those who do not know what the Spratley Islands are, they are just a series of reefs that are under water at high tide and at low tide above water. They are just a short distance, as you can see, this is here, this is the Philippines; and right about 100 miles offshore, the Spratley Islands. Yet they are several hundred miles from China. Yet the Chinese are trying to claim these islands. That is what this was all

about. Not only are these islands, the Spratley Islands, the home of natural gas and oil deposits, but they are also in a strategic location.

□ 2245

The Spratly Islands, having them in China's power, having them being recognized as part of China, would, of course, be a disaster to the Philippines whose oil and gas that belongs to, but also it would give the Communist Chinese sovereignty rights which would permit them to bracket the South China Sea. China, Hainan Island, the Spratlys would bracket the South China Sea, from this land point to this land point. Thus, we have a situation where when China claims, which it does, a 200-mile zone, that would leave China with a stranglehold on the South China Sea which is one of the most important commercial areas on this planet. It would have a stranglehold on Japan and Korea.

What do you think our friends in the Persian Gulf, for example, would think about it if they understood that this was a power play, that what we had with the surveillance aircraft was a power play? The reason why the Communist Chinese were demanding an apology then, they were demanding an apology because supposedly we were in their airspace. If we apologized, that was a recognition of their sovereignty in bracketing with the Spratly Islands on one side and Hainan Island on the other side, bracketing the South China Sea. If we ended up apologizing to the Communist regime, it would have been taken as a legal recognition, a small one, of their sovereignty and their 200-mile limit. That is what this was all about. That is why they were playing hardball with us.

The American people and our allies are not being told that that is what the stakes were. This is a long-term effort on the part of the Communist Chinese to dominate the South China Sea and expand their power so they could call it maybe the Communist China Sea rather than the South China Sea. It behooves us to face these facts. That is what it was all about. That is why they wanted an apology and that is why they should not have gotten an apology.

I applaud this administration for wording its letter in a way that was not and could not in any way be interpreted as a recognition of the Chinese sovereignty over that airspace. An accommodationist policy toward Communist China, ignoring this type of aggression, ignoring human rights and democracy concerns while stressing expanded trade, and even through all this you have a bunch of people saying, ''Oh, isn't it lucky we have trade relations or we would really be in trouble with the Communist Chinese.'' Give me a break. But ignoring those other elements and just stressing trade as part of a so-called engagement theory has not worked.

The regime in China is more powerful, more belligerent to the United States and more repressive than ever before. President Bush's decision in the wake of this incident at Hainan Island to sell an arms package to Taiwan including destroyers, submarines and an antiaircraft upgrade was good. At least it shows more moxie than what the last administration did.

I would have preferred to see the Aegis system be provided to our Taiwanese friends. But at least we have gone forward with a respectable arms deal that will help Taiwan defend itself and thus deter military action in that area.

But after the Hainan Island incident, the very least we should be doing is canceling all U.S. military exchanges with Communist China. I mean, I do not know if they are still delivering us those berets or not, but that is just ridiculous to think that we are getting our military berets from Communist China. We should cancel all military exchanges.

The American people should be put on alert that they are in danger if they travel to the mainland of China. And we should quit using our tax dollars through the Export-Import Bank, the IMF and the World Bank to subsidize big business when they want to build a factory in China or in any other dictatorship.

Why are we helping Vietnam and China? Why are we helping those dictatorships when nearby people, the people of the Philippines, whom I just mentioned, who are on the front line against this Communist aggression, who China is trying to flood drugs into their country. The Chinese army itself is involved in the drug trade going into the Philippines.

The Philippines are struggling to have a democracy. They have just had to remove a president who is being bribed. Bribed by whom? Bribed by organized crime figures from the mainland of China. When those people in the Philippines are struggling, why are we not trying to help them? Let us not encourage American businesses to go to Vietnam or to Communist China, when you have got people right close by who are struggling to have a democratic government and love the United States of America. The people of the Philippines are strong and they love their freedom and their liberty, but they feel like they have been abandoned by the United States. And when we help factories to be set up in China rather than sending work to the Philippines, and they do not even have the money to buy the weapons to defend themselves in the Philippines. That is why it is important for us to stand tall, so they know they can count on us. But they can only count on us if we do what is right and have the courage to stand up.

The same with China and India. India is not my favorite country in the world, but I will tell you this much, the Indians are struggling to have a free and democratic society. They have democratic institutions, and it is a struggle because they have so many varied people that live in India. But they are struggling to make their country better and to have a democratic system and to have rights and have a court system that functions, to have opposition newspapers. They do not have any of that in China. Yet instead of helping the Indian people, we are helping the Communist Chinese people? This is misplaced priorities at best.

Finally, in this atmosphere of turmoil and confrontation, let us never forget who are our greatest allies, and that is the Chinese people themselves. Let no mistake in the wording that I have used tonight indicate that I hold the Chinese people accountable or synonymous with the Chinese Government or with Beijing or with the Communist Party in China. The people of China are as freedom-loving and as pro-American as any people of the world.

The people of China are not separated from the rest of humanity. They too want freedom and honest government. They want to improve their lives. They do not want a corrupt dictatorship over them. And any struggle for peace and prosperity, any plan for our country to try to bring peace to the world and to bring a better life and to support the cause of freedom must include the people of China.

We do not want war. We want the people of China to be free. Then we could have free and open trade because it would be a free country and it would be free trade between free people instead of this travesty that we have today, which is a trade policy that strengthens the dictatorship.

When the young people of China rose up and gathered together at Tiananmen Square, they used our Statue of Liberty as a model for their own goddess of liberty. That was the statue that they held forth. That was their dream. They dreamed that her torch, the goddess of liberty, would enlighten all China and they dreamed of a China democratic, prosperous and free. Our shortsighted policy of subsidized one-way trade crushes that goddess of liberty every bit as much as those Red Army tanks did 12 years ago.

Let us reexamine our souls. Let us reexamine our policies. Let us reach out to the people of China and claim together that we are all people of this planet, as our forefathers said, we are the ones, we are the people who have been given by God the rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That is not just for Americans. That is for all the people of the world. And when we recognize that and reach out with honesty and not for a quick buck, not just to make a quick buck and then get out, but instead to reach over to those people and help them build their country, then we will have a future of peace and prosperity.

It will not happen if we sell out our own national security interests. It will not happen if we are only siding with the ruling elite in China. We want to share a world with the people of China. We are on their side.

Let me say this. That includes those soldiers in the People's Liberation Army. The people in the People's Liberation Army come from the population of China. They and those other forces at work in China should rise up and join with all the other people in the world, especially the American people, who believe in justice and truth; and we will wipe away those people at the negotiating table today that represent both sides of this negotiation, and we will sit face-to-face with all the people in the world who love justice and freedom and democracy, just as our forefathers thought was America's rightful role, and we will build a better world that way.

We will not do it through a World Trade Organization. We will do it by respecting our own rights and respecting the rights of every other country and every other people on this planet.

I hope that tonight the American people have heard these words. The course is not unalterable. This is a new administration. And in this new administration, I would hope that we reverse these horrible mistakes that have compromised our national security and undermined the cause of liberty and justice.

I look forward to working with this administration to doing what is right for our country and right for the cause of peace and freedom.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ABERCROMBIE (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and until 1:00 p.m. April 25 on account of official business.

Mr. HOLDEN (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and the balance of the week on account of illness.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CROWLEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BONIOR, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TIERNEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BERMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. VISCLOSKY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BECERRA, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCGOVERN, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CROWLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WEINER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SHERMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DOOLEY of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. ESHOO, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. RADANOVICH) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DEAL of Georgia, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RADANOVICH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SWEENEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BILIRAKIS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MORELLA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROYCE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RAMSTAD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HORN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WELDON of Florida, for 5 minutes, April 26.

Mrs. KELLY, for 5 minutes, May 1.

Mr. KIRK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FERGUSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SOUDER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, on April 25.

## SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Concurrent resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 7. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should establish an international education policy to further national security, foreign policy, and economic competitiveness, promote mutual understanding and cooperation among nations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations; in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

S. Con. Res. 23. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the involvement of the Government of Libya in the terrorist bombing of Pan Am Flight 103, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

## BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Jeff Trandahl, Clerk of the House reports that on April 5, 2001 he presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills.

H.R. 132. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 620 Jacaranda Street in Lanai City, Hawaii, as the ''Goro Hokama Post Office Building.''

H.R. 395. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2305 Minton Road in West Melbourne, Florida, as the ''Ronald W. Reagan Post Office of West Melbourne, Florida.''

## ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 25, 2001, at 10 a.m.

## BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT PRIOR TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

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

On December 15, 2000:

H.R. 1653. To complete the orderly withdrawal of the NOAA from the civil administration of the Pribilof Islands, Alaska, and to assist in the conservation of coral reefs, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2903. To reauthorize the Striped Bass Conservation Act, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4577. Making consolidated appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4656. To authorize the Forest Service to convey certain lands in the lake Tahoe Basin to the Wahoe County School District for use as an elementary school site.

H.R. 4942. H.R. Making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5016. To redesignate the facility of the United States Postal service located at 514 Express Center Road in Chicago, Illinois, as the ''J.T. Weeker Service Center''.

H.R. 5210. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located 200 South George Street in York, Pennsylvania, as the ''George Atlee Goodling Post Office Building''.

H.R. 5461. To amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management eliminate the wasteful and unsortmanlike practice of shark finning.

H.R. 5528. To authorize the construction of a Wakpa Sica Reconciliation Place in Fort Pierce, South Dakota, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5630. To authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2001 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5640. To expand homeownership in the United States, and for other purposes.

H.J. RES. 133. Making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes.

## BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

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

On December 20, 2001:

H.R. 207. To amend title 5, United States Code, to make permanent the authority under which comparability allowances may be paid to Government physician retirement purposes.

H.R. 1795. To amend the Public Health Service Act to establish the National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering.

H.R. 2570. To require the Secretary of the Interior to undertake a study regarding methods to commemorate the national significance of the United States roadways that comprise the Lincoln Highway, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2816. To establish a grant program to assist State and local law enforcement in deterring, investigating, and prosecuting computer crimes.

H.R. 3594. To repeal the modification of the installment method.

H.R. 3756. To establish a standard time zone for Guam and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4020. To authorize the addition of land to Sequoia National Park, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4907. To establish the Jamestown 400th Commemoration Commission, and for other purposes.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1527. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Nectarines and Peaches Grown in California; Revision of Handling Requirements for Fresh Nectarines and Peaches [Docket No. FV01–916–1 IFR] received April 5, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1528. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Fenpyroximate; Time-Limited Pesticide Tolerance [OPP–301109; FRL–6773–2] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received April 5, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1529. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Imidacloprid; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP–301114; FRL–6777–6] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received April 5, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1530. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Zoxamide 3, 5-dichloro-N- (3-chloro-1-ethyl-1-methyl-2-oxopropyl) -4-methylbenzamide; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP–301110; FRL–6774–8] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received April 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1531. A letter from the Chairman and CEO, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation; Risk-Based Capital Requirements (RIN: 3052–AB56) received April 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1532. A letter from the the Director, the Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the cumulative report on rescissions and deferrals of budget authority as of April 1, 2001, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 685(e); (H. Doc. No. 107—58); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1533. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a request to make funds available for the Disaster Relief program of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended; (H. Doc. No. 107—59); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1534. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council, transmitting an Annual Report for FY 2000; to the Committee on Financial Services.

1535. A letter from the Deputy Director, National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research, Department of Education, transmitting Final Priorities—Recreational Programs, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(f); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1536. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—Software Quality Assurance—received April 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1537. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—Reporting Unofficial Foreign Travel—received April 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1538. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule— Stabilization, Packaging, and Storage of Plutonium-Bearing Materials [DOE-STD–3013–2000] received April 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1539. A letter from the Attorney, NHTSA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Light Truck Average Fuel Economy Standard, Model Year 2003 [Docket No. NHTSA–2001–8977] (RIN: 2127–AI35) received April 5, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1540. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Solvent Extraction for Vegetable Oil Production [FRL–6965–5] (RIN: 2060–AH22) received April 5, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1541. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Standards of Performance for Electric Utility Steam Generating Units for Which Construction is Commenced After September 18, 1978; Standards of Performance for Industrial—Commercial—Institutional Steam Generating Units [FRL–6965–4] (RIN: 2060–AE56) received April 5, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1542. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; Transportation Conformity: Idaho [ID–00–001; FRL–6957–1] received April 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1543. A letter from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Avalon, Fountain Valley, Adelanto, Ridgecrest and Riverside, California) [MM Docket No. 99–329; RM–9701] received April 5, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1544. A letter from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.622(b), Table of Allotments, Digital Television Broadcast Stations (Hastings, Nebraska) [MM Docket No. 00–241; RM–9968] received April 5, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1545. A letter from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Huachuca City, Arizona) [MM Docket No. 00–208; RM–9977]; (Rio Rico, Arizona) [MM Docket No. 00–209; RM–9978]; (Pine Level, Alabama) [MM Docket No. 00–211; RM–9993] received April 5, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1546. A letter from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Hinton, Whiting, and Underwood, Iowa; and Blair, Nebraska) [MM Docket No. 99–94; RM–9532; RM–9834] received April 5, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1547. A letter from the Chief, Market Disputes Resolution Division, Enforcement Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Implementation of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 [CC Docket No. 96–238] Amendment of Rules Governing Procedures to be Followed When Formal Complaints are Filed Against Common Carriers—received April 5, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1548. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting progress toward a negotiated settlement of the Cyprus question covering the period February 1 through March 31, 2001, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2373(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

1549. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report on the status of efforts to obtain Iraq's compliance with various resolutions adopted by the United Nations Security Council, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1541; (H. Doc. No. 107—56); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

1550. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a 6-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia that was declared in Executive Order 12978 of October 21, 1995, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1622(d); (H. Doc. No. 107—57); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

1551. A letter from the Lieutenant General, USAF, 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 Republic of Korea for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 01–06), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

1552. A letter from the Lieutenant General, USAF, Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting a report of enhancement or upgrade of sensitivity of technology or capability (Transmittal No. 0A–01),

pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b)(5)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

1553. A letter from the Lieutenant General, USAF, Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting a report of enhancement or upgrade of sensitivity of technology or capability (Transmittal No. 0B–01), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b)(5)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

1554. A letter from the Lieutenant General, USAF, Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Navy's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to the Republic of Korea for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 01–08), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

1555. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed Manufacturing License Agreement with the Republic of Korea [Transmittal No. DTC 132–00], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

1556. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the second report on the Status Of The Ratification Of World Intellectual Property Organization Copyright Treaty and The World Intellectual Property Organization Performances and Phonograms Treaty; to the Committee on International Relations.

1557. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule—Entity List: Revisions and Additions [Docket No. 9704–28099–0127–10] (RIN: 0694–AB60) received April 9, 2001; to the Committee on International Relations.

1558. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 13–580, ''Storm Water Permit Compliance Amendment Act of 2000'' received April 19, 2001, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1—233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1559. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 14–26, ''Motor Vehicle Excessive Idling Exemption Temporary Amendment Act of 2001'' received April 19, 2001, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1—233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1560. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 14–27, ''Eastern Avenue Tour Bus Parking Prohibition Temporary Amendment Act of 2001'' received April 19, 2001, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1—233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1561. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 14–28, ''Medicaid Provider Fraud Prevention Temporary Amendment Act of 2001'' received April 19, 2001, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1—233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1562. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 14–29, ''Homestead and Senior Citizen Real Property Tax Temporary Act of 2001'' received April 19, 2001, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1—233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1563. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 14–35, ''Closing of a Public Alley in Square 873, S.O. 99–68 Act of 2001'' received April 19, 2001, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1—233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1564. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 14–36, ''Uniform Per Student Funding Formula For Public Schools and Public Charter Schools Temporary Amendment Act of 2001'' received April 19, 2001, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1—233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1565. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 14–37, ''Attendance and School Safety Temporary Act of 2001'' received April 19, 2001, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1—233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1566. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 14–38, ''Real Property Tax Clarity and Litter Control Administration Temporary Amendment Act of 2001'' received April 19, 2001, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1—233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1567. A letter from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting a report on the failure of the Department of Defense to provide access to certain records to the General Accounting Office, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 716(b)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1568. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the FY 2000 report pursuant to the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1569. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's FY 2000 Annual Program Performance Report and FY 2002 Annual Performance Plan; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1570. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1571. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting the Board's FY 2000 performance report; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1572. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, 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 of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 010112013–1013–01; I.D. 032101H] received April 5, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1573. A letter from the Acting Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Steller Sea Lion Research Initiative (SSLRI) [Docket No. 00–1220361; I.D. 022801A] (RIN: 0648–ZB03) received April 13, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1574. A letter from the the Chief Justice, the Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting amendments to the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure that have been adopted by the Court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2075; (H. Doc. No. 107—60); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

1575. A letter from the the Chief Justice, the Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting amendments to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure that have been adopted by the Court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2072; (H. Doc. No. 107—61); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

1576. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule—Visas: Nonimmigrant Classes; Legal Immigration Family Equity Act Nonimmigrants, V and K Classification—received April 5, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1577. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Army, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on the construction of a flood damage reduction project for the Upper Des Plaines River, Illinois; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1578. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Army, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on the recreation and commercial navigation project at Ponce de Leon Inlet, Volusia County, Florida; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1579. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Establishment of Prohibited Area P–49 Crawford; TX [Docket No. FAA–2001–9059; Airspace Docket No. 01–AWA–1] (RIN: 2120–AA66) received April 5, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1580. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Establishment of Class E Airspace: Harrisonburg, VA [Airspace Docket No. 00–AEA–13FR] received April 5, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1581. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Establishment of Class E Airspace: Waynesboro, VA [Airspace Docket No. 01–AEA–14FR] received April 5, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1582. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—Cooperative Research and Development Agreements—received March 22, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science.

1583. A letter from the Co-chair, National Assessment Synthesis Team and Co-director, The Ecosystems Center, Marine Biological Laboratory, transmitting a report entitled, ''Climate Change Impacts On The United States: The Potential Consequences Of Climate Variability And Change''; to the Committee on Science.

1584. A letter from the Acting Associate Administrator for Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Emergency Medical Services and Evacuation— received April 5, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science.

1585. A letter from the Acting Associate Administrator for Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Safety and Health (Short Form)—received April 5, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science.

1586. A letter from the Chief, Regulatory Policy Officer, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Puerto Rican Tobacco Products and Cigarette Papers and Tubes Shipped From Puerto Rico to the United States [T.D. ATF–444] (RIN: 1512–AC24) received April 5, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1587. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Announcement and Report Concerning Pre-Filing Agreements—received April 5, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1588. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Publication of Inflation Adjustment Factor, Nonconventional Source Fuel Credit, and Reference Price for Calendar Year 2000—received April 5, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1589. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Determination of Issue Price in the Case of Certain Debt Instruments Issued for Property [Rev. Rul. 2001–22] received April 19, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1590. A letter from the Secretary, Department of State, transmitting a report assessing the voting practices of the governments of UN member states in the General Assembly and Security Council for 2000, and evaluating the actions and responsiveness of those governments to United States policy on issues of special importance to the United States, pursuant to Public Law 101—167, section 527(a) (103 Stat. 1222); Public Law 101—246, section 406(a) (104 Stat. 66); jointly to the Committees on International Relations and Appropriations.

## 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 April 3, 2001 the following reports were filed on April 20, 2001]*

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 503. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, and the Uniform Code of Military Justice to protect unborn children from assault and murder, and for other purposes (Rept. 107–42 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.J. Res. 41. A resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to tax limitations; with an amendment (Rept. 107–43). Referred to the House Calendar, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 392. A bill for the relief of Nancy B. Wilson (Rept. 107–44). Referred to the Private Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1209. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to determine whether an alien is a child, for purposes of classification as an immediate relative, based on the age of the alien on the date the classification petition with respect to the alien is filed, and for other purposes (Rept. 107–45). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 863. A bill to provide grants to ensure increased accountability for juvenile offenders; with an amendment (Rept. 107–46). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

*[Submitted April 24, 2001]*

Mr. HANSEN: Committee on Resources. H.R. 146. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating the Great Falls Historic District in Paterson, New Jersey, as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes (Rept. 107–47). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HANSEN: Committee on Resources. H.R. 309. A bill to provide for the determination of withholding tax rates under the Guam income tax (rept. 107–48). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 118. A resolution providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J.Res. 41) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to tax limitations. (Rept. 107–49). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mrs. MYRICK: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 119. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 503) to amend title 18, United States code, and the Uniform code of Military Justice to protect unborn children from assault and murder, and for other purposes (Rept. 107–50). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII, The Committee on Armed Services discharged from further consideration of H.R. 503. Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

## TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XII the following action was taken by the Speaker:

*[The following action occurred on April 20, 2001]*

H.R. 503. Referral to the Committee on Armed Services extended for a period ending not later than April 24, 2001.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (for herself, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Ms. MCKINNEY):

H.R. 1540. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to prohibit discrimination regarding exposure to hazardous substances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. EVANS (for himself, Mr. REYES, and Ms. BROWN of Florida):

H.R. 1541. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide the Secretary of Veterans Affairs authority to furnish certain benefits for certain diseases occurring in children of Vietnam-era veterans upon a determination that such diseases have a positive association with parental exposure to a herbicide agent; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TAUZIN (for himself, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. FROST, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. DICKS, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. KIND, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. CAMP, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. HOLDEN, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. BOYD, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. BUYER, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. VITTER, Mr. BASS, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. QUINN, Mr. BACA, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. BAKER, Mr. WALSH, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. PETRI, Mr. WATKINS, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. OTTER, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, and Mr. WYNN):

H.R. 1542. A bill to deregulate the Internet and high speed data services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SESSIONS (for himself and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas):

H.R. 1543. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to exempt certain communications from the definition of consumer report, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 1544. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt State and local political committees from duplicative notification and reporting requirements made applicable to political organizations by Public Law 106–230; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANDREWS (for himself and Mr. GRAHAM):

H.R. 1545. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to clarify the exemption from the minimum wage and overtime compensation requirements of that Act for certain computer professionals; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 1546. A bill to allow States to spend certain funds to establish and maintain peer mediation programs; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 1547. A bill to establish a grant program in the Department of Defense to assist States and local governments in improving their ability to prevent and respond to domestic terrorism; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Energy and 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. ANDREWS:

H.R. 1548 A bill to phase out the incineration of solid waste, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. ANDREWS:

H.R. 1549. A bill to establish a demonstration program to provide comprehensive health assessments for students; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and 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. BARTLETT of Maryland:

H.R. 1550. A bill to change the deadline for income tax returns for calendar year taxpayers from the 15th of April to the first Monday in November; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BENTSEN:

H.R. 1551. A bill to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 to reduce losses caused by repetitive flooding, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. COX (for himself, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia):

H.R. 1552. A bill to extend the moratorium enacted by the Internet Tax Freedom Act through 2006, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DREIER (for himself, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. HONDA):

H.R. 1553. A bill to repeal export controls on high performance computers; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, 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. FILNER:

H.R. 1554. A bill to provide for a one-year procurement moratorium for the Marine Corps V–22 Osprey tilt-rotor aircraft program in order to provide a needed time out and to allow for a safety and performance reliability evaluation of that aircraft; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FOLEY (for himself, Mr. TANNER, and Mr. MCCRERY):

H.R. 1555. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the deduction for meal and entertainment expenses of small businesses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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

H.R. 1556. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of payment for inpatient hospital services under the Medicare Program, and to freeze the reduction in payments to hospitals for indirect costs of medical education; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and 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. GRAHAM:

H.R. 1557. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to permit local educational agencies to use funds made available under the innovative education program to support certain community service programs; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HILLIARD (for himself, Mr. FILNER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CLYBURN, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. FRANK, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CLAY, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. WYNN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. LEE, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. NADLER, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN):

H.R. 1558. A bill to prohibit States from denying any individual the right to register to vote for an election for Federal office, or the right to vote in an election for Federal office, on the grounds that the individual has been convicted of a Federal crime, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILLIARD (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. FILNER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. WYNN, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Ms. LEE, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. JACKSON of Illinois):

H.R. 1559. A bill to require that general Federal elections be held over the 48-hour period that begins with the first Saturday in November, to prohibit States from preventing citizens who are registered to vote from voting in Federal elections and from carrying out certain law enforcement activities which have the effect of intimidating individuals from voting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

H.R. 1560. A bill to increase the numerical limitation on the number of asylees whose status may be adjusted to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas (for herself and Mr. SERRANO):

H.R. 1561. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to the record of admission for permanent residence in the case of certain aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

H.R. 1562. A bill a bill to replace the Immigration and Naturalization Service with the Office of the Associate Attorney General for Immigration Affairs, the Bureau of Immigration Services, and the Bureau of Immigration Enforcement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Government Reform, 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 Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas (for herself and Mr. SERRANO):

H.R. 1563. A bill to assist aliens who were transplanted to the United States as children in continuing their education and otherwise integrating into American society; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUCINICH (for himself, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. FROST, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. SAWYER, and Mr. HINCHEY):

H.R. 1564. A bill to fund capital projects of State and local governments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and the Budget, 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. LAHOOD:

H.R. 1565. A bill to award a congressional gold medal to Brian Lamb; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LEACH:

H.R. 1566. A bill to urge the President to initiate consultations with the Governments of Singapore, Australia, and New Zealand to determine the feasibility and desirability of negotiations to create a free trade area between the United States and those countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LEE (for herself and Ms. WATERS):

H.R. 1567. A bill to encourage the provision of multilateral debt cancellation for countries eligible to be considered for assistance under the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) Initiative or heavily affected by HIV/AIDS, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT (for himself, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. FROST, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. FRANK, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. CLAY, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. RUSH, Mr. STARK, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. SANDLIN, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. HILLIARD, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia):

H.R. 1568. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to remove the restriction on coverage of periodic health examinations under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 1569. A bill to establish a commission to study the establishment of a national education museum and archive for the United States; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 1570. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide up-to-date school library media resources and well-trained, professionally certified school library media specialists for elementary schools and secondary schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 1571. A bill to provide for permanent resident status for any alien orphan physically present in the United States who is less than 12 years of age and to provide for deferred enforced departure status for any alien physically present in the United States who is the natural and legal parent of a child born in the United States who is less than 18 years of age; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 1572. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for legal permanent resident status for certain undocumented or nonimmigrant aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 1573. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide more revenue for the Social Security system by imposing a tax on certain unearned income and to provide tax relief for more than 80,000,000 individuals and families who pay more in Social Security taxes than income taxes by reducing the rate of the old age, survivors, and disability insurance Social Security payroll tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 1574. A bill to provide for prices of pharmaceutical products that are fair to the producer and the consumer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 1575. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to suspend all motor fuel taxes for six months, and to permanently repeal the 4.3-cent per gallon increases in motor fuel taxes enacted in 1993; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UDALL of Colorado:

H.R. 1576. A bill to designate the James Peak Wilderness and Protection Area in the Arapaho and Roosevelt National Forests in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. HOEKSTRA (for himself, Mr. FRANK, Mr. COLLINS, Mrs. MALONEY

of New York, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. COBLE, Mr. HILLEARY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. HART, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. GORDON, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. NEY, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. EHLERS, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CAMP, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SOUDER, and Mr. TANNER):

H.R. 1577. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to require Federal Prison Industries to compete for its contracts minimizing its unfair competition with non-inmate workers and the firms that employ them and increasing the likelihood that Federal agencies get the best value for taxpayers dollars, to require that Federal Prison Industries fully and timely perform its Government contracts by empowering Federal contracting officers with the contract administration tools generally available to assure full and timely performance of other Government contracts, to enhance the opportunities for effective public participation in decisions to expand the activities of Federal Prison Industries, to provide to Federal agencies temporary preferential contract award authority to ease the transition of Federal Prison Industries to obtaining inmate work opportunities through other than its mandatory source status, to provide additional work opportunities for Federal inmates by authorizing Federal Prison Industries to provide inmate workers to nonprofit entities with protections against commercial activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEARNS:

H. Con. Res. 105. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the Congress should have the power to prohibit desecration of the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRUCCI (for himself and Mr. ENGLISH):

H. Res. 120. Resolution urging cemeteries to maintain the flags placed on the grave sites of American veterans on Memorial Day through at least May 31; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. COYNE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FILNER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. SOLIS, and Mr. STARK):

H. Res. 121. Resolution expressing the sincerest condolences of the House of Representatives to the families of the 42 people, including 37 children, killed in the March 6, 2001, explosion of the Fanglin elementary school in the Jianxi province of the People's Republic of China, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H. Res. 122. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that India should be a permanent member of the United Nations Security Council; to the Committee on International Relations.

## MEMORIALS

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

24. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to Resolution 8 memorializing the United States Congress to enact H.R. 1041 that amends section 1917(b)(1)(c) of the Social Security Act by deleting the date of May 14, 1993, for states to have long term care partnership plans approved, affording states throughout the nation the ability to give their citizens the same rights to participate in these types of programs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

25. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of North Dakota, relative to Resolution No. 4028 memorializing the United States Congress to call a convention pursuant to Article V of the United States Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

26. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Indiana, relative to Resolution 22 memorializing the United States Congress to rename the Federal Building in New Albany, Indiana, in honor of former Congressman Lee Hamilton; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

27. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Ohio, relative to Resolution 8 memorializing the United States Congress to take all actions that are necessary to stop the dumping of foreign steel in the United States, including the amendment of existing foreign trade laws or the enactment of new foreign trade law to address the crisis in the steel industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

28. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, relative to Resolution 40 memorializing the United States Congress to repeal the federal excise tax on telephone and other communications services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

29. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, relative to a Resolution memorializing the United States Congress to immediately secure the construction of critically needed new electric generation facilities, oil, and gas pipeline and transmission facilities using Wyoming Power River Basin super compliant coal, Wyoming gas and other available Wyoming natural resources; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Transportation and Infrastructure.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 1578. A bill for the relief of Abecnego Monje Ortiz, Dolores Ortiz, and Eneyda Monje Ortiz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUTIERREZ:

H.R. 1579. A bill for the relief of Juan Gonzalez and Mayra Valenzuela; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 7: Mr. PITTS, Mr. KOLBE, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 10: Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. HANSEN, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. GRUCCI, Mr. GILMAN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. REHBERG, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois.

H.R. 13: Mr. MCHUGH and Mr. SWEENEY.

H.R. 17: Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. PETRI, and Mr. FORD.

H.R. 25: Mrs. ROUKEMA.

H.R. 28: Mr. RAHALL and Mr. WEINER.

H.R. 31: Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. WATKINS, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 36: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. EHLERS.

H.R. 37: Mr. CANNON and Mr. BOEHLERT.

H.R. 39: Mr. TIAHRT Mr. VITTER, and Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 41: Mr. CARDIN, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 46: Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 65: Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H.R. 68: Mr. GOODE, Mr. STENHOLM, Ms. LEE, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 80: Mr. COX.

H.R. 82: Mr. LATOURETTE.

H.R. 115: Mr. MEEKS of New York.

H.R. 117: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. WU, and Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 144: Ms. RIVERS.

H.R. 162: Mr. LUTHER, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. HOEFFEL, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. COSTELLO, and Mr. BLAGOJEVICH.

H.R. 168: Mr. CRENSHAW and Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia.

H.R. 175: Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. CULBERSON.

H.R. 179: Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GORDON, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 187: Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 214: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 218: Mr. KING, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. HOSTETTLER, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. GORDON, Mr. CLEMENT, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, and Mr. COX.

H.R. 250: Mr. SNYDER, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MATHESON, Mr. OSBORNE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. SABO, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. JOHN, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 259: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.

H.R. 261: Mr. LEWIS of California and Mr. COX.

H.R. 267: Mr. HOBSON, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, and Mr. HILLIARD.

H.R. 280: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland and Mr. LINDER.

H.R. 281: Mr. HILLEARY.

H.R. 293: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. BONIOR, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 294: Mr. REHBERG.

H.R. 296: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 298: Mr. SOUDER, Mr. FRANK, Ms. HART, and Mr. COSTELLO.

H.R. 303: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. GOSS, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. LARGENT, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. HONDA, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. DOOLEY of California.

H.R. 318: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. FERGUSON, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 336: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA and Mr. UDALL of Colorado.
H.R. 348: Mr. DEUTSCH.
H.R. 429: Ms. WATERS.
H.R. 436: Mr. PLATTS, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. HOEFFEL, and Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 458: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. ENGLISH, and Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 476: Mr. TIAHRT and Mr. BLUNT.
H.R. 478: Mr. BOYD.
H.R. 500: Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 503: Mr. WOLF, Mr. WICKER, Mr. GRAVES, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, and Mr. KINGSTON.
H.R. 510: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA and Mr. BERRY.
H.R. 512: Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. BONIOR, and Mr. BOEHLERT.
H.R. 513: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. BOEHLERT, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. LAFALCE.
H.R. 516: Mr. MURTHA.
H.R. 525: Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia.
H.R. 526: Mr. SNYDER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. ROSS, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, and Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 527: Mr. HERGER, Mr. HOSTETTLER, and Mr. SIMPSON.
H.R. 542: Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 548: Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. DOYLE, Mrs. WILSON, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. BOYD, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. HOLT, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. FRANK, Mr. PAUL, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. COYNE, Mr. FILNER, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. HAYES, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. BACA, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. ROSS, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. GORDON, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. SANDERS, and Mrs. THURMAN.
H.R. 549: Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. NEY, and Mr. GEKAS.
H.R. 566: Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 572: Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 582: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mrs. THURMAN.
H.R. 586: Mr. OSBORNE, Mrs. CLAYTON, and Mr. UDALL of Colorado.
H.R. 595: Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. KING, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. WEXLER, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 599: Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. BONIOR, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. ROTHMAN.
H.R. 602: Ms. HART, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. ROTHMAN.
H.R. 604: Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LANTOS, and Mrs. MCKINNEY.
H.R. 606: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. OWENS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. BERRY, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. COSTELLO, and Mr. HUTCHINSON.
H.R. 608: Mr. STRICKLAND.
H.R. 612: Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. NEY, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
H.R. 619: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 623: Mrs. TAUSCHER.
H.R. 631: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 639: Mr. FOLEY, Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mrs. THURMAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
H.R. 661: Mr. GANSKE, Mr. POMEROY, and Mr. PORTMAN.
H.R. 663: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HOLDEN, and Ms. MCKINNEY.
H.R. 665: Mr. BISHOP, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. STUPAK.
H.R. 682: Mr. SABO.
H.R. 687: Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 730: Mr. BOUCHER and Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.
H.R. 737: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Mr. HONDA, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. BERRY, and Mr. HOLDEN.
H.R. 746: Mr. KERNS and Mr. TIAHRT.
H.R. 747: Mr. COX.
H.R. 752: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H.R. 755: Mr. SABO, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BOUCHER, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 760: Mr. HOLDEN and Mr. SHAYS.
H.R. 762: Mr. BACA.
H.R. 770: Ms. SANCHEZ, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. JO ANN DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H.R. 778: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. HARMAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 782: Ms. HART, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. STARK, and Mr. BOUCHER.
H.R. 783: Ms. MCKINNEY.
H.R. 786: Mr. GONZALEZ and Ms. PELOSI.
H.R. 792: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. STARK.
H.R. 805: Mr. TIAHRT and Mr. HILL.
H.R. 817: Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California, and Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.
H.R. 822: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.
H.R. 826: Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. GOODE, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, and Mr. SMITH of Michigan.
H.R. 827: Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. SOUDER.
H.R. 831: Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. HORN, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. COYNE, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. GANSKE, Mr. GORDON, Mr. BACA, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. HART, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 840: Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. RAMSTAD, and Mrs. THURMAN.
H.R. 844: Mr. KING, Mr. FRANK, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. ENGLISH, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. BOEHLERT, and Mr. WEINER.
H.R. 862: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 868: Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. PENCE, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. WAMP, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. STUMP, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LATOURETTE, and Mr. PUTNAM.
H.R. 869: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mrs. MORELLA, and Ms. HART.
H.R. 876: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. DICKS, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. STENHOLM, and Mr. INSLEE.
H.R. 877: Mr. RYUN of Kansas and Mr. TIAHRT.
H.R. 885: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 906: Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. GRUCCI, Mr. HOEFFEL, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 912: Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. KLECZKA, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. RUSH, and Mrs. THURMAN.
H.R. 917: Mr. SABO.
H.R. 921: Mrs. THURMAN.
H.R. 931: Mr. ARMEY, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. DOYLE, and Mr. SOUDER.
H.R. 933: Mr. BONIOR, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 937: Mr. STUMP.
H.R. 948: Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. FRANK, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. CLAY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. RIVERS.
H.R. 951: Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mrs. THURMAN, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. BISHOP, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. FRANK.
H.R. 952: Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. GEPHARDT, and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.
H.R. 954: Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. WU, Mr. DICKS, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. PAYNE, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 962: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 967: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. WEXLER, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. BONIOR, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. GOODE, Mr. KING, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 968: Mr. BONIOR, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. PAUL, Mr. WICKER, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. SCHROCK, and Mr. SANDLIN.
H.R. 969: Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. NEY, Mr. CHAMBLISS, and Mr. BUYER.
H.R. 1001: Mr. SANDLIN.
H.R. 1004: Mr. CLYBURN.
H.R. 1016: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.
H.R. 1018: Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 1020: Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. NADLER, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. ROSS, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BASS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. HART, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. GANSKE, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. PETRI, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. HAYES, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. HILL, Mr. HERGER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. GEKAS.
H.R. 1029: Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. PITTS, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. TIAHRT, and Mr. SOUDER.
H.R. 1051: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 1052: Mr. KANJORSKI and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 1053: Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 1054: Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 1055: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 1056: Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 1057: Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 1058: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 1059: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.
H.R. 1060: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 1061: Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 1072: Mr. BLAGOJEVICH and Ms. MCKINNEY.
H.R. 1076: Mr. PAYNE, Ms. WATERS, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. STRICKLAND, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. TRAFICANT, and Mr. ACKERMAN.
H.R. 1082: Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. TERRY, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. HAYES, and Mr. LATHAN.
H.R. 1083: Mr. WU.
H.R. 1084: Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 1086: Mr. BONIOR.
H.R. 1097: Mr. MCKEON, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. COYNE, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Mr. LANTOS.
H.R. 1112: Mr. STARK, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 1116: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1121: Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. KAPTUR, and Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 1136: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.

H.R. 1137: Mr. HEFLEY, Ms. HART, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H.R. 1138: Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. PICKERING, and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 1140: Mr. COMBEST, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. KENNEDY of Minnesota, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. REHBERG, Mrs. BONO, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. SCHROCK, Mr. PUTNAM, Mr. COBLE, Mr. STUMP, Mr. TIBERI, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. TANNER, Mr. GORDON, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BOYD, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Ms. PELOSI, MR. CRAMER, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. HONDA, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 1143: Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BACA, Mr. QUINN, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. FRANK, Mr. STARK, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. MCNULTY.

H.R. 1147: Mr. GREENWOOD and Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 1155: Mr. BECERRA, Mr. KIND, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. BOSWELL, and Mr. LATOURETTE.

H.R. 1160: Mr. SABO.

H.R. 1165: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 1170: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. ROSS, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1177: Ms. ESHOO and Mrs. MORELLA.

H.R. 1182: Mr. TOOMEY.

H.R. 1184: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. HOYER, and Mr. BONIOR.

H.R. 1187: Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. BORSKI.

H.R. 1192: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. DOYLE, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. OLVER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. FORD, and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 1194: Ms. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. PORTMAN, and Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 1227: Mr. BARR of Georgia.

H.R. 1234: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. MEEKS of New York, and Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.

H.R. 1238: Mr. COYNE, Mrs. MORELLA, and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 1242: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. TERRY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. CAPUANO, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H.R. 1252: Mr. SAXTON, Mr. HOLT, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. FRANK, Mr. OWENS, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. STARK, Mr. FROST, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. SOLIS, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 1255: Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 1271: Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1275: Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. KIRK, Mr. STRICKLAND, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 1276: Ms. KAPTUR and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 1280: Ms. HART, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BACA, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Mr. FRANK.

H.R. 1291: Ms. HART, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BACA, Mr. BONIOR, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. GOODE, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 1296: Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. PETRI, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia.

H.R. 1305: Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. COBLE, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. ROGERS of Michigan, Mr. TIBERI, and Mr. VITTER.

H.R. 1306: Mr. STARK, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 1307: Mr. BONIOR, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. LEE.

H.R. 1313: Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 1324: Mr. ROSS, Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. ACEVEDO-VILÁ, AND MR. BONILLA.

H.R. 1328: Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. GANSKE, Mr. NEY, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. LATOURETTE, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, and Mr. BACA.

H.R. 1330: Mr. BORSKI, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. FILNER, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. STARK, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. HONDA, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H.R. 1335: Ms. DELAURO and Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.

H.R. 1340: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.R. 1351: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 1354: Mr. WYNN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. LATOURETTE, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BALDACCI, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 1358: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. HOLT, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 1360: Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. KIND, Mr. OLVER, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. CAPUANO, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. BALDACCI.

H.R. 1366: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. LEE, Mr. OSE, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. RADANOVICH, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. HORN, Mr. HERGER, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. STARK.

H.R. 1367: Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 1371: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. WEXLER, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 1375: Mr. SOUDER, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 1377: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. CRENSHAW, and Mrs. WILSON.

H.R. 1388: Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. BERRY, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SKELTON, and Mr. HILLIARD.

H.R. 1400: Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. SABO, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. ROSS, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. RODRIGUEZ.

H.R. 1416: Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 1431: Mr. CARSON of Oklahoma, Mr. KUCINICH, and Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 1436: Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. STARK, and Mr. MCNULTY.

H.R. 1438: Mrs. THURMAN.

H.R. 1450: Mr. CRENSHAW, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. DEUTSCH.

H.R. 1452: Ms. LEE, Mr. STARK, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 1462: Mr. SCHAFFER.

H.R. 1464: Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. FORD, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. NADLER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. THURMAN, and Mr. RODRIGUEZ.

H.R. 1467: Mr. OTTER, Mr. SHOWS, and Mr. GOODE.

H.R. 1468: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 1470: Mr. SABO, Mr. SAWYER, and Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 1471: Mrs. THURMAN.

H.R. 1488: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1490: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mr. HUTCHINSON.

H.R. 1496: Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 1497: Mr. SHERMAN and Mr. SHOWS.

H.R. 1498: Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 1501: Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 1507: Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. GOODE, and Mr. EVERETT.

H.R. 1522: Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. LEE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. FILNER.

H.J. Res. 13: Ms. RIVERS.

H.J. Res. 20: Mr. UNDERWOOD.

H.J. Res. 36: Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. LARGENT, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, and Mr. BALDACCI.

H. Con. Res. 25: Mr. WELLER, Mr. STARK, and Mr. ROTHMAN.

H. Con. Res. 37: Mr. BEREUTER.

H. Con. Res. 42: Mr. TIERNEY, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DICKS, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, and Mr. PASTOR.

H. Con. Res. 45: Mrs. WILSON, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. BONIOR, and Mr. HOLT.

H. Con. Res. 58: Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. BONIOR, and Mr. BLAGOJEVICH.

H. Con. Res. 67: Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, and Mr. KING.

H. Con. Res. 68: Mr. WYNN, Mr. WAMP, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. BONIOR, and Mr. FRANK.

H. Con. Res. 72: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. SOUDER, and Mr. RUSH.

H. Con. Res. 89: Mr. AKIN, Mr. GRAVES, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. HULSHOF, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. OTTER, Ms. DUNN, and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H. Con. Res. 95: Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. PETRI, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. KELLER, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. CASTLE, and Mr. ISAKSON.

H. Con. Res. 97: Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BACA, and Mr. SHERMAN.

H. Con. Res. 98: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GONZALEZ, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. HONDA, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H. Con. Res. 104: Mrs. CLAYTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. MCKEON, and Mr. LEVIN.

H. Res. 13: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H. Res. 14: Mr. LANGEVIN.

H. Res. 75: Mr. MANZULLO.

H. Res. 87: Mr. COYNE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H. Res. 97: Mr. LEVIN and Mr. LANTOS.

H. Res. 112: Mr. SHIMKUS and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H. Res. 117: Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. PASCRELL.

## DELETION 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. 641: Mr. OSBORNE.
H. R. 1310: Mrs. MALONEY of New York.

## AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 503

OFFERED BY: MS. LOFGREN

*(Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute)*

AMENDMENT NO. 1: Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the ''Motherhood Protection Act of 2001''.

**SEC. 2. CRIMES AGAINST A WOMAN—TERMINATING HER PREGNANCY.**

(a) Whoever engages in any violent or assaultive conduct against a pregnant woman resulting in the conviction of the person so engaging for a violation of any of the provisions of law set forth in subsection (c), and thereby causes an interruption to the normal course of the pregnancy resulting in prenatal injury (including termination of the pregnancy), shall, in addition to any penalty imposed for the violation, be punished as provided in subsection (b).

(b) The punishment for a violation of subsection (a) is—

(1) if the relevant provision of law set forth in subsection (c) is set forth in paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of that subsection, a fine under title 18, United States Code, or imprisonment for not more than 20 years, or both, but if the interruption terminates the pregnancy, a fine under title 18, United States Code, or imprisonment for any term of years or for life, or both; and

(2) if the relevant provision of law is set forth in subsection (c)(4), the punishment shall be such punishment (other than the death penalty) as the court martial may direct.

(c) The provisions of law referred to in subsection (a) are the following:

(1) Sections 36, 37, 43, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 229, 242, 245, 247, 248, 351, 831, 844(d), (f), (h)(1), and (i), 924(j), 930, 1111, 1112, 1114, 1116, 1118, 1119, 1120, 1121, 1153(a), 1201(a), 1203(a), 1365(a), 1501, 1503, 1505, 1512, 1513, 1751, 1864, 1951, 1952(a)(1)(B), (a)(2)(B), and (a)(3)(B), 1958, 1959, 1992, 2113, 2114, 2116, 2118, 2119, 2191, 2231, 2241(a), 2245, 2261, 2261A, 2280, 2281, 2332, 2332a, 2332b, 2340A, and 2441 of title 18, United States Code.

(2) Section 408(e) of the Controlled Substances Act of 1970 (21 U.S.C. 848).

(3) Section 202 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2283).

(4) Sections 918, 919(a), 919(b)(2), 920(a), 922, 924, 926, and 928 of title 10, United States Code (articles 118, 119(a), 119(b)(2), 120(a), 122, 124, 126, and 128).

H.J. Res. 41

OFFERED BY: MS. JACKSON-LEE

AMENDMENT NO. 1: Page 3, line 22, strike the close quotation mark and the period that follows.

Page 3, after line 22, insert the following:

''SECTION 3. Any bill, resolution, or other legislative measure reducing benefits payable from the Federal Old Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund, the Federal Disability Trust Fund, the Medicare Hospital Insurance Trust Fund, the Medicare Supplemental Medical Insurance Trust Fund, or any successor fund shall require for final adoption in each House the concurrence of two thirds of the Members of that House voting and present.''.

Page 2, lines 15 and 16, insert '', other than section 3,'' after ''this article'' each place it appears.

United States of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 107th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 147 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, APRIL 24, 2001 No. 52

# Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable LINCOLN CHAFEE, a Senator from the State of Rhode Island.

PRAYER

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

God of all nations, Father of every tribe, color and tongue of humankind, You have created us to live at peace with one another in Your family. You have revealed to us Your desire that all Your children should be free to worship You. Here in America, freedom of religion is a basic fabric of our life. Sadly, this freedom is not enjoyed in so many places in our world. We are grieved by the shocking accounts of religious persecution. Prejudice expressed in hostility and then in hatred and violence exists throughout the world. As we think of the pain and suffering inflicted on Christians because of their faith, we also are reminded of all forms of intolerance over religion in the world today. We remember the suffering of the Jews in this century. Forgive any prejudice in our own hearts and purge from us any vestige of imperious judgmentalism of people whose expression of faith in You differs from our own. We pray for tolerance in the human family. And may it begin in each of us. Amen.

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable LINCOLN CHAFEE 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.

## APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
*Washington, DC, April 24, 2001.*

*To the Senate:*

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable LINCOLN CHAFEE, a Senator from the State of Rhode Island, to perform the duties of the Chair.

STROM THURMOND,
*President pro tempore.*

Mr. CHAFEE thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

## RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The acting majority leader.

## UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate begin consideration of Calendar No. 23, S. 1, the education bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, reserving the right to object. I was here yesterday and again today. I am the ranking member of the Committee on Environment and Public Works. We have reported legislation out of the subcommittee—by the way, the Presiding Officer is the Chair of that subcommittee—we reported out of that subcommittee more than a month ago brownfields legislation. This is legislation that affects 500,000 sites.

I object, and I will at the appropriate time this morning talk more about what I think is so wrong about our inaction in the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

## MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, in light of the objection, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now be in a period for morning business until 12:30 p.m., with the first half of the time designated for the majority leader, or his designee, and the second half of the time controlled by the minority leader, or his designee.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, again reserving the right to object, at an appropriate time, I will withdraw my objection, but I again state to those assembled that it is absolutely wrong that we are going to spend all day today in morning business when we have waiting legislation that affects people in the State of Nevada. We could clean up lightly polluted areas starting this year if we simply move forward on this legislation.

I repeat, we have 500,000 sites in America today that are awaiting action of this Congress. The President of the United States said he supports brownfields legislation. Let us test him to find out if he does. I think it is absolutely wrong that we are going to spend all day in morning business.

Further, under the proposal my friend from Vermont has propounded, the first 90 minutes will be under the control of the Senator from Vermont or somebody on his side. My friend from North Dakota is here and wishes to speak this morning. Will the Senator allow the Senator from North Dakota to speak for 20 minutes? I do not see anyone here.

Mr. JEFFORDS. I have no objection so long as it is coming out of your time.

Mr. REID. Yes, of course. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that I be allowed to speak for 5 minutes and that the Senator from North Dakota be allowed to speak for 20 minutes and that the time be taken out of the 90 minutes designated by the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Vermont.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that at

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



Printed on recycled paper.

2:15 p.m. the Senate resume morning business until 5:15 p.m., with Senators speaking for up to 10 minutes each and the time be equally divided in the usual form.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## SCHEDULE

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, negotiations are continuing on the education bill. It was hoped that negotiations could be completed this morning with the understanding there would be amendments offered to the legislation. However, the time between 2:15 p.m. and 5:15 p.m. is expected to be used for the initial discussion of the education legislation.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada.

## BROWNFIELDS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, this brownfields legislation is important. It provides three important steps to directly spur cleanup and reuse of these abandoned and contaminated sites.

No. 1, it provides critically needed money to assess and clean up abandoned and underutilized sites which will create jobs and increase tax revenues and preserve great parks and open space. It is estimated this legislation will bring tax revenues to local governments of up to $2.4 billion.

No. 2, it encourages cleanup and redevelopment by providing legal protections for innocent parties, such as contiguous property owners, prospective purchasers, and innocent landowners.

Under the present state of the law, these places are left abandoned because people are afraid if they purchase these properties or lease them, they will be subject to Superfund liability. This legislation negates all that.

No. 3, it further provides for funding and enhancement of State cleanup programs and a balance between providing ''certainty'' for developers and others but still ensuring protection of public health.

We reported this bill out of committee by a vote of 15–3. A couple of Senators had some problems. We worked literally day and night on a staff level to resolve those problems. For example, the Senator from Ohio had some suggestions. I told him at the committee that we would work with him, and we have. We have satisfied Senator VOINOVICH's problems with this legislation.

We need to do this. The reason I am so frustrated is that yesterday we did nothing, and today we are going to stand around and be in morning business. There is no reason we cannot do this. We have agreed on this side to 2 hours of debate evenly divided. I do not know why in the world we cannot move forward with this legislation. It is extremely important.

I believe President Bush is a good person, and I believe he means well and wants to do the right thing. He stated during the campaign that he supports brownfields legislation.

His environmental record has been abysmal this first 100 days. Why doesn't he lend his prestigious efforts to this legislation that he says he supports?

I cannot understand why we do not move forward with this legislation. This legislation is important. It is important to the State of Nevada. It is important to every State in the Union.

As we all know, this issue has wide support from groups including environmentalists, the Mayors' Association, businesses, the real estate community. This bill is a meeting of minds from all sectors of American society and from both sides of the aisle.

S. 350 is a model of how an evenly divided committee can work together. I urge the Republican leadership in the Senate to show this Senate can recognize good legislation when it sees it and prove to Americans a 50/50 Senate can be productive and we can enact good laws.

I urge my friend, the junior Senator from Mississippi, the majority leader, to allow us to debate this bill and move forward on it. We will do it with a short agreement. We agreed to 2 hours.

This bill will pass overwhelmingly. Work done by the Presiding Officer and the Senator from California has been exemplary, and the work the full committee did is excellent. I urge my colleagues to work toward moving this forward. Hard work has been done. The cooperation of the Republicans and Democrats on the committee was noticeable. It is a shame at this time we don't move forward with this legislation.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota.

## THE TRADE DEFICIT

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, last week we were all witnesses to headlines in the newspapers about a meeting held in Quebec City, Canada. The newspaper headlines talked about tear gas, chain link fences, police lines, demonstrators, 30,000 people marching down streets. It also discussed anarchists.

What is this all about, 30,000 people demonstrating in the streets of a major city in our hemisphere? It is about international trade. The same sort of thing happened in Seattle a year and a half ago. The future WTO ministerial meeting will be held not in a major city but in a place called Qatar. Why? Because no city wanted to host it, as I understand it. They will have to even bring in cruise ships for hotel rooms. They feel if the ministers of trade from around the world can hold a meeting in an isolated place, no one will show up to protest their closed door meeting.

Last week's demonstrations in Quebec City underscored again that world leaders are not going to hold trade talks without attention being paid to the issues concerns of the people and the problems related to global trade. It is not that global trade ought to be stopped. It is that global trade has marched relentlessly forward without the rules of trade keeping pace. There is a relentless accelerated march toward globalization. However our world leaders have not develop acceptable rules, so people demonstrate in the streets.

I want to make two points this morning: One, trade is very positive for our country when it occurs in circumstances where it is fair. It makes sense for us to do that which we do best and trade with others who in their comparative advantage are doing what they do best. That makes sense on the world stage. Our country has been a leader in world trade, a leader in expanded trade, and it does make sense to expand our trade opportunities as long as doing so represents the values that this country considers important in the development of our economy and in the development of our international relationships.

It is also the case that while all say that expanded trade is good for this country, it is also the case that we ought not allow the international corporations in this world to pole vault over all the issues that relate to labor, the environment and of production simply by saying: We are going to produce in Sri Lanka, Indonesia, Bangladesh, or China, and we will ship back into the United States. So what if they hire 12-year-olds and pay them 12 cents an hour, working them 12 hours a day. So what. They would like us to think that is fair trade.

It is not fair trade. That is why people are marching in the streets. It is not fair trade when corporations are able to become international citizens and decide to circle the globe in their airplanes and evaluate where they can produce the cheapest, where they can employ kids, where they can dump pollution in the water and the air, where they can have factories without the barriers and problems of making them safe and produce there, create a cheap product and send it to a department store in Pittsburgh or Los Angeles, or Butte, MT.

The question is, Is it fair trade when that happens? This country has fought for a century over these issues. All of those fights were agonizing. Many occurred in this Chamber. The fight about whether we ought to be able to employ children, so we have child labor laws saying we don't want you to send 12-year-olds into coal mines. We don't want 12- and 14-year-olds put on a factory floor to work 12 hours a day. We have child labor laws.

The question of safe workplace, demanding that those who employ people employ them in safe workplaces that are not going to pose risks to the life and safety of workers. We have fought, and made laws to protect our people.

The issue of fair compensation, we have fought for a long while in this country about that issue. We have collective bargaining and the ability of employees to form and join unions. We have minimum wages. We fought about that and continue to fight about that from time to time in this country, but we have settled part of it. Now, some say that doesn't matter; we can go elsewhere. We can produce elsewhere, where people can't join a labor union, they are illegal. We can produce where we can hire a 12-year-old child and pay 16 cents an hour, and we can make a pair of shoes that has an hour and a quarter direct labor, with 20 cents labor costs in a pair of shoes, and ship that to New York City for a department store shelf because we are saying to the American consumer, this is better for you because it is cheaper for you.

So people demonstrate in the streets because they say that is not fair trade. That is not what we mean by expanding the opportunities of trade.

We have had some experience in this country recently with our trade issues and that is not a pleasant experience. This chart shows what has happened to this country's trade deficit. There has been a great deal of good news on the issue of deficits in this country. The fiscal policy and the budget deficits have diminished year after year, and we now have surpluses. Look what has happened to the trade deficits of this country.

In 1993, we had merchandise trade deficits of $132 billion. It is now $449 billion and growing. This trade deficit is mushrooming. If there are people who think it doesn't matter, think again. This is like the runup of dot com companies in the stock market. Everybody thought NASDAQ would continue to increase forever. These values are perfectly understandable. We had people on Wall Street who made a lot of money that were justifying and explaining why the values made sense.

They didn't make sense. This doesn't make sense. This ballooning, mushrooming trade deficit will cause serious problems to this country unless it is addressed. This country must repay these trade deficits. With a budget deficit, you can make the case that it is a deficit, you owe it to yourself. You cannot do that with trade deficits. This is a deficit we owe to others.

Inevitably, they are repaid with a lower standard of living in this country. That is an action in economics that no one disputes. This is a very serious growing, abiding problem.

With whom are our trade deficits? Our trade deficits are with Canada. We passed a U.S.-Canada trade agreement. We had a reasonably small trade deficit with Canada. We quickly doubled it, very quickly doubled our trade deficit with Canada. What an incompetent trade agreement. We ought to haul those negotiators to the well of the Senate to explain to us what they did in public and in secret to undercut this country's interests in the U.S.-Canada agreement. I could talk about some of those issues, but I don't have time today.

China, the China trade deficit, the trade deficit we now have with China is an $83 billion merchandise trade deficit, and growing rapidly; the European Union, $55 billion trade deficit, and growing; Japan, $81 billion trade deficit, and growing. And we have had a trade deficit with Japan of $50 billion a year plus now for a long time.

Mexico, by the way, prior to the U.S.-Canada and Mexico trade agreement, something called NAFTA, North American Free Trade Agreement, we had a surplus trade balance with Mexico. We had a surplus. It is now nearly a $25 billion deficit. Talk about colossal incompetence. The trade agreements we have negotiated in recent years have undercut this country's interests in fair trade. In every set of circumstance, our country bows to trade agreements that undercut our workers and our producers all in the name of free trade.

Quebec City hosted a big meeting last week. The President went to Quebec City and talked about the desire for expanded trade agreements. He said Congress must give him what is called trade promotion authority. That is just new language for fast track. What the President is saying is: I want fast-track trade authority.

To the extent I have the capability of involving myself in this, I will say to the President: You are not going to get fast-track trade authority. We wouldn't give it to President Clinton, and we won't give it to you. Your first job is not to create new trade agreements when every agreement in recent years has undercut this country's interests and resulted in larger and larger trade deficits. Your first job is to fix the problems that have been created in the last decade and a half. Fix these problems, then come to us. Then we can talk about trade promotion authority.

Do you want to hear some problems? We have a huge, growing trade deficit with Japan. Do you know what the tariff is on a T-bone steak we send to Tokyo, American beef sent to Japan? There is nearly a 40-percent tariff on every single pound of American beef sent to Japan—40 percent. That would be declared a huge problem if the United States imposed a 40-percent tariff, but we will allow our allies to do that, our trading partners. Why? Because we are poor negotiators and we do not have backbone and we do not have the nerve and we do not have the will to stand up for this country's economic interests. So T-bones to Tokyo are just a small example, just one small example.

How about going from T-bones to apples? Try sending apples to Japan. Do you know what Japan will tell apple growers in this country? They say the apples that are shipped in Japan must be shipped from trees in the United States that are separated by at least 500 meters from the other trees in the orchard. Does it sound goofy to you? It does to me. How do they get by with it? They get by with it because we negotiate incompetent agreements, incompetent bilateral agreements with these countries.

China? Well, China has a huge and growing trade surplus with us—or we a deficit with them. They ship us their trousers and their shirts and their shoes and their trinkets—they flood our country with their goods. But try to get American wheat into China these days. Ask what China is buying from the United States. See whether our trade agreement with China is fair.

Let me just give one example. We just sent negotiators to negotiate with China. When they finished—I will just talk about automobiles for a moment. China has 1.1 billion people. When our negotiators finished, just a year and a half ago, negotiating a bilateral agreement with China, here is what they said: China, it is all right for you, after a rather lengthy phase-in, to impose a 25-percent tariff on any automobiles the United States sends into China. And, by the way, for our part, we will impose a 2.5-percent tariff on any automobiles China would send to the United States.

We sent negotiators to sit down with the Chinese to negotiate a bilateral agreement and said what we will agree to, with a country with 1.3 billion people that is going to need a lot of automobiles in the future, we will agree you can impose a 10-times higher tariff on automobiles that we would send to China versus the automobiles they might send to the United States.

I would like to find the people who agreed to that on behalf of this country and ask them how do they justify their public service by such incompetence. It makes no sense to me that we engage with other countries on trade and are not hard-nosed and strong negotiators, saying we are all for trade so let's have reciprocal trade policies: We must say you treat us like we treat you, we treat you like you treat us. Let's treat each other fairly.

But that is not the way our trade negotiators see it. Every single time they get involved in a negotiation, our farmer, ranchers, and small businesses lose. I talked about having our trade negotiators wear jerseys as they do in the Olympics. At least they could look down and see the initials on the jerseys and see for whom they are working.

What is happening with trade with China, Canada, EU, Japan, and Mexico? There is now a merchandise trade deficit of over $450 billion a year, a deficit every single day of goods going into our country that exceeds goods going out, and this $450 billion in accumulated merchandise deficits is part of our account that has to be settled at some point, and it will weaken this country's economic strength when we do it.

The question for this administration—and I have asked exactly the

same question with the previous administrations—is: Are you going to stand up for this country's economic interests? President Bush went to Canada. He said at the outset that we have to recognize the issues of labor and the environment in trade agreements. Then later in the week he said: Trade agreements must be commercial—commercial interests, and, by the way, what I want is trade promotion authority—which, as I said, is a new term for fast track.

For those who do not know what fast-track authority is, it means our negotiators shall go negotiate an agreement with another country, bring it back as a treaty to this Senate, and the provisions under fast track would be we can debate it but cannot amend it; no Senator has the right to offer any amendments at any time under any circumstances.

It is fundamentally undemocratic. Had we had the opportunity to offer amendments to NAFTA, we would not be in this situation with Mexico and Canada, just as a example, with respect to our current trade agreement with our neighbors.

The big study on Mexico and Canada was by Hufbauer and Schott study, which everybody used. The Chamber of Commerce and all our colleagues used it. They said if we do this trade agreement, we will have 350,000 new jobs in this country. And they said here are the imports and exports between the United States and Mexico that we expect after this agreement.

It turns out they said the principal imports from Mexico would be imports of largely unskilled labor. What are the three largest imports from Mexico? The three largest imports are automobiles, automobiles parts, and electronics, all of which come from skilled labor, all of which mean the Hufbauer and Schott study missed its mark. We didn't gain jobs, we lost jobs with that trade agreement and turned a surplus into a fairly large trade deficit.

Who is going to be called to account for that? Nobody. Because that is exactly what the international companies wanted. They do not get up in the morning and say the Pledge of Allegiance. They are international entrepreneurs, and they are interested in producing anywhere in the world where they can find the fewest impediments to production and the cheapest place to produce. They don't want to have to worry about the child labor laws, pollution and the standards that countries impose in preventing companies from dumping into the air and water. They don't want to have to worry about worker safety. They don't want to have to worry about fair compensation. They had those fights and lost them in this country, and now they want to go elsewhere and say: We want to be able to ignore that.

The people in the streets are saying: Wait a second, there needs to be some basic set of standards. What does it mean when someone ships carpets to this country and the carpets are made by kids, 10- and 12-year-old kids, some of whom have had gunpowder put on their fingertips to have them burned off so they have permanent scarring, so 10- and 12-year-old kids can make carpets and run needles through the carpets, and when they stick the top of their fingers, it doesn't hurt them because they have already been scarred by burning.

That is part of the testimony before Congress about child labor. It is happening in this world. Is it fair trade for those carpets to come into our country and be on our store shelves? Would anybody be proud to buy from countries where the circumstances of production are represented by that kind of behavior? The answer is no.

What I want to say today is very simple. The example in Quebec City last week is an example that is going to continue. I do not support the anarchists and others who show up for those events to cause trouble, but I understand why protesters come to those events, peaceful protesters—and most of the 30,000 people who showed up were peaceful. I believe we should expand trade. I believe expanded trade is important for this country. But I also believe this country ought to be a world leader, promoting and standing up for the values for which we fought for over a century to protect. Those are the values of dealing thoughtfully with the rules of production dealing with the hiring of children, with safe workplaces, dealing with the environment and controlling the emission of pollutants.

If this is, indeed, a global economy and if it matters little where people are producing, then you have to have some assurance, if they are going to close a plant in Toledo or Fargo and move to Guangzhou, they are not going to be able to do that because in Guangzhou they can hire kids and pollute the water and air and not have a safe workplace and produce a cheaper product and represent to the people of the world: We have done it all for you. That is not doing anybody a favor. That is a retreat from the standards for which we fought for a century in this country.

People will demonstrate in the streets on trade issues because they want the rules to keep pace with the relentless march of globalization. I want globalization to continue, but I want it done under rules that are fair. Coming from a small State in the northern part of this country, North Dakota, that borders a friendly nation, Canada, I know full well what happens when we are sold out and undercut by our trade negotiators. It happened to us with the trade negotiations with Canada. We sent a trade ambassador to Canada. They negotiated a trade agreement, and they essentially said to family farmers: Your interests are unimportant to us, so we will sell those interests out in order to get concessions for other industries. And we have family farmers going broke in my State because we have an avalanche of unfairly traded durum wheat coming into this country. We produce 80 percent of that in the State of North Dakota. Durum wheat is used to produce semolina flour which makes pasta, so most everyone has eaten semolina which comes from the fields of North Dakota in the form of our pasta. But durum growers were severely undercut. Their interests were severely undercut by our former trade ambassador who not only made a bad agreement but then made a private side deal that he didn't disclose to Congress, and he pulled it right out from under our producers. That is not fair.

Neither is it fair that we will negotiate with a country such as Canada that has a monopoly state trading enterprise and that sells their wheat on what is called the Canadian Wheat Board, which would be illegal in this country. They say: We will have a trade arrangement under which we will sell in the U.S. market at practically secret prices and refuse to disclose it to anyone. It is fundamentally unfair trade.

We sent people to Canada to say we want to evaluate the prices at which you sell to determine whether you are dumping in the American marketplace. They thumb their noses, saying: We don't intend to show you one piece of paper about what we are doing in United States.

To allow that to happen is unfair. It is unfair to farmers, it is unfair to producers, and it is unfair to workers. On a broader level, it is unfair to corporations that are doing business in this country and producing for our marketplace.

I hope it is not lost on this administration—I have said the same thing to previous administrations—that they should not hold trade agreements or trade negotiations, or trade conferences for that matter, in cities around the world without, in my judgment, opening the discussion for a lot of people who want to raise questions about what the fair rules are for international trade. Globalization will continue, and should. But it must be attended by rules of fair trade, and people ought to understand that and know that.

Second, finally, when we negotiate trade agreements, we ought not to be afraid to stand up for this country's economic interests. It is about time to be a bit hard nosed, and have a backbone that serves to stand up for this country's interests.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES ACT

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, we are, of course, poised this week to take on one of the most important issues we will face during this year. That is the issue of education.

As we talk about issues over the country and as we take polls, education is the first issue the American people are interested in, and very understandably so. Certainly there is nothing more important to us than education. I think nothing is more important than the future of our country with respect to the training of our children who obviously will be the leaders of the country. I am looking forward to that. I think certainly there are many things that can be done and that Congress can do.

Clearly, in my view, the principal responsibility for public education lies with the States, with the communities, and the decisions that are made with respect to the schools ought to be made primarily based on the needs of those schools as defined by the local leadership.

The role of the Federal Government then is one that is always debated in the Senate, and properly so. It is one on which there are different views as to what the role of the Federal Government is and should be. The amount of financial contribution made to the elementary and secondary schools is approximately 6 percent to 7 percent of the total cost. It is relatively small, but it is very important. Often it is oriented specifically to special education—to a particular need, and so on. That is good. We will, hopefully, have a bill before us that will provide for some commonsense education and a reform plan that will help all children attain their potential so they can be successful.

In increasing the accountability for student performance, money is obviously the key factor. Money alone, however, is not enough. Money just doesn't do it unless there is some other accountability there so we can measure performance. We need to support the programs that work and take a look at those that do not work. Obviously, there are some of each.

I think we need to reduce the bureaucracy so that officials in Washington are not deciding what we ought to do in Sundance, WY, or Philadelphia. The people in other parts of the country ought to have the opportunity.

We need to empower parents to be able to make decisions with respect to their own children's future. Part of what we will be talking about in consideration of the bill will be to hold schools accountable with annual reading and math assessments and annual testing that gives parents the information they need to be able to determine whether or not their children are learning.

Testing is somewhat controversial, particularly national testing. I hope we can give the States as much flexibility as possible as to how they do that. On the other hand, with the kind of movement we have among children as they get out of school and go to other places, we need to ensure that as they are trained in Colorado, they are prepared to work in California; that their educational background will give them the ability to do that.

Testing gives educators the information they need to know what works, to see what is working in classroom and to improve skills and improve teaching effectively. That is part of what we will be doing. Federal dollars should not follow failure. We need to ensure that the programs that are funded by Federal dollars are programs that are useful and programs that are producing results. I think we need to make sure we support the programs that are effective and that are research-based programs. Schools need to be held accountable, of course. School boards need to do a lot of that. Parents need to do a great deal of that.

We need flexibility, of course, As I mentioned, school districts are quite different. They need to know that school districts are different. It is really not appropriate to send dollars, saying they have to be used to reduce the size of the class when in fact the size of the class is not the issue; computers are the issue or the building is the issue or teacher training is the issue. We need to do that.

Parents need to be empowered, of course, to be able to determine the quality of education the children are receiving so they can make some decisions. I think there has to be clear accountability. In many cases, I think the idea that you can have some choice among public schools is the way parents can have some accountability as well. In my hometown of Casper, WY, we have a number of charter schools—schools that are different from public schools—so that children have a chance to go to different places and do different things.

We will be talking about the Educational Opportunities Act. We will try to respond to the declining student performance we all hear about in our public schools. We need to change what is going on if our purpose is to have higher performance. The Educational Opportunities Act is designed to support learning efforts in all 50 States and helping local leaders determine what those programs need to have.

Also, we will be talking about how to help disadvantaged children meet the high standards and providing schools and teachers with greater decision-making authority to make the changes that will result in better performance and schools more responsive to the needs. For any school that fails to help its students over a period of time and make adequate progress, perhaps there can be an opportunity either for that school to be restructured or, indeed, in many instances for the parents to have an opportunity to send their kids to other public schools.

I don't think in the beginning that the proposal will have the voucher aspect of it, even though that is very controversial. But we can have the charter idea, and we can have the notion that people can choose.

There is nothing more important in education than the teacher. Give them a better opportunity for training. Alternative certification may be helpful to continuing learning opportunities. Teacher empowerment will be one of the programs.

We will have enrichment initiatives where there can be different programs designed for the 21st century learning centers, where you can have special kinds of schools and special kinds of programs happening for kids. There is also the gifted and talented program, the advanced placement program, and help for neglected, delinquent, and at-risk students. There are all kinds of programs that are necessary.

Obviously, safe and drug-free schools is something we want. We used to think about the problem of talking out loud or chewing gum in schools, and so on, as problems in school. Now problems are much more serious than that. There are drug problems, shooting problems, and other kinds of safety problems. So we are going to address that issue.

There is a title on educational opportunity initiatives where we can help children with the establishment of charter schools. More of that will be done. It is pretty much a local initiative.

We can help students across the digital divide so they are computer literate in the eighth grade and ready to do the things that now need to be done to be successful in the private sector.

There is bilingual education and educational enhancement. I think there needs to be some focus on students who speak limited English so that they have a better chance to succeed when they go out into the world. Obviously, the students will want to maintain their own choice of language, and that is great. But if they are going to be successful in this country, they have to be competent in English. I think that is something that can be done.

There is also impact aid. Of course, we have schools that are different, schools that are in communities that are largely Federal. For example, they do not have the same kind of tax structure and opportunities that others do. We have schools on Indian reservations and schools for Native Alaskans, and so on, that need special care. In Wyoming, we have reservations that need special attention. We can provide that special attention.

So these are the issues that will be involved in the educational bill that is upcoming. There is great concern over the amount of money that will be put in education. The Republican bill has more money in the budget than the President has asked. There will still be arguments made about needing more money.

Of course, one of the issues is that when there is a ''surplus,'' there is never enough spending to suit some people. Others think there ought to be a limitation on the role of the Federal Government. I happen to agree with that in terms of its involvement in elementary and secondary education.

So I think we will have a spirited debate. It is interesting, though. Everyone in the debate, I believe, would agree that we have a real responsibility and are determined to help strengthen the educational system in this country. The question will be, how do we do it? How do we best do it? What are the areas in which we can have the most impact?

I have to confess, frankly—and I know there is testing, and so on—I am pretty proud of the system that we have and the young people with whom I have occasion to deal. Frankly, my wife is a special ed teacher, so I have a little insight into that. As I tour around our State, I am pretty darn proud of the young people in my State. I think they do a great job. Quite frankly, many of them are better prepared for life when they get out of school than I was or perhaps some of us were that are a little older.

So are we where we should be? No, of course not. Are there areas that are particularly in need? I think so. And we are in one of those areas right now. The results in the District of Columbia are not up to the normal performance levels. There are many of those areas. So we need to work on that. But we also have lots of dedicated teachers who do a great job and lots of school districts that do a great job.

So I am anxious for us to move on this matter of education. I think we will be on it today. Certainly we will be on it for some days. Indeed, we should be. As we deal with this question —or any question, for that matter, but this one maybe even more than others—we need to set some goals for ourselves as to where we want to be in 10 years, where we want to be in 15 years, what we want our children to be able to do, what opportunities we want to be able to provide for them, so that as we deal with today's issues, and the issues that are in this bill and are before us—each one is a rather small step—that those steps are directed for the attainment of a goal with which we can all agree.

It seems to me that is very important to having a successful discussion of an issue of this kind.

We need to have defined what our values are, what our goals are, where we are headed, and what it is we want to have as a result of the efforts we have made.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

Mr. DURBIN. I ask unanimous consent to be recognized in morning business.

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

## AMERICA'S PRIORITIES

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, as the Members of the Senate are returning this week from our Easter recess, many of us spent time in our home States talking with our families and leaders, trying to catch the pulse of America. I was back in Illinois and had the opportunity to travel across my State and have a number of meetings which had a profound impact on me in terms of our debate in the Senate. I think these recess periods are valuable because, as close as we think we are to people, there is absolutely no substitute for sitting down with them and having some conversations about the issues we are debating.

One of the issues we have spent a lot of time debating in Washington is the whole question of the tax cut. I think most of us believe a tax cut is a good thing to do. This may be a good time to do it. There is a lot of uncertainty in America now about our economy. I met a lot of people during the course of my time back home who have seen their 401(k) plans and IRAs and mutual fund savings take quite a battering over the last 5 or 6 months. It has happened to virtually all of us who were not quite smart enough to get out of the market at the right moment.

I still have a very positive feeling about where we are going, and I do believe we can get this economy back on track. But I, frankly, do not believe we are going to do it with the proposal we have heard from the White House for a $1.6 trillion tax cut. This is a suggestion by the President that we will have such prosperity and such surpluses over the next 10 years that we can make dramatic tax cuts now and be able to pay for them 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, or 10 years from now.

It takes a lot of insight and foresight to look ahead and suggest where America's economy is going to go. One of the people most respected in Washington is Alan Greenspan, Chairman of the Federal Reserve. It was only 6 or 7 months ago that Chairman Greenspan suggested raising interest rates to slow down a hot economy. Since then, the economy has slowed down dramatically, and Chairman Greenspan has been racing week after week to lower interest rates to try to get things moving again.

So even the best minds at the Federal Reserve and the Chairman 6 months ago, 8 months ago, were guessing wrong about where America's economy would be today. I think it leads to a healthy skepticism by many people when President Bush says: I know what America is going to look like 5 years from now; I know where we are going to be.

Take a look at the same economists President Bush is relying on. What did they guess 5 years ago for today? They told us America would find its economy in such a shape and the Federal budget in such a shape that we would have a $320 billion deficit this year. It turns out that our surplus is about $260 billion. So they missed it by $580 billion 5 years ago when they tried to guess where we would be. So I think you might understand why this Member of the Senate and many of the people I represent are skeptical when the President says the best thing for America is to guess we are going to be so well off in 5 years or 10 years that we can create tax cuts now.

Many of us believe we are on the right track in terms of the general drift of our economy, though we are in a slow period; We do think if we make the right decisions now we can get back to see the growth of income in families, the increased value of our retirement plans, more jobs, more housing. But we have to make the right decisions now.

If there is going to be a tax cut, and I think there should be, it should be a sensible one, one that we can justify, not only today, but which might look good a few years from now. If we are going to have a tax cut, for goodness' sake, everybody in this country should profit from it. Everybody should benefit. All taxpayers should benefit.

Under President Bush's proposal, the $1.6 trillion tax cut, 43 percent of the benefits go to people making over $300,000 a year. These are people who have a monthly income of $25,000 or more. They are the big winners in the President's plan.

I am sorry, but I do not believe those are the people on whom we should be focusing. Yes, they are entitled to a tax cut, as every American family should be, but they should not receive a disproportionate share of any surplus.

Let me give you two illustrations. A man came up to me Saturday night in Chicago and he said: You know, Senator, you just don't represent me in Washington, DC.

I said: What do you mean?

He said: I think you ought to vote for President Bush's tax cut because it would help people like me. I am one of those leaders in the economy who makes a difference, and you, in fact, have criticized the President for the tax cut that would help me.

I said: Tell me a little bit about your circumstance.

He says: I pay taxes. I paid a lot of taxes last year. I paid $900,000 in Federal taxes last year.

How many people do you run into who paid $900,000 in Federal taxes? I didn't know the man. But just a rough calculation—you don't have to be H&R Block to figure this out—suggests that man's income last year was $3 million or $4 million, maybe more. He paid

$900,000 in taxes and he was critical that I didn't support the Bush tax cut that would have given him over $46,000 of tax breaks last year.

I said to him: I understand that you have been an important part of this economy. Of course you should be considered when it comes to tax cuts. But you have done pretty well, haven't you?

He says: I have, but my portfolio has taken quite a hit over the last 6 months.

I said: Numerically, virtually all of us can tell that story.

But it is hard to imagine that this is the man we should be focusing on when we talk about getting America's economy and people moving again.

I had another conversation a few days before that stay in a little hotel in Chicago late one night when I went to do some laundry down the hall at about 9 o'clock. There was a housekeeping lady who was kind of laughing at the Senator who was out doing his laundry. But I said we kind of lead ordinary lives when we are not in the spotlight.

We started talking. This lady is a single mother who raises a few children and works as a housekeeper in this hotel. I said: How are you doing? She said: I thought I was doing pretty well, Senator. She said: I was keeping up with my bills and everything, but this winter the heating bills have really hit me hard. I paid the same amount as I did last year for my heating bills, and I am $1,000 behind. Now I have to pay $1,000 more. I have to pay for the heating bills, and now I am working with the gas company to figure out how to do that. She said: I really try to pay something on those. I have really tried. I am $1,000 behind.

I was thinking to myself, as I was flying back to Washington, about those two people I met. Frankly, both of them are good, God-fearing American citizens. But I have a great deal of concern about that lady who is a housekeeper and is working at night trying to keep her family together, paying her bills, and who ran into an unexpected expense of $1,000 because of her heating bills. Sadly, the Bush tax cut provides no tax benefit for them. If anything, it is about $220 a year. For the man who makes $3 million or $4 million a year, the Bush tax cut is worth $46,000 more. For the lady who is trying to figure out how to pay for the $1,000 heating bill, it is $200. That doesn't strike me as fair.

If there is going to be a tax cut in this country, it should be a tax cut that really benefits all the taxpayers and gives everyone a chance to have some spending money and have their taxes reduced.

Another concern of mine is that the Bush tax cut doesn't provide any tax relief for people who do not pay income tax but pay payroll taxes. Twenty-one million Americans go to work every day, and because their income is low, they don't pay income tax but they pay the payroll taxes. They pay for Social Security and Medicare. Sometimes it is a substantial part of what they earn. To say that these people are not taxpayers I don't think is fair. They are working people who pay their payroll taxes and see it taken out of their paycheck. I think they are entitled to be in this conversation about tax cuts to get America moving again.

When it comes to the tax cut proposals, I sincerely hope that when the conference committee meets, it is going to move closer to what the Senate suggested and bring the President's tax cut down to a level we can justify, that doesn't rely on inflated projections about where our surplus might be, and try to make sure we invest in our priorities for this country. And when it comes to the tax cut itself, let's try to make that fair for all families—not 43 percent of it for people making over $300,000 a year but for that housekeeper in that hotel in Chicago doing her level best for her family and who just needs a helping hand now, and for families who, frankly, have low-income jobs but are going to work every day. They may not pay income taxes, but they see those payroll taxes come out of every paycheck. Include them in any tax assistance you provide.

One of the most significant votes during the course of the debate on the budget came as a result of the amendment of the Senator from Iowa, Mr. HARKIN. He offered an amendment that said President Bush's $1.6 trillion tax cut should be reduced so that we can put more money into two things: First, national debt reduction; and, second, education. I think Senator HARKIN was right. I am glad his amendment passed on a bipartisan basis.

The national debt is our national mortgage. The national debt is about $5.7 trillion. It has never been larger in our history. We collect $1 billion a day in Federal taxes to pay interest on the old national debt. It doesn't hire a teacher. It doesn't build a road. It doesn't protect America. It services the old debt.

When Senator HARKIN suggested that we put more money in debt reduction, I think he was right. If there is going to be a surplus this year, let's start retiring the national mortgage. The best gift I can leave my kids or grandson is to have less of a debt burden for my generation. I think that makes sense.

I am glad Senator HARKIN prevailed. The White House did not approve of his amendment. They opposed it. But a bipartisan majority on the Senate floor supported it.

The second part of Senator HARKIN's amendment also goes to the key issue of education. Senator HARKIN proposed $250 billion in new spending by the Federal Government for education over the next 10 years. I think Senator HARKIN is right on the money.

As I talk to people across my State of Illinois, they say education is very important. For many of us, without education, we wouldn't be where we are today. Neither my mother nor father went beyond the eighth grade, yet I was able to go through high school, college, and law school and stand in this Chamber today. I brought the report card home every 6 weeks. It was a big event in our house. My parents may not have had a great formal education, but they knew what education was all about. I think families across America know that education is really the ladder we all climb for success in America.

Senator HARKIN said in his amendment, cut back on President Bush's tax cut and put the money in education. Where would we put it?

I had a meeting in Naperville, IL. Naperville is the fourth largest city in my State. It is a great community. The mayor took me around. We went to a local high school, Naperville Central. They are very proud of the fact that they just took an international test in math and science and came up first. It is a good school system. But it is a school system facing a lot of pressure right now because of cutbacks in funds and property tax caps. They are doing their best to keep good teachers and to make sure they still have the best students. That is one of the better off school districts in my State. In my old home, East St. Louis, and parts of Chicago they are really struggling with limited funds.

Senator HARKIN said we needed to invest more Federal dollars in education in the areas they have focused on with these investments. The local level I think is what most people understand.

First, the key to success in education is good teaching. I can recall some excellent teachers in my life who made a difference for me. I can recall some who weren't so great where I had to kind of weather the storm, get through and hope for a better teacher in another course and another year.

Senator HARKIN is talking about investing money in teacher training so that we have the very best teachers in the classroom. We have a lot of teachers who are going to retire very soon. We want to make sure they are replaced by young, idealistic, and energetic teachers who can really motivate our students to learn. There is no substitute for that. If the Federal Government can assist in teacher training, recruitment, and retention of good teachers, I think that is money well spent.

The second thing we are talking about is class size. I have had teachers come up to me in the Chicago area and say the Federal initiative to reduce the number of students in the classroom is the best thing that ever happened to them.

Imagine yourself as a parent trying to raise your kids at home. I can recall when my wife and I had our first child. We doted on that little girl. We spent all that time. And then came along a son. Then came another daughter. Pretty soon it looked like a mob scene in our house. We tried to keep it under control with three kids. Imagine your classroom every day with about 30

kids. It is a tough thing to make sure you focus on every child's desk and what they are doing and trying to give a little help to those needing a little extra help. Teachers say, if you can reduce that class size to 20 or so, it makes a profound difference in their effectiveness as teachers.

In Federal investment in education, we want to make sure we put that money where it is needed so that we can have smaller classroom sizes.

I also think we ought to take a look at the schoolday. The schoolday that ends at 2:30 or 3 in the afternoon isn't realistic anymore. Usually kids don't have people to whom to go home. They have a period of 3 or 4 hours where they could stick around school and be involved in activities. That is good. But for too many of them it is just dead time—time to watch television and hang out at the mall or on the street corner. That is not the best time to be unsupervised. That is when juvenile crime goes up. I think afterschool programs make sense, so kids have supervision.

We have Gallery 37 in the Chicago public school system in which Mayor Daley and his wife have been involved. They are about to expand that to provide more opportunities for kids after school. I find that all around my State that has happened. That ought to be a national program, so that we have afterschool programs for kids who may need extra help with their studies or may need an opportunity to learn how to play a musical instrument, to get involved in an art class, or perhaps just to play basketball. It may be something that will enrich them or enable them to learn a little bit more about computers.

All of these afterschool activities are good, but we really need to focus on it to make the schoolday reflect the reality of American families.

The same thing is true with the school year. Three months off in the summer so the kids can go work on the farm—there are not a lot of kids working on the farm, even in Illinois. The question is whether or not there should be a summer school opportunity for enrichment for children.

You find that kids, if they have tested well at the end of the school year, and they are gone for 3 months, when they come back they lose lots of what they learned. So when we invest money in summer programs to enrich kids, and give them new opportunities, and they continue to learn, it is a good investment in continuing education.

I think taking money from the $1.6 trillion Bush tax cut, which goes primarily to wealthy people, and putting it into education so kids have a chance in the 21st century in America makes a lot of sense. That is why I was happy to support the proposal from Senator HARKIN, the bipartisan amendment which passed, to cut it back and make sure we have more money invested in education.

We celebrated Earth Day last Sunday, too. I think that is worth a comment or two, as well, because if we are going to make investments in America, we certainly ought to make investments in environmental protection.

Some of the things that have happened in the first 90 or 100 days in the Bush administration have been very troubling, such as this whole debate over arsenic in drinking water. I happen to believe we ought to take a serious look at what we breathe and what we drink and what we eat to make certain that it is safe.

All of us are concerned about public health statistics that show an increase in cancer, in pulmonary disease, factors that lead us to question why is this happening now in an America that is so modern, in an America with so many health resources. I think, in many instances, it gets down to the basics—the water we drink, the air we breathe, the food we eat.

When the administration came in initially and said they were not going to stick with the Clinton proposal of reducing the arsenic content in water, there was a cry across America because families said: Why are we doing that? Wouldn't we want to make water safer? We know that arsenic is a carcinogen. It causes cancer: lung cancer, bladder cancer, skin cancer.

For years now, we know that Europe has had a safer arsenic standard. We know the National Academy of Sciences tells us we should move to the safer standard. Why would the Bush White House reverse that position? But they did.

Last week you may have heard Christine Todd Whitman at the Environmental Protection Agency say they were going to reconsider this decision. This debate goes back and forth. But I tell you, when it gets down to something as basic as the safety of the water we drink, we expect the White House to be listening to families across America and not to special interest groups that are pushing for relaxed environmental standards.

Whether we are talking about carbon dioxide in the air—which is part of global warming—whether we are talking about lead or whether we are talking about arsenic in drinking water, the Environmental Protection Agency is supposed to be just that: an agency to protect the environment, not a revolving door so that special interests and corporate interests can come through and change regulations to their liking.

I am glad they are going to reconsider their position on arsenic in drinking water. But I certainly hope that is not an isolated situation where they found religion. I hope that it reflects a new idea in the Bush White House about true environmental protection.

We can take a look at some of the energy concerns across America, and they are directly linked to the environmental questions. The people who have talked to me for the last several months in Illinois about increased heating bills and the high natural gas prices now are talking about increases in gasoline prices at the pump. I don't know if it is happening across America, but it is certainly happening, again, for the second year in a row, in Illinois, where we are seeing this runup in gasoline prices at the pump.

Yesterday, two of the major oil companies reported record profits. It is no surprise; the families and businesses I represent are paying more at the pump, and that must translate into profits for some. The question is, When the President's task force on energy policy comes in with a report in a few weeks, will they take into consideration the consumers, the people who are paying the bills—the higher electricity bills, the higher heating bills, the higher gasoline bills? It is not appropriate or fair, as far as I am concerned, for them to just look at it from the corporate viewpoint.

I know the President and many of his people in the White House have been closely aligned with the oil industry in Texas. I understand that. That is part of their background. But I think their responsibility now goes far beyond the industry. It is time for them to be sensitive to the families and consumers who are paying the bills.

A lady came to see me yesterday in Chicago and talked about the increase in gasoline prices. She has a small business, a messenger service. She said: Senator, here we go again. It hit us last year and it is coming back this year. I have to lay off people. I can't afford this.

I had some people who came to me from a steel company in Chicago, Finkl Steel. They have had an increase in natural gas prices, which means an increase in the cost of their product. They find it difficult to pass along this cost to their consumers as they are struggling to keep everybody working in their plant.

These energy prices, as they are going up, have a direct impact on employment. We have to try to find an energy policy that accomplishes several things. First, it gives America a reliable source of energy; second, it makes certain consumers are not disadvantaged in the process; and, third, it respects our environment.

I certainly hope the Bush administration comes in with a proposal on this and that they will, in fact, take all three factors into consideration, and not just the profitability of the energy industry.

So we have an important debate ahead of us in Washington on a number of issues related to education, environment, energy policy, and certainly health care. I left health care for last because it is something that I think we have forgotten, and we should not. The people I represent have not forgotten it.

I went up to Palatine, IL, to the clinic run by the Cook County Bureau of Health Services and Northwest Community Health Care. I was there with the mayor, Rita Mullins. After we went

into this clinic, Dr. Rodriguez came up to me and the first words out of his mouth were: Welcome, Senator. We need universal health care.

That was the first thing he said to me. He had a waiting room full of people with small children who were uninsured, people who were charity cases for that clinic.

Each day in America more people lose health insurance. At a time of prosperity, when those of us in Congress are supposed to be sensitive to the real problems of families, we are totally ignoring the obvious. More and more people are uninsured. Fewer and fewer families have peace of mind when it comes to health insurance. More and more employers are cutting back on health insurance coverage for their employees, and they are making it difficult for those employees to protect their families.

I know a fellow who had a small business with only about 10 employees. One of the children of one of his employees had a serious health problem. As a result of that health problem, the employee incurred very expensive medical bills. The health insurance company came back the next year and said: We are increasing your premiums by over 50 percent because of the one child in the one family. Because of that, the business was forced to drop health insurance coverage and to merely give their employees the amount of money they had traditionally spent for health insurance policies in the past. At least they did something, but it was of little or no help to the one man and his family who had been hit by all these medical bills.

That is the reality of the America in which we live. There are virtually no proposals before Congress to deal with this problem. We cannot overlook it because the people who get severely ill in this country end up showing up, at some point, at the hospital when they are facing an acute illness. They do get treatment, at the expense of the system, at the expense of everyone else who pays for health insurance premiums across this country.

There are several things I think we can do. First, I believe we should provide tax benefits, deductions, and credits for small businesses that offer health insurance. Give them a helping hand in the Tax Code. If the President can find $1.6 trillion for a tax cut, primarily for the wealthiest people in this country, for goodness' sake, can't we find a tax break for small businesses so they can provide health insurance for their employees? I think that is good for the family who owns the business as well as those who work there.

Secondly, I have introduced legislation called caregivers insurance. This is what I am trying to achieve. We entrust the people we love the most in our lives to those who are paid a minimum wage.

Who am I talking about? Our children and grandchildren in daycare, our disabled friends and relatives who need a personal attendant, our parents and grandparents in nursing homes. They are primarily attended to and watched by those making the minimum wage, and these people who are keeping an eye on the folks we love the most generally don't have any benefits; they certainly do not have any health insurance in most instances.

The plan I propose, caregivers insurance, would make all of these licensed workers in daycare facilities, personal attendants to the disabled, and those working in nursing homes eligible for Medicaid coverage in their States. The State of Rhode Island is doing this. I think every State should do this—so that it is part of that job.

The turnover in these businesses is 50 percent or more each year. If we are going to keep good daycare workers, if we are going to keep good working people at nursing homes, we ought to give them the peace of mind of having health insurance. That is something we should do in this Congress. I hope the caregivers across America to whom we say we are willing to entrust our children and our parents can come together and prevail in this Congress for this health insurance protection. So as we get into this debate, the serious part of it in the appropriations bills, we have an important agenda ahead of us.

The President will have completed his first 100 days as of next Monday. At that time, people will make an assessment. I think the President deserves good marks in some areas even though I sit on the other side of the aisle from his party. I certainly acknowledge that he has shown a sensitivity to many issues to which the American people are sensitive as well.

But I think the basic question is whether this White House is really focused on the average family, the working family, the people who are good citizens in their neighborhoods and in their parishes and churches and synagogues and temples, people who are paying their taxes, obeying the law, doing their best to raise their kids, whether this administration keeps them in mind when it talks about a tax cut plan that should be benefiting these families as much as the wealthy—sadly, the Bush tax cut really is focused on helping the wealthiest among us and not these families who make up the core values of America—and whether the President's plan on education really thinks about families across America in the cities and rural towns in Illinois and the suburbs around Chicago, families who want their kids to have the very best education, whether the President is really prepared not only to give a speech about education but to provide a budget which funds education at levels so that education quality is maintained and improved for this country.

Finally, of course, when it comes to the environment, that the people at the Environmental Protection Agency and the Department of the Interior will think about their public responsibility to the legacy we are leaving our children. This Earth should be cleaner. It should be safer. There should not be questions about the water we drink, the arsenic levels in it, the air we breathe, and whether or not we are doing our share in America to deal with global warming. We need to have the courage and the leadership in the White House to be sensitive to environmental issues that will affect generations to come.

The assessment of the first 100 days will be made by many, but the most important assessment will be made by that family back in Illinois, or whatever State they may be from, who will ask this basic question: Does this administration, does this White House, and does this Congress really care about me and my family? Are they making decisions for special interest groups or for those who have all of the power in Washington or are they remembering the real America, the families in each community who make this the great nation it is?

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

## EDUCATION

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, maybe I should have taken the time to look at some notes. Instead, I will speak extemporaneously about the education bill.

I will take a few moments to talk about an issue that is near and dear to me, given my own background as a teacher and my great passion about children and education. I will talk about the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Before we went on break, I objected to a motion to proceed to this bill. The main reason I objected was I did not know what was in the bill. As a legislator, as a Senator from Minnesota, who gives, if you will, a special priority to children and education, I wanted to know what is in the bill.

The second question, of course, has to do with appropriations. But, first things first. I wanted to know what is in this bill, and there are some questions I want to raise right now in anticipation of what will probably be a very rigorous and vigorous debate about education before the Senate. This is as it should be.

The title of this bill is called BEST. President Bush is arguing we can do our best for children and for education by the Federal Government requiring that every school throughout the United States of America having annual testing starting at age 8 with

third graders, going through age 13. This will be in addition to the testing that now takes place.

The first point I want to make today about this legislation is that we have to be very clear in the language that there is no abuse of testing and that at the local and State level, school officials and those who administer this test will be able to rely on multiple measures. We want to be very careful that this testing is consistent with National professional standards of testing. That is very important. Quite often there is confusion between accountability, which we are all for, and a single standardized test. They are not one in the same thing.

The second point is if, in fact, we are going to have this mandate on all of the States to do this testing, there has to be money committed to administer these tests. This should not become an ''unfunded mandate.'' States and school districts will be interested in that.

Most important of all, if we are going to have a massive requirement which puts all of the emphasis on testing, we also should make a massive commitment by way of resources to make sure all of the schools, teachers, and children have the same opportunity to do well on these tests.

Right now, we do not have that. What we have from the President is a tin cup budget for education. I have said it over and over and over again in the Senate, and in articles, one cannot realize the goal of leaving no child behind on a tin cup budget. At the moment, we have very little by way of increase in expenditures for education under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. That, to me, is unconscionable. If we are going to now basically say to every State, every school district, every school, every child, take these tests and this is going to be how we will measure how you are doing, we will set up a lot of schools, teachers, and children for failure unless we give them the resources to make sure the children can do well.

I will be very interested to see when we move to this bill, whether or not there is a new, bold commitment to the title I program for kids who come from disadvantaged backgrounds. Now it is funded at a 33-percent level. I will be interested to see whether or not there is a commitment to afterschool programs, whether or not there is a commitment to additional help for kids in reading, and whether or not there is a commitment for rebuilding our crumbling schools. I will want to see whether or not we have a commitment to smaller class size and whether or not we have a commitment to recruiting good teachers. If we don't do that and we don't live up to what is our responsibility, we have put the cart before the horse. We are going to hold the schools, children, and teachers accountable where we should be held accountable.

Where is the investment, I ask. I probably will offer a trigger amendment, if, in fact, this bill comes to the floor, which will say that no state will be required to implement the new testing under this bill until we fully fund the federal share of the IDEA program, which is a program for kids with special needs. How can we not fully fund this program? Right now, we are funding IDEA at one-third of what we owe. We need to pay for everything that we owe. How can we not fund that? How can we not fully fund the title I program? How can we not fund teacher recruitment, smaller class size, investing in crumbling buildings, before we start saying we will have tests every year?

What the President has done, what the administration has done, and what too many Democrats seem to be accepting is the idea that tests are the reform. The tests are the way we assess reform. I do not believe we will be doing our best for children in America if the only thing we will do is force tests on every State and school district in the country without at the same time giving the schools and teachers and children the resources to do well.

If we want to make the argument that to invest money and not have any tests is to not have any accountability, fine; let's have accountability, if the testing is done the right way. My argument is if all we do is have the tests and we have hardly any new additional investment in education and in children, what we have done is have accountability but it is a waste of time.

Quite frankly, until we get serious—the President is not; not in the budget—it does not matter the words we utter. It is not the photo ops. It is not visiting children in schools. Where it matters is whether or not we are willing to make the investment.

Senator HARKIN and I had an amendment that called for $225 billion more by way of investment in education over the next 10 years. That must be kept in the Budget Conference Committee. That amendment is all about investment in children. Unless we do that, unless we make that kind of a commitment, we are not doing our best for children.

My hope is that Democrats will make it very clear to our colleagues on the other side that anything and everything that helps children and education, we are for. Any way we can work together, we should do so. But we are not going to throw our support behind an education program which calls itself BEST—which does not come anywhere close to how we can do our best for children—all for the sake of $2 trillion in Robin-Hood-in-reverse tax cuts, with over 40 percent of the benefits going to millionaires.

This President so far has not shown the commitment to make the investment in children and education. I hope the Democrats will stand up for children and stand up for education. We will make it crystal clear that if we are going to have this mandate of all these tests, the resources are going to come with it. That is the second point.

Finally, there are some fairly serious policy questions left outstanding. One of those policy questions has to do with what is called the Straight A's Program. The question is whether or not we are now beginning to go to block granting to, seven States. This, theoretically could affect a large number of children in America. It would mean we would all of a sudden move away from safe and drug-free schools, move away from afterschool programs, move away from certain programs that we have passed as a national community. We want to have separate funding for these programs, we want to make these programs a priority, for every child, no matter where he or she lives. To move away from that Federal commitment without some fairly strong language that makes sure all of the children are going to benefit; that makes sure this is not abused in any way, shape, or form; that makes sure this is not used for extras as opposed to what can help children do their very best; I think we have to be vigilant on this question.

I think this could shape up as a historic agreement if it is real. But if it is not real, and the President is not willing to back his rhetoric with resources, and instead he puts most of these resources into tax cuts for, basically, wealthy people at the top, and does not make this investment in education for children, Democrats should speak up for kids. We should speak up for education. We should speak up for our school boards and our school districts and our States.

As far as my State of Minnesota is concerned, I have been in enough meetings with enough schools and enough teachers. We are going through a very difficult battle at the State level, as well, on the education budget. More than anything, what all of the good teachers tell me is give them the resources to work. And, by the way, in addition, what the really good teachers say is they do not want to be forced into some sort of straitjacket education, where everybody is teaching to low quality tests and to the lowest common denominator. This is the educational deadening. If we are going to use tests, they must be high quality. We have got to get it right, do it the right way.

Maybe every Senator has been in a school. I have tried to be in a school every 2 weeks for the last 10½ years. If you get to the school level, you get down in the trenches, you realize a lot of what purports to be reform, may, in fact, not be so good for kids in schools. It may, in fact, be counterproductive. It certainly will be, unless we get the investment in resources.

For my own part, I objected before spring recess to move forward with the bill, and I will continue to object until I see what is in the bill, and then we will see whether we go forward in the debate. I hope, unless the President comes forward with a real investment of resources, that Democrats and some Republicans will directly challenge

this piece of legislation. I don't want to have a piece of legislation that has this great acronym ''BEST'' with all of the symbolic politics that purport to do so well for children and, in fact, do not. We shouldn't play symbolic politics with children's lives. We ought to be able to do well for kids and get the resources to the school districts, the resources to the States, the resources to the schools, the resources to the teachers, and the resources to the kids. At the minimum, we ought to do that.

That would be my commitment in this debate that is to come.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORZINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

## THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. CORZINE. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about our environment, and the right of all American families to clean air, clean water, and a clean future for generations to come.

Maintaining a clean and safe environment should not be a partisan issue. All of us live on the same planet. We all breathe the same air. We all drink the same water. When it comes to our global environment, we are one community.

In fact, when Americans voted last November, they voted for two Presidential candidates who both professed a strong commitment to our global environment. Former Vice President Gore obviously made environmental protection a top priority. But President Bush also made several promises to improve environmental conditions.

Unfortunately, as we celebrate Earth Day, Americans around the country are growing increasingly concerned that these environmental promises have not been kept. Instead, we have seen a series of actions that threaten to have significant and adverse effects on the quality of our air and water, and on the natural resources that our children and grandchildren will inherit.

First, President Bush reneged on a campaign promise to regulate carbon dioxide emissions. Then he caused an embarrassment abroad by announcing the United States' withdrawal from an international initiative to address global warming. He went on to block new protections against arsenic in our drinking water, even though scientists have clearly found that Americans face unacceptably high cancer risks from arsenic in drinking water under existing standards.

These actions are out of step, in my belief, with the American people. Certainly they are out of step with the people of New Jersey. Americans understand and reject the outdated notion that we need to sacrifice the environment in the name of the economy.

Unfortunately, the attack on our environment continued in the President's budget, which would slash funding for EPA and natural resource programs by 15 percent over 10 years. This would significantly weaken our commitment to environmental protection in many ways.

Consider, for example, the President's request for funding for water infrastructure funding. The President is reducing the funding for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund and wastewater loan program by $450 million in this budget year. Yet more than 40 percent of our Nation's waters are not safe for fishing and swimming. In my own State of New Jersey, 85 percent of the water does not meet the quality standards of the Clean Water Act. I cannot and will not support a budget that will take us to even lower standards of protection.

I also am concerned about the administration's proposal to cut funding for clean air programs at the EPA. More than 100 million Americans today breathe air that does not meet the standards of the Clean Air Act. Yet President Bush's budget cuts EPA's clean air programs by 6 percent next year, from $590 million to $564 million. This could have a serious impact, especially for those more vulnerable to dirty air: the young, the old, and the infirm. Just this week we saw new scientific evidence of the carcinogenic impact of breathing soot in our air. I know it will have an impact in my State where the air quality in 9 of our cities and countries is among the worst in the Nation. We need to move against this.

While the cuts to programs like clean air and clean water may tend to get the most attention—and maybe they should—I am especially concerned about the cuts in the President's budget for EPA's enforcement operations—the so-called compassionate compliance. We can have lots of strong laws on the books to protect our environment, but if they're not enforced, they're worth little more than the paper they're written on. We in New Jersey have seen the consequences of underfunding enforcement. For example, our State reduced funding for our water pollution control enforcement program by 26 percent. I repeat, 85 percent of our waterways do not meet the clean water standards. That is a major reason why we continue to have such significant water quality problems in our State. We are not enforcing the rules that we have on the books. I hope we will not repeat this kind of mistake at the national level.

The President's budget also underfunds initiatives to conserve energy and to develop clean energy technologies. Overall, the budget cuts for the Department of Energy are $700 million next year. This includes a $103 million cut in renewable energy research and development, and a $20 million cut in energy conservation programs. These cuts come at a time when our Nation is once again confronted with the need to reduce our dependence on foreign oil and to develop a comprehensive energy policy. An energy policy that addresses this challenge should have renewables and energy conservation as centerpieces. Instead, this budget puts them on the chopping block.

The President's budget also threatens our Nation's land and wildlife resources. It would weaken the protections of the Endangered Species Act, underfund land conservation initiatives, and generally weaken the Department of Interior's efforts to protect and preserve our Nation's great natural heritage, including our national parks. This will undermine numerous efforts by our States to fight the effects of sprawl and over-development, including the one spearheaded in my own State of New Jersey by our then-Governor, Christie Todd Whitman. She implemented a 100,000-acre open space initiative as Governor. I am concerned because in New Jersey the Sierra Club estimates that we are losing 10,000 acres of our dwindling open space a year. In New Jersey, these are real issues for us. We are the most densely populated State in the Nation.

The budget goes beyond cuts in some cases; for example, it eliminates the popular Wetlands Reserve Program. This is a voluntary program that creates incentives for farmers to manage their lands as wetlands. Finally, the budget proposes to drill the pristine Arctic Refuge in Alaska at the expense of rare species and fragile ecosystems.

Let me say that I would always prefer to give the President the benefit of the doubt. His actions, and the things he has to do, are difficult for everyone. But it is simply wrong to give big corporate interests such overwhelming influence in the development of environmental policies. The mining industry may do a lot of good, but it should not control policies over public lands. The oil and gas industries play important roles, but their short-term interests should not undermine the broader public interest in protecting our precious natural resources. We need a more balanced approach then we have been getting thus far in our discussion of the environment.

It is a great disappointment to me and many of my constituents given how important the environment is to each of them and their families. I have certainly heard that as I have traveled across New Jersey in the weeks leading up to Earth Day.

I hope we in the Congress will do what we can to help restore a balance to our Nation's environmental policy. I assure the people of New Jersey that I will continue to do all I can to resist efforts that would lead to dirtier water and dirtier air and erode our national heritage. The stakes are vital to our country and to my State. The American people deserve better.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

## EDUCATION

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I want to take a brief moment to speak about one element of the education issue which as we move towards the debate on the education bill will be discussed at considerable length in this Chamber.

I want to lay out a predicate for this discussion. That involves the issue of what I call portability, or choice. Some have tried to place on it the nomenclature of vouchers, which really isn't accurate. But the issue is giving parents options in the educational system to assist them in ensuring that their children get an education which is of benefit to them and allows them to be competitive in our society.

I think we all understand that the core element of success in our society is quality education. We especially understand that in New Jersey where we don't have a natural resource to mine or agricultural products. We don't have some unique physical characteristic that gives us the ability to create income as a result of that characteristic. The essence of what gives our State its competitive advantage is the fact that we have a lot of people who are well-educated, intelligent, and are able to compete successfully in a very highly technical society.

That is a definition that can be applied to our country as we see a global market develop in all sorts of commodities. It becomes very clear that the theories of Adam Smith apply in our society and in our world today. There are certain products and certain capabilities which one society is better at than other societies. Fortunately, our society is best at those activities which produce the most wealth and the most prosperity. A large percentage of those products and capabilities involve technology. They involve intellectual capacity, and they require a strong education system to succeed.

Regrettably, what we have seen in our society today is an educational system that has not kept up with the needs of our Nation. In fact, tens of thousands—literally hundreds of thousands—of kids in our educational system simply aren't being educated at a level which makes them competitive in this high-technology world. It makes them capable of being successful, which means when they leave school they have the capacity to compete with their peers in English and math and basic science.

We have seen this regrettably for years and years. The situation hasn't improved a whole lot. In fact, we see in study after study the conclusion that our school systems aren't working that well in many parts of our country; that we are well behind other nations which we are competitors with in the international community in the industrialized world. We rank close to last in math and science. It is especially true of kids who come to the table of education who have a natural disadvantage of coming from a low-income background. Those kids are even further behind than kids who do not have that disadvantage coming to the educational table. In fact, as I commented in this Chamber before, the average child in the fourth grade coming from a low-income background reads at two grade levels from his or her peers.

The same is true nationally. It is throughout the system. It is not just fourth grade. We have seen the dropout rate. We see the lack of capacity to be competitive academically on the low-income side, and especially the minority side in our urban areas is a staggering problem. It hasn't improved even though we have spent hundreds of billions of dollars in this country trying to improve the system. What can we do to change that?

We are bringing out an educational bill on the floor with amendments to address a number of areas, and it has some very unique and creative initiatives. The President made it his No. 1 priority. He brought forward the debate and I think moved the debate dramatically down the road or significantly down the road towards trying to get a different approach to this issue, recognizing that we have not been successful with the way things have been working for the last 20 or 30 years. He has suggested that we give schools more flexibility, but in exchange for flexibility for parents, teachers and principals in the school system require more accountability, and that we hold that accountability to be applied not only to the norm but to every individual group within the norm, whatever their ethnic, race, or income background. It is basically a testing program that requires kids maintain that level of proficiency in their grade level.

But what happens when you see a school system which continues to fail year in and year out? You may say: Who defines failure? The Federal Government? No. Failure is defined by the local school district or the State school board deciding what a child should know in the third, fourth, fifth, and sixth grades. It is not the Federal Government setting the standard. It is the local school boards.

But we know literally thousands of schools in this country year in and year out meet the standards when it comes to teachers teaching kids in those school districts and those school buildings—standards which are set up not by the Federal Government but are set up by the local school districts or by the States.

Literally thousands of schools are not cutting it this year. They have not cut it for years in sequence. In some of our urban areas, 80 or 90 percent of the schools simply are not teaching the children in those school systems at a level that the local school district or the local school board or State school board defines as educational proficiency.

A parent who has to send their child to that school says to themselves: What am I to do? My child started in this school in the first grade and the school was failing. Now my child is in the fifth or sixth or seventh grade and the school is still failing. My child has passed through a system which simply wasn't teaching them what they were supposed to be taught, and everyone knew that child wasn't learning what they needed to learn.

What can the parent do under our present rules? The parent can do virtually nothing to try to help their child unless they happen to come from a reasonably high-income family. Then they can take the child out of school, or even a moderate-income family if they have a Catholic school system somewhere or a religious school system somewhere that has a low cost and have their child go to that school. But for most low-income families in our urban communities, their options are nonexistent. If you are the single mother with two or three kids, or even one child, and your child is trapped in that school system, you are saying to yourself: How is my child ever going to have the knowledge they need in order to be successful? How am I going to get my child to a point where they can read and do math, where they can step out of that school and get a good job, and where they aren't going to be assigned to a situation where they cannot compete in our society because they haven't been taught? That single mother's options are nonexistent today.

Some of us on our side of the aisle, and a few on the other side of the aisle, have suggested giving parents some options. Let's say to a parent whose child is locked in the school that has failed year in and year out—we are not talking about all parents. We are just talking about parents in low-income families, and single moms trying to make a living. They have a job. They are sending their kids to school. Their kids are in a school that doesn't work. Let's say to those parents that we have some other options. After 3 years in that school system that has failed, the parent will have an option to use the special money which the Federal Government sends to that school system to benefit low-income children, which obviously isn't doing any benefit.

You, the parent, will have the ability to take a proportion of that money and have it follow your child to another school, either a public school or a private school, where your child will have a chance to succeed. Your child will have a chance to participate in the American dream rather than to be locked out of it because they are in a school that does not work.

This concept has been demonized. This concept has been vilified. This concept has been aggressively attacked, primarily by the liberal educational establishment in this country, essentially the leadership of the labor unions. Why is that? This concept of giving parents whose kids are stuck in failing schools—low-income parents, most of them single parents, most of them women—an option to do something to try to bring their kids out of that destitute situation, why has it been so attacked by the major labor union movement in this country which controls the teachers' unions? Primarily because it is the first step to what is known as competition.

Competition is an evil term when it comes to the liberal educational establishment in this country. I am not really sure why it is an evil term. If you go out to buy a car, you decide on buying that car because there is competition. Competition has produced the one car that does a better job of what you are interested in than what somebody else has built. You buy a Ford over a Chevrolet or a Chrysler over a Chevrolet or maybe a Chevrolet over a Chrysler because you decide they build a better product that meets your needs more appropriately.

Competition has been the essence of what has produced quality in the area of products in our country. They will say, this is not a Chevrolet; it is education. No, it is not a Chevrolet. This isn't cars. This is service. In the area of service you do exactly the same thing.

If you have a doctor who you think is not taking care of you or your family correctly, you go to another doctor. If you have a dentist who is not taking care of you correctly—maybe he drilled into your tooth and did not give you any novocaine which caused you a little pain—you go to another dentist.

For service providers, the same is true right across the board in our country. The only place where service isn't provided in a competitive way in our society with any significance, outside of pure Government is in public education. As a result, regrettably, when a child is locked in a failing school, the parent has no options. That is not fair. It is not fair to that child. It is especially not fair to the low-income parent in America. It is not fair to the urban poor in America that their children are the only children who are subjected to this lack of ability to have a chance at the American dream because we have a society which demands that they attend a school that fails year in and year out.

So we have suggested, let's give these parents and these kids a chance. Let's take a small percentage of the funds and allow the parent to use those funds to bootstrap that child into some other educational venue where they think they can do a better job, where the parent thinks they can do a better job. It can be a public school or it can be a private school.

This is an idea that has caused great disruption obviously in the educational community. But let me point out it is working today with State and local dollars. It is working in the city of Milwaukee and in the State of Arizona. They allow the State tax dollars and the local tax dollars to follow the child to the educational venue, the educational place they wish to go. It works very well.

Listen to the mayor of Milwaukee, who happens to be a very active Democrat, and he proselytizes on this issue about how good it has been for the kids in the inner city, to give them a chance to be more successful, a chance to live the American dream. Remember, we are not proposing—and this is critical to understand—a unilateral Federal program that comes into the State, comes into the community, and says: You must allow the parent to have portability, to have those dollars follow the child.

What we are saying is this: We are going to put on the cafeteria line of Federal programs an idea. You, the local school district, you, the State, if you decide to, through your elected officials—and it is key to underline that; through your elected officials—can take off that cafeteria line the idea of portability, having the dollars follow the child. So it is going to be a program which is totally controlled by publicly elected officials. It will be only at the discretion of publicly elected officials who control the public educational system.

So if the public education system in Milwaukee wants to use the Wisconsin dollars and the Milwaukee dollars, and then wants to also use the Federal dollars, they can do that. But if the public education system in Chicago does not want to use Federal dollars or local dollars or State dollars in order to give parents the option, then it will not happen.

This is not a unilateral exercise. This is an exercise which is related to the local community making the decision, through its locally elected officials, who control local education. So it is not some huge scheme that is going to be settled on the community from above.

Why shouldn't we say to the city of Milwaukee: All right, you have a program that you think is working very well. You are taking your State tax dollars, you are taking your local property tax dollars, and you have set up a program where those dollars follow the child. But, unfortunately, you, Milwaukee, today, under our law today, cannot take Federal dollars and follow the child. Your Federal dollars have to go to the public school system. They have to go to the public schools, and it is not in relation to how many low-income kids there are in the schools—and there can be some low-income kids who do not get any dollars for education—but, rather, it is in relationship to some arbitrary formula settled back in 1976 that simply happens to be a formula based on political expediency today.

Why shouldn't we say to Milwaukee: We are not going to do that any longer, Milwaukee. You have made a decision as to how you think you can educate your children. We are going to let the Federal dollars follow the local and State dollars. Specifically, in Milwaukee, if you decide to do it, we are going to allow you to use these dollars with portability, so the parents can have options; the same with Arizona.

That is what we are proposing. It is really not radical at all. It is not a Federal initiative demanding we have a national program on ''vouchers,'' a word that has been made a pejorative term. It is a program that suggests that local communities and States may decide that parents, who have their kids in failing schools, where those schools have failed year in and year out, can do something for their children that will create some competition in the educational market, something which is fundamental to the American society in producing quality. It is a program that suggests that those school districts which have made those decisions locally or statewide, through their elected leaders, will have the option, with our Federal dollars, to do the same.

That idea has retained huge resistance; the resistance isn't rational. The resistance is political. It is driven by a desire basically not to allow competition, not to allow creativity in our local school districts, but to drive the process of education from Washington, so that an elite few can decide for many how education is pursued nationally.

We are going to discuss this at greater length as we move down the road on the education bill. But I thought it would be appropriate at this time to at least lay down the foundation for the predicate of the debate because it is grossly misrepresented in the press, not because the press does not understand the issue but because the presenters to the press maybe want to misrepresent. I believe it is appropriate to maybe begin to make clear for the record what is being proposed.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, in his capacity as the Senator from Wyoming, asks unanimous consent the calling of the quorum call be rescinded.

Without objection, it is so ordered.

## RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now stand in recess until the hour of 2:15.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:30 p.m. recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer [Mr. INHOFE].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

TARGETING CHILDREN

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I want to draw the attention of this body to a report that was released just today by the Federal Trade Commission. It is a followup study to one that was done last year on the issue of the marketing of violent, adult-rated entertainment material to children. It was a groundbreaking Federal Trade Commission study last year that found that much of our adult material, adult-rated entertainment material—movies, video games, music—was adult rated by the companies themselves, entertainment companies, the conglomerates, and then target-marketed back to children, for example, in the Joe Camel advertisement. It was said this was an adult-rated product, cigarettes, but using an image to target-market that then back to children. It turns out the entertainment community—entertainment companies and movies and music and video games—was doing the exact same thing.

That report was released last fall, and it was very discouraging and disappointing that they would do this, particularly at a time when we have so much difficulty with violence in our society, violence among kids in our schools, killings among our teenagers.

There was a followup study released just today to that September FTC study. What came forward is that the movie industry is doing somewhat better about not target-marketing the adult-rated material to children, the video game industry is doing better than the movie industry in not target-marketing their adult-rated fare to children, and the music industry that is putting forward these hyperviolent, suicide, violence-towards-women lyrics has actually done nothing to change its marketing practice and continues to directly target-market adult-rated material. This is material the music companies themselves deem to be inappropriate for children. They put an adult sticker, parental advisory, on this material, and they turn around and continue, with millions of dollars in marketing campaigns, to target children.

They are saying: Yes, we got the study last fall. We saw that. Yes, we were target-marketing adult-rated, parental-advisory-stickered material to children last fall. Do you know what. We are going to keep doing it. And they have continued to do that, as shown in this study that was just released today.

I asked that industry to come forward and change its marketing practices: If you believe this material is inappropriate, to the point it needs a parental advisory label on it, don't spend millions of dollars to try to bypass parents and get the kids to buy them.

What the FTC study found is deeply disappointing. There have been some efforts made at progress, mostly, as I noted, in the video game industry, and more modest attempts in the movie industry. For those efforts I offer both praise and encouragement to step up the progress. But the report also found, as I stated, that the recording industry has made no effort to implement any reforms—either those mentioned in the report or the reforms that they, the recording industry themselves, told Congress they would do. This is even more disappointing.

Before we had the hearing last fall on the marketing of violent material to children, the recording industry stepped up and said: We are going to change. Here is a three-point, five-point, seven-point plan we are putting forward; we will implement these as an industry to change our marketing practices.

They volunteered. Now what they have done is they have said: We are not even going to do what we volunteered to Congress we would do—change our marketing practices.

I want to read just a few statements from this report because it is deeply disturbing:

> The Commission's review indicates that the entertainment industry had made some progress in limiting advertising in certain teen media and providing rating information in advertising. The industry must make a greater effort, however, if it is to meet the suggestions for improvement included in the Commission's Report as well as its own promises for reform.

Specifically, the report found, ''ads for R-rated movies still appeared on the television programs most popular with teens . . .''—even though they are supposed to be a restricted audience for the movie—''and the ratings reasons in ads were either small, fleeting or inconspicuously placed.''

That was the good part of the study. The report reserved its harshest criticism for the music industry and stated:

> The Commission found that the music recording industry, unlike the motion picture and electronic game industries, has not visibly responded to the Commission's report, nor has it implemented the reforms its trade association announced just before the Commission issued its report. The Commission's review showed that advertising for explicit-content labeled music recordings routinely appeared on popular teen television programming. All five major recording companies placed advertising for explicit content music on TV programs and magazines with substantial under-17 audiences. Furthermore, ads for explicit-content labeled music usually did not indicate that the recording was stickered with a parental advisory label.

So not only did they market to kids, they didn't warn the parents in the advertising that this was parental labeled material. In the advertising, they said they were not even going to point that out to the parents.

If you refer back to the original FTC report released last September, you will find 100 percent of the violent music they studied was target-marketed to kids—100 percent. Evidently the recording industry saw no reason to change.

Soon the Senate will turn its attention to consider the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, ESEA, and how to provide the best education for all of America's children. I think for every Senator of both parties, ensuring that America's children get a world-class education is a top priority.

We also know one of the best measures of what a child learns is time on task; that is, children learn what they spend their time focusing on. That is significant because typically the American child spends more time each year watching television and movies, playing video games, listening to music, than he or she does in school. It makes no sense to assume that what a child sees, hears, and does in school will mold, shape, and enlighten his or her young mind but that what he sees, hears, and plays in terms of entertainment will have no impact whatsoever.

Many of the most popular songs, games, and movies actively glorify violence and glamorize brutality. There are video games which cast players as drug kingpins, with the game revolving around selling drugs and killing competitors. There are movies which glamorize murder, casting teen idols as dashing killers. And there are numerous songs which celebrate violence against women—all of which are marketed to children.

If being perceived is doing, we clearly have problems on our hands.

There is new evidence to suggest that exposing children to violent entertainment not only affects their emotional and behavioral development—their sensitivity to other's pain, their ability to empathize, and their perceptions of the world around them—but also their cognitive development. A professor in my alma mater of Kansas State has done ground-breaking research on the impact that exposure to violent entertainment has on children's brain activity. Dr. John Murray's studies have found that in terms of brain activity, kids who are exposed to violent entertainment have a similar experience to those who are exposed to real-life trauma, and their brain responds in much the same fashion.

This research, while still in its rudimentary stages, has potentially profound implications for education. I would therefore like to announce my intention to introduce an amendment to ESEA which calls for increased research into the impact that exposing children to violent entertainment—violent music, and violent video games—has on their cognitive development and educational achievement. I hope and trust that the Senate will adopt this amendment.

In conclusion, I urge my colleagues to look at this interim study by the FCC and what has happened.

I also urge the recording industry to step up and actually do what they said they would do, which is not to market adult-rated material and parental advisory material directly to children. It is harming our kids. It is the wrong thing to do. I ask them sincerely to review what they are doing in their marketing campaigns and stop this practice. It is harmful.

I am hopeful when we have the followup study and the anniversary report

to the FCC study this fall that the recording industry will actually step forward and do what is right.

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to yield myself up to 15 minutes as in morning business.

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

(The remarks of Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire pertaining to the introduction of S. 759 are located in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I would like to address the Chamber. May I ask, what is the business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are in a period of morning business for 3 hours, equally divided.

Mr. DODD. Is there a limitation on the amount of time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a 10-minute limitation.

## ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I want to spend a couple of minutes, if I can, talking about the possibility of us debating and passing a comprehensive bill on elementary and secondary education. My hope is, of course, that in the coming days this body will do what it should have done 2 years ago; that is, to pass legislation, as we are required to do only once every 5 or 6 years, on elementary and secondary education.

This morning across America 55 million children went to school. Fifty million went to school in a public school; 5 million went to school in a private or parochial school. We, as President Bush has said, bear a principal responsibility to the education of all our children, but a particular responsibility to children in our public schools, and even further, from a Federal standpoint, a particular obligation to the most disadvantaged children across America.

That has been our historic participation, to try to assist our communities, our States, and most particularly families in this country who suffer from various depravations, to see to it that their children have an equal opportunity to success. We have no obligation, in my view, to guarantee anybody success in America. But we do bear responsibility to try to provide an equal opportunity to achieving success. That is all really any of us can try to accomplish in our public responsibilities.

So the Elementary and Secondary Education Act historically over the years has been an effort by the Federal Government to assist and participate in the improvement of the quality of public education in the United States. For every dollar of education that is spent by our public sectors—State, local governments, and the Federal Government—out of every dollar that is spent, the Federal Government spends about 6 to 8 cents. And 93, 94 cents of the dollar spent on elementary and secondary education comes from local property taxes in most States. I do not know what Oklahoma does, but I know in Connecticut it is mostly a local property tax. The State also contributes, but primarily it is local property taxes. So the Federal Government's participation financially is rather small when you think of it. Out of a dollar spent, we contribute about 6 or 7 cents.

I am not going to debate this point right now, or discuss this point, but I happen to believe in the 21st century the Federal Government ought to be a better partner financially. I would like to see us become someday a one-third partner—the States one-third, the local government one-third, and the National Government one-third. What a wonderful relief it would be—and I saw the Presiding Officer nod affirmatively when I spoke of property taxes in Oklahoma, as is the case in Connecticut—what a great relief it would be, putting aside education issues, if we could say to people in Oklahoma and Connecticut: We are going to reduce your local property taxes by a third—that is where most of it goes, to education—because your Federal Government is going to step up and be a far greater participant in recognizing the national benefits we all accumulate if the quality of public education in this country improves. So that is what brings us to this particular point.

There has been a lot of discussion about whether or not we have some agreements between the White House and the Senate on an Elementary and Secondary Education Act. There has been some progress. But we are light-years away from an agreement—light-years away from an agreement.

I do not say that with any glee. I had hoped after 2 or 3 weeks of discussions we would be a lot closer. But reports I have read in the newspaper and heard in the press and heard from the White House, heard from some quarters here, that we are on the brink of some agreement, is very far from the truth. I think it is a sad commentary, but it happens to be a fact. Let me tell you why.

First of all, we are asking schools to do some very dramatic things—testing, for one.

I am not terribly enthusiastic about testing as the only means of judging performance. Testing is really not a reform; it is a measurement of how well one does. That is all. As an educator in my State recently said: When children have a fever, taking their temperature three times an hour is not going to make them feel better; medicine will. Testing every year in and year out is inclined, in my view, to turn our schools into nothing more than test prep centers across America.

Who is going to pay for that unfunded mandate if we jam that down the throats of communities across the country? I am very concerned with this mandatory testing idea as the only way to judge how students are performing.

Many look to our schools as the source of the kids' problems when, in fact, in my view, the problems begin before the kids ever get to school. The problems too often are occurring at home. We do not want to look in the mirror and see what is happening in our own homes long before this child enters kindergarten or the first grade. We now blame child care centers. We blame the kindergarten teacher, the first, second, third, fourth, or fifth grade teacher because Johnny cannot read or Johnny is not performing well.

As I said, too often the problems occur long before a child reaches school age or enters a child care center. We need to be a bit more realistic about what we can expect by testing kids all the time, at some significant cost, as a mandate.

Accountability standards have been improved. I am willing to support some of those. These are the same accountability standards that have been developed, frankly, over the last few years. JEFF BINGAMAN, my colleague from New Mexico, has been the principal author of legislation to improve accountability standards that will get us closer to a better way of getting schools to live up to the obligations they bear for their students and families who send their children to these schools.

Today's children are part of the first generation that is being raised in a truly global world. Nothing we do this year or in the coming years is more important than how we go about providing for our children's education. If we succeed in this endeavor, our country's future will be very bright. If we do not succeed, it is going to be bleak.

With that in mind, I believe we have much work to do as we prepare to take up the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. If this debate turns out to be a feeding frenzy with literally dozens and dozens of amendments being proposed every 5 minutes, with Members having little knowledge of what they may do, we do not know what we are going to produce.

Since we only deal with this once every 5 or 6 years, we ought to take some time and pull this together and come forward with a bill that truly recognizes and reflects bipartisanship, that includes the ideas of people who spend a lot of time thinking about how to improve the quality of education in our country, rather than one that is a jump ball that could end up doing a lot more damage despite the press releases

and pats on the back we give ourselves on how we judge whether or not we have lived up to our obligations.

The first issue we have to talk about candidly is the funding of these programs. If, as the President says, education is his top national priority—and I applaud him for that; this is what I call the hub of the wheel: education. If we get education right, then we increase dramatically the likelihood that every other issue will be dealt with intelligently, and we can build public support and come up with good answers.

If, in a democratic society, our education system begins to crumble and fall apart, then our democratic institutions, in my view, begin to fall apart as well. Thomas Jefferson, 200 years ago, said that any nation that ever expects to be ignorant and free expects what never was and never possibly can be. If that was true at the outset of the 19th century, then it is even more profoundly true as we begin the 21st century.

Our children will not just be competing with each other—a child in Oklahoma competing with a child in Connecticut or a child in Louisiana competing with a child in New Hampshire—it will be a child in Oklahoma and a child in Connecticut competing with a child in Beijing, Moscow, South Africa, Paris, Berlin, and Australia. That is the world in which they will have to be able to compete.

What we do this year with elementary and secondary education will be how we begin the 21st century, giving this generation the tools it must have to succeed as a generation and to also perpetuate the vision and dream that each generation has embraced over our more-than-200-year history.

Funding is important. I happen to believe if elementary and secondary education is the top priority, then it ought to be reflected in the funding. We know we need approximately $14 billion to meet the 6 or 7 cents out of every dollar the U.S. Government contributes to elementary and secondary education.

What resources will we devote to title I, the most important title of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the primary mechanism through which the Federal Government provides resources to help low-income schools improve student achievement, resources to pay for more teachers, new computers, curricula, and other reforms?

According to a study published this year:

> Whenever an inner city or poor rural school is found to be achieving outstanding results with its students by improving innovative strategies, these innovations are almost invariably funded by title I.

The President's budget provides for an additional $42 billion for all education programs over 10 years. That is approximately $4.2 billion a year out of a huge economy, and I will speak to that in a minute. At the same time, the President's budget includes a $1.6 trillion tax cut over that same 10-year period.

Think about this. The President said: This is my top priority. He has only been in office about 100 days: This is my top priority. All during the campaign: This is my top priority; $4.2 billion a year versus $1.6 trillion. The numbers speak louder than the rhetoric—much louder.

By the way, under the President's tax proposal, approximately $680 billion will go to people who earn more than $300,000 a year. Those are not my numbers; those are the President's numbers: $681 billion will be going to people who earn $300,000 or more a year. That is where the tax cuts go. It appears the President considers tax cuts for people making over $300,000 a year to be seven times more important than increased funding for education in America.

I do not agree with those priorities. I do not think the President does, or at least he says he does not. And I know the American public does not either. In fact, 3 weeks ago, this party on a bipartisan basis showed it does not agree with those priorities either. That is why we supported the amendment of Senator HARKIN from Iowa to decrease the tax cut by $450 million and devote that amount equally to education and debt reduction. That is why we supported the amendment of Senator BREAUX and Senator JEFFORDS to reduce the tax cut to provide funding for special education.

I suspect Connecticut is not different from Oklahoma, Minnesota, or Louisiana. When I go home every week and meet with the mayors or first-select people—forget about meeting with the superintendents of schools and the PTAs—I say: Tell me what you think are the top priorities. I am going back to Washington on Monday; what can I do to help?

The answer is: Special education. You guys promised 40 percent of the cost of this. You mandated it basically. You said: We will come up with 40 percent of the money for it. That was 25 years ago, and we have done about, at best, 11 percent. That money is not even included in the President's budget, although we force it down the throat of the administration.

Special education is critically important. Contrary to what some in the administration say: we as a nation cannot afford the increased funding for education, the Democrats are saying we can afford it if we really believe it is a top priority.

We are not talking about eliminating the tax cut. We are saying make a more modest tax cut and use some of those resources for making education the top priority that most people think it ought to be. I believe it is a priority to help children and communities by fully funding special education. I believe it should be a priority to provide children with afterschool programs to enrich their lives.

I have been willing to go along with the accountability standards. Some testing may be fine. We will work that out. But I have asked the administration: How about school construction funds? That is something I really care about and I think a lot of parents do, too.

Mr. President, 50 percent of our students this morning went to school in a building built prior to 1950. Think of that: 50 percent of our elementary and secondary kids walked into a building that was built prior to 1950.

How about some resources for new school construction, wired to compete in a global economy, to have access to the great libraries and institutions all over the world? A kid who walks into a falling-apart building is going to get a falling-apart education. That is not any great leap of logic; that is a fact.

How about some resources for new school construction? How about the White House saying: We will go along with you on that? I say: You want me to support some of your ideas that I think are questionable at best. How about supporting my ideas and those of us who advocate funds for school construction.

Smaller class sizes: This should not take more than 5 minutes of debate. If a teacher is in a classroom and has more than 20 kids they are not teaching; all they are doing is managing chaos in most instances. The teacher cannot teach; the kids cannot learn. That is not a leap of logic; that is a fact. Every parent knows it; every teacher knows it. We do not need to do any studies; what we need is some resources to help poor communities across the country and others to come up with some resources so they can reduce class size and attract good people to the teaching profession.

We talk about the administration that says we want to test teachers every year or every 2 years. I wonder, if I said we are going to test all lawyers every 2 years or test all doctors every 2 years—how about testing every Senator for 2 years? What other profession do we mandate at the Federal level we are going to require testing every year?

If the administration tries to write that into the bill, I will not vote for it under any circumstance. That is punitive. It doesn't accomplish anything. It only creates great divisions within this country. It isolated the teaching profession.

There are ways of determining whether or not teachers are doing a good job. A lot of the States are doing a good job in making those evaluations. Test the new ones coming in and decide whether or not they can teach at all and use some of the creative methods developed to determine whether or not teachers are up to the job. This rush to test everybody, every year, is not a model of form.

We have asked for $14 billion, an increase of the elementary and secondary education authorization. I don't think that is too much. I don't think it is too much to demand in the context of a $1.6 trillion tax cut. I know many colleagues on both sides of the aisle agree

with me. That is why I will offer an amendment with Senator COLLINS of Maine to authorize full funding for title I grants to schools over the next 10 years. Congress must go on record in making that, not a tax cut for the wealthy, a top national priority. That is why this education bill must include class size reduction funds. No one questions that smaller class sizes and better teachers result in better student achievement. That is why this education bill must include school construction funds.

According to the GAO, the problem of inadequate, unsafe school facilities is a $112 million problem. The average school student goes to a school built around the 1950s. There are issues far from being resolved. They are not being discussed in these negotiations. Come out to the floor, offer your amendment, and see what happens. You accept all of our provisions and we will have a jump ball over yours.

What happened to bipartisanship? How many times did I hear we would work things out? It is 50/50 here, almost 50/50 in the House. I heard the President say over and over again: I want to work in a bipartisan fashion. Bipartisanship means you take my ideas and we will see what happens to yours? That may be enough for some people; it is not enough for me.

This bill will not be voted on again for 5 or 6 years. For many, this may be the last time we get to express how public education at the elementary and secondary schools across the country ought to be dealt with.

We took 2 weeks on campaign finance reform. We took 2 weeks last year to name the Ronald Reagan National Airport. We can take a few weeks to try to get this right. The American people expect nothing less. I remember the days, not that many years ago, when an elementary and secondary education bill passed this Chamber by votes of 92–6, 96–4. Today we ought to try to achieve the same results and to truly work to include these provisions which are necessary.

Democrats support real increases in proven programs. Yet the President, who says education is his top priority, would provide inadequate increases, $4.2 billion each year over the next 10 years, in a budget where he advocates a $1.6 trillion tax cut.

We can do better than that. I know our colleagues agree with that conclusion. That is why this education bill must include construction funds, include class size reforms.

We have to speak with a clear voice and build consensus. We are not there yet. In my view, we ought to be. But we are a long way from achieving the kind of consensus that those who have been out there suggest we are on the brink of; we are not. We may have to take some time before this is resolved.

I intend to be heard on these matters. I don't want to see a bill come up which will turn into a mess out here that allows these ideas to go down the drain and the President claiming a bipartisan achievement because a few Democrats go along with something that isn't adequately funded, doesn't provide for the true reforms that are needed, and we end up doing some real damage to kids, and then build a consensus that our public schools have failed for this country and you have to walk away from it. That is my fear of what will happen down the road and we will look back to these days and rue the fact we didn't try to come together with a truly compromised bill that reflected the attitudes of all people in this Chamber and particularly the values and aspirations of the people we represent.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Ms. LANDRIEU. I rise to add my voice to my distinguished colleague from Connecticut and to thank him for his outstanding leadership. Senator DODD and my staff have been enthusiastically involved in this particular debate. As a member of the committee, he has been a tremendous voice for education reform. I acknowledge the work Senator DODD has done with many of our colleagues on this issue and to say how much I agree with all of the points he has raised. I will join with him in as many hours as it takes through this week and the next week to try to bring some of these points home to our constituents and to the country at large.

I thank the Senator again for continuing to keep Senators focused on not only the increases in investments that we need in education but the targets of those investments to reach the children who need the most help, whether in Connecticut, Louisiana, Oklahoma, or other States, for whom we are fighting. I thank the Senator for that.

Mr. DODD. I thank my colleague, and I admire her work. She has been at these issues for a long number of years both in her home in Louisiana before she arrived in the Senate and as a Member of this body.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Let me follow up by making a few points. The President is right about one thing. That is, simply throwing more money at the problems facing our educational system in America will do little to create the type of reform necessary to move America forward in the new global economy.

However, conversely what is true, passing new mandates and new accountability and new standards and new goals for our students and our teachers and our communities, without that important and strategic and significant new investment in education, is a hollow and an empty promise.

I call attention to a wonderful ad that caught my attention a couple of weeks ago. It was put out by the Business Leader Council. We do a lot of talking in this Chamber about budgets, taxes, futures trading, commodities trading, and economic issues.

With my compliments to the Business Roundtable, this is the ad they ran. It said under the picture of the bright-eyed optimistic and hopeful children:

> Our Nation's classrooms are America's true futures market, where a commitment today will yield individual and national prosperity tomorrow.

Let me repeat that:

> Our Nation's classrooms are America's true futures market, where a commitment today—

Not next year, not 5 years from now, but a commitment today—

> will yield individual and national prosperity tomorrow.

I hope my colleagues can see the faces of these children. What jumped out at me from the picture is the hopefulness in these children's eyes. They look like children in every classroom in Louisiana, with smiles on their faces, with hands in the air, anxious to answer questions presented by their teachers, with hope and optimism for the future.

The debate we will have in this Chamber and with our colleagues in the House will determine whether these children walk away with supplies or whether they walk away with heads hung, shoulders stooped down, opportunities taken from them because we have made the wrong decisions on this floor.

That is what this debate is about. This budget is not just about numbers. It is not just about hard, cold facts. It is not just about statistics. It is about hearts, minds, souls, and opportunities for our children and for our families and for this country. I am afraid if we don't come to terms and make the best decisions we can, and good decisions this week, these children and millions and millions like them, and their parents, are going to be sorely disappointed.

Let me try to explain. One of the major debates we are preparing for is what kind of investment in education should we be making. The President has recommended what might seem to be a lot of money. When we talk about billions and hundreds of millions of dollars, those are large figures and people's eyes tend to glaze over because that sounds like a lot of money. We are debating an underlying bill, a reauthorization of elementary and secondary education, that is going to fundamentally change the way the Federal Government helps local and State government.

We are saying, instead of just sending you money and crossing our fingers and hoping for results, we are now going to tie the resources in a real and meaningful way. When we give you these moneys, we are going to expect real performance, real excellence, and there are going to be real consequences for failure. Schools may have to be reconstructed, reorganized; principals and teachers may need to be removed and we may need to have a new leadership team come in. Students are to be

tested not once every few years but every year. Teachers are going to be held to higher standards because we believe in excellence. We do not want to leave any child behind, and we want to make sure that, whether you are in a poor rural area or a poor urban area or in a wealthy urban area or wealthy rural area, that you have a chance, as a child, to get an excellent education.

We are also going to give local officials more flexibility. We are not going to micromanage from Washington any longer. We are not going to specifically mandate that you have to cross every t and dot every i. We are going to be less focused on compliance and more focused on performance.

I agree with the President that all of those things are important and that we should change the way Washington funds our elementary and secondary education system. But doing that and yet not providing the money at a high level for our schools to be able to do that is an empty, hollow promise to our children and an unfunded mandate of gigantic proportions to our local governments and to our States.

It would not be right. It is not what the American people want. It is not what we should do. That is what this debate is about. Yes, we want reform, but we must have the significant, historic, huge investments necessary to make those reforms work.

Let me say to those who might say money doesn't matter—yes, it does. Testing costs money. Improving teacher quality costs money. Fixing leaky roofs costs money. Buying textbooks and computers and training teachers and students costs money. You cannot just wish it. We can be more efficient. We can spend our money more wisely. But in this year, in 2001, as we begin this new century, it has to be a combination of new reforms and new investments.

Let me share some interesting poll numbers that came out because people might say: Senator, you feel this way, but does anybody else feel this way? Senator DODD feels this way, but does anyone else?

This is a Washington Post poll issued today. The question was very basic. It says, Is the Federal Government spending too much, about right, or too little for education? Mr. President, 60 percent of the public says we are spending too little; 60 percent of Americans are saying we are spending too little at the Federal level for education. Only about 24 percent say ''about right'' and 8 percent say ''too much.'' So 60 percent of Americans.

When we talk about at the State level, Is your State government spending enough on education? Mr. President, 61 percent say the State governments are spending too little on education. At the local level you can see that number drops fairly significantly because we are paying a greater portion at the local level.

This chart indicates to me that at the State level, but particularly at the Federal level, people across the board—and I think this was across regions and economic income levels—suggest our current investment level is not sufficient to meet the challenges.

Let me also share with you, from the same poll, a question: Which is more important to you, holding down the size of government, providing needed services, or both?

Mr. President, 31 percent said ''holding down the size of government,'' 62 percent, ''providing needed services.'' Does that mean the American public supports sort of a runaway government? Obviously not. But do they support a government that has efficient programs and effective programs and also makes investments in areas that matter to them—education being one of them? Absolutely.

Let me show you the second chart that shows what their priorities are. This is what the American people said in the same poll. If given the chance, how would you spend your money and what are some of your most important concerns? Education is at the top of the chart, 47 percent. The next closest is 34 percent, Social Security and Medicare, making sure the resources are there to provide for Social Security and strengthen it, and provide, hopefully, for reforms in the Medicare system, and an expansion for prescription drugs. Health care is important also, at 29 percent.

I want to focus on this area—education. The President, when he was running for President, said it over and over again: Let's not leave any child behind. I agree with him. Many, many people in this Chamber, both on the Republican and Democratic side, do. But that is just a slogan unless it is backed up with real dollars that actually move children forward, that give them hope, that fulfill a promise for life to help them develop their skills and their abilities.

Again the Business Roundtable said:

> Our Nation's classrooms are America's true futures market—where a commitment today will yield individual and national prosperity tomorrow.

Let me share, for the record, a specific example from one of Louisiana's industries, Avondale Industries. It is one of the largest employers in Louisiana, an industry that I certainly try to help and support, that is building some of the finest ships for our commercial shippers as well as our national defense. It does a magnificent job, let me add. They are now part of the Northrop Grumman Corporation, which is one of the five remaining facilities left in this whole country capable of building large combat vessels.

My staff called them and asked them if they could send us some applications for jobs that they might periodically put out to try to hire some of the individuals necessary for this work. These positions range from electrical engineer to data entry clerk. But the one requirement that comes through in all of these applications is that a high school diploma is necessary. What that translates to is really an 11th grade or 12th grade proficiency in math. Many of these jobs are related to calculations, to making analytical decisions based on plans and graphs, as you can imagine.

Right now in our Nation, according to the latest data, only 30 percent of our eighth graders are functioning at the proficient level in math. Here is an industry in my State that could employ thousands of individuals, that puts out applications daily for a variety of different jobs. The minimum requirement is a high school education. Part of that is functioning just at the proficient level—not outstanding, not the top 1 percent in the Nation, just at the proficiency level for math.

I have to stand here as a Senator and look these industry people in the eye and tell them that we can only create a school system that can, at best, give them 30 percent of the eighth graders who can fill out the application. This is not going to work. It is not going to work for Louisiana. It is not going to work for Connecticut. It is not going to work for New York. It is simply not going to work. And a budget that does not fund more science teachers, more math teachers, makes a real investment to give those kids an opportunity, is not going to help them, their families, or Avondale.

I know the last administration asked me—it was a hard vote and I did it—to vote for 50,000 H–1B visas to bring in people from outside this Nation to fill jobs because we were not able to find people in America to take these jobs. I cast that vote, but I will tell you I thought about that vote, because when I cast that vote it allowed high-tech industries and some industries such as Louisiana's shipbuilders to be able to hire people from other nations.

I go home and drive through neighborhoods, walk through communities, sit and talk to young people who have been left out because we have not provided them the kind of education they need. They have to step aside and watch someone from another country walk past their door, fill out the application, and take the job that they could have had if we had had a school system that could have given them the education necessary for the job.

That is a tough thing for a Senator to have to do because I do not represent any other country; I represent the United States, and I represent Louisiana. I represent cities and communities where there are thousands of people who cannot pass 11th grade math because we will not put the resources and the money where they need to be to give them the chance. Are they willing? Yes. But we have not done what we need to do.

So my message to the President and to my colleagues is, let's do it while we can. Perhaps when we were running terrible deficits and running up large, large bills, you could say: Look, we would love to do it but we simply can't

afford it. We are running huge deficits. We can't keep spending money we don't have. Money doesn't grow on trees. We can't tax people any more. So I am all for that and when we have to cut back, let's do it.

But now that we have a historic and significant surplus, now I am listening to people say: We have the surplus; we have the money; it is sitting there in the bank, but we don't want to spend it on these children. We don't want to spend it on them. They are not our future. We want to give a huge tax cut, and we don't want to make any investments in education.

I am not talking about the same kind of investments for the same mediocre results. We can't keep doing it 3 percent a year or 4 percent a year or 5 percent a year, which is what the President is recommending, and think we are going to get a 50-percent increase in results. It doesn't work that way.

We have to make an extraordinary commitment now and put our money where our mouth is to reach the children that we need to reach through our schools. Yes, reform our schools with strong accountability standards matched with a true investment and targeted to the kids who need it the most.

We do a great job sometimes in Washington inventing new programs, and everything sounds great. And every year we invent about five, six, or seven more programs. We need to get back to the basics and fund through elementary and secondary education a significant amount, if not tripling the amount of money, for title I—flexible grants that go to places in Louisiana, New York, Connecticut, Alabama, New Mexico, or where the communities can't raise the tax dollars because they are relatively poor or have a limited capacity.

The Federal Government can honestly stand up and say, whether you are little girls in Oregon or you were born into a poor, rural area or a poor urban area, it doesn't matter because we have a system at the Federal level that ensures, because of the way we fund education, that the school you go to will help you pass and exceed that proficiency in math so that you can get a job and we don't have to import someone from another country to take the job while you collect welfare or while you have to live on food stamps or while you tell your children they cannot ever live in a home of their own because you can't bring home a paycheck enough for you to be able to live in a home of your own.

I am not going to say that as a Senator because the money is in the bank. The question is, Are we going to write the check for the kids who need it or to our schools, or are we going to squander the surplus and not make the investments that we need?

I will come to the floor every single day this week and next week, as long as it takes, because I know as a Senator from Louisiana, particularly, my State's future rests in large measure on how our schools can function so that every child in every part of our State can get the quality education that in some small way perhaps will make up for what they do not always get in their homes.

I don't know what kind of miracle schools can achieve. I know schools can't do it without the parents. I know there is a limit to what schools can contribute to a child if they are not getting that support at home. But I am tired of making excuses and hearing excuses such as this kid can't learn because this child only has one parent or this child can't learn because this child is poor or this child can't learn because this child is a special education student.

I am here to tell you that every child can learn, but it takes a good system and good investments from the Federal Government, the State government, and the local government working in partnership with parents.

I am about fed up with the excuses because I want to support trade and globalization, and I want our businesses to have the workers they need. I have to fight for children to have the opportunity. I urge our President to please work with us. Work with the Democrats. We don't want to waste money. We want to make a significant investment in education, coupled with accountability, new standards and exciting possibilities for our Nation. I most certainly want to work with him. I believe we can make a real difference in Louisiana and Texas and many places throughout our Nation.

In conclusion, I refer to the vision of Lyndon Baines Johnson when we created the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—a vision that would make the dream of a quality education a reality for all children regardless of their race, their socioeconomic status, or their gender. This is what America is about. It is about opportunities.

In many ways, while education begins at home, it is most certainly enhanced at the school level. We are shortchanging ourselves, shortchanging our children, and shortchanging our future to do anything less.

I will end saying, again, I am going to be down here every day until we complete this debate, urging my colleagues to push hard for a significant investment and targeting that investment to the schools and communities that need the most help, and also helping all of our districts to achieve success in educational excellence.

I yield any remaining time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, before my colleague from Louisiana leaves the floor, I thank her so much for saying what the issue before us really is. We all agree that we need to make children our No. 1 priority. We all agree that there are things in our schools that need to be improved, and we need to, frankly, underscore the things that are working. We don't want to leave any child behind. That is President Bush's comment.

When we get the chance to have an education bill brought here with our friends, Senator KENNEDY, Senator JEFFORDS, and others, we want to make sure it is not just an empty promise. I think she has fleshed this out. I thank her very much.

In California, we test every year. It is not a big deal. We have that reform in place. But if you test them and find they are failing and you don't have anything in place to help them after school or during school to give them the smaller class sizes, to give them a facility that feels good, looks good, and is safe for them, they are not going to improve.

When this education bill comes up, I predict that the Senate will take that Bush bill and change it dramatically in terms of the resources we put behind the rhetoric. There are two R's. Usually they say there are three R's. But there is rhetoric here, then there is requirement. Those are the two R's. The rhetoric is fine. Let's get the requirements in there so that we can meet the needs of our children. There is a third R—results. That is what we want to do.

How much time do I have? Is there a limit on time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there are 10 minutes per speaker, and the Democrats have 40 minutes remaining.

Mrs. BOXER. I would like to know when I have 1 minute remaining of my 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will notify the Senator.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the Chair.

## THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I have been amazed at the first 100 days of the Bush administration in relation to the environment issue. When I say the environment, I don't just throw that word out. I am talking about air, I am talking about water, I am talking about drinking water, I am talking about parks, and I am talking about cleaning up Superfund sites and brownfield sites. The fact is, we have a situation on our hands that is going to be very dangerous for our people.

Why do I say that? I say that for a couple of reasons. First of all, we see rollbacks on very important issues. We have all heard about the President backing off the pledge he made in the campaign to deal with $CO_2$ emissions which cause major problems in air quality. We know he has backed off that.

We saw him evaluate a number of rules that were put in place under the Clinton administration. The one that I cannot get over—there are a number; I don't have time to get into them—is the one dealing with arsenic. We know a few things about arsenic. It is unsafe at any level. We know for a fact that at

the current level of arsenic that is allowed in our drinking water, if you drink out of that water supply, 1 out of 100 people will get cancer—not may get cancer, not might get cancer, but will get cancer. We know this to be the case.

Yet this administration, in violation of the law, in my opinion—that will be tested in the courts—reversed the Clinton administration rule on arsenic to reduce the parts per billion that would be allowable, where the Clinton administration had gone from 50 parts per billion to 10 and he put us back at 50 parts per billion.

Let me list some of the countries that have a standard of 50 parts per billion. I will give you an idea of the countries that allow 50 parts per billion of arsenic: Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bolivia, China, Egypt, India, and Indonesia. That is an example.

Let me list some of the countries that have the 10 parts per billion: European Union, Japan, and Jordan.

I have to say that we owe our people safe drinking water. If we owe them nothing else, we can argue a lot of things, but the Federal Government needs to make sure that our people are safe.

What we have is a rollback on a number of fronts. I am just talking about the arsenic one today. There are others. I will save them for another day. But in addition to this, in order to pay for his tax cut to the wealthiest people who do not need it, those over $300,000 and $400,000 a year, those over $1 million, $2 million, or $1 billion a year, in order to pay for that tax cut, some of those people are going to get back a million dollars a year. This President has cut back environmental enforcement.

Let's take a look at the key cuts that he has put in his budget. The Environmental Protection Agency, a $500 million cut; the Interior Department, a $400 million cut. The clean energy and nuclear contamination cleanup—you have DICK CHENEY out there saying we need more nuclear power. He has not even figured out a way to clean up the nuclear waste we have. They have cut $700 million, and they want more nuclear power, which is dangerous. There is a conservation program in the Agriculture Department. They cut that $300 million. So we see a total of $1.9 billion in cuts to pay for a tax cut that favors the top 1 percent, leaving out 99 percent of the people.

What does that really mean? What does it mean when you cut environmental enforcement? Let me get into that. It is very serious. What happens is, we are going to see fewer inspectors out in the field and fewer technical exports on the ground. We are going to see that the Federal Government will no longer be able to be a watchdog for some of the most serious threats to public health and the environment.

I want to give examples because people have seen the movie ''Erin Brockovich.'' We all saw what happened to people in a small town in California when that particular water system had an excess of chromium 6, which is, by the way, very dangerous. It is very lethal. By the way, there is no Federal standard for chromium 6 in water. I have a bill that would place into law a Federal standard, but we hear silence from the Bush administration on that. Instead of looking at the new threats, they are taking the old threats and making them more threatening, such as with arsenic, by rolling back the laws.

When the American people know about this, I think they are going to be very upset. You should not have to be able to afford bottled water in this country to be safe. You should not have to worry that your child is going to get cancer as a result of drinking from the water tap.

Oh, they say, it costs money to clean it up. As my kids would say when they were young: Dah. Yes, this is so. It costs money to clean up an environmental problem. Do we have it? Yes, we do. Why not cap the tax refund people earning over $1 million will get? Every year they earn $1 million. Cap their tax refund. Take the money and clean up the water. Get the arsenic out. Help the local people.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 4 additional minutes.

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

Mrs. BOXER. But, no, let's look at these priorities. The President wants to bring an education bill to the floor. My colleague from Massachusetts is our real leader in the Senate, and he is going to talk about it. There are some good ideas that have been carved out between the parties. There is not enough money behind it. It is a false promise.

A kid takes a test and fails the test. What are you going to do for the kid? You can test him every 6 months. Why not test him every 2 months? What good is it if there is no one available to help that child learn? So when the President says, ''Leave no child behind,'' where is the beef?

When you look at the environmental budget—and you have to remember the President stood in front of some beautiful lakes and streams and rivers and said he was an environmentalist—how can we have prosperity when our environment is dirty? Yet we look at the budget, which includes the priorities of this President, and you see nothing but destruction.

I have seen it happen in California in El Segundo. We had a refinery that was releasing air pollution that aggravated very badly those suffering from asthma. People were very sick. There was a lawsuit that was brought. EPA supported it. Why? They had enforcement capability.

Chevron's own records show that it simply did not use the pollution control technology that was required. There was not any new innovative technology. It was already approved. They agreed to a huge settlement, one of the biggest in history. Because of the Environmental Protection Agency, the people got help. Chevron is going to help build and operate a health clinic to take care of those people who experience health problems.

EPA has the legal authority needed to ensure that serious violations are stopped and that polluters are held accountable—which can help deter a company from disregarding environmental protections in the future. EPA's legal authority and resources are most often needed in cases like this one, where the issues are very serious and the company has substantial resources. It was not until the Federal Government filed suit against Chevron that the company agreed to comply with the law.

In another example, the United States, including EPA, Department of Interior, and Department of Commerce, as well as several California state agencies, reached settlement worth an estimated $1 billion with Aventis to clean-up the Iron Mountain Mine located near Redding, CA, in October of 2000.

The State of California requested help from the Federal Government in this enormously complex case explaining that they had ''exhausted all practicable enforcement action against the potential defendants.''

Prior to the settlement, this mine discharged an average of one ton of toxic metals per day into the Upper Sacramento River, a critical salmon spawning habitat and a central part of California's water system. As recently as 5 years ago, the site dumped the equivalent of 150 tanker cars full of toxic metals into the Sacramento River during winter storms. At one point, workers had left a shovel at the site in a green liquid flowing from the mine and it was half eaten away over night.

I have a photograph of a disposal area on the site that gives you a feel for just one part of the damage at this very large and complex site.

This site dumped approximately one quarter of the total copper and zinc discharged into our nation's water from industrial and municipal sources throughout the United States.

This case is another good example of the kind of cases a strong EPA enforcement program is needed for—sites that are large, that can overwhelm State programs, even in a State with a well developed and active environmental program like California, and sites with very large corporate interests involved.

When you take a close look at EPA's past enforcement efforts you see who benefits from cuts in enforcement. Serious polluters can take big hits to their pocketbooks when they are caught. A cut in enforcement is worth a great deal to these violators, but enforcement cuts come at the expense of public health and safety as well as the environment.

The President's proposed budget cuts the heart out of agricultural conservation programs, like the Wetland Reserve Program which is eliminated—cut from $162 million in fiscal year 2001 to $0 in fiscal year 2002. This program was first authorized in 1990, during the first Bush administration, to provide long term protection for wetlands.

The President has collected an incredible assortment of cuts in environmental protection—all sources for the tax cut that fails to take into account the priorities of the American people, like conservation and environmental protection. Before deciding on what the ''right size'' of the tax cut should be, the President should consider the impacts of these cuts. California provides some valuable examples of the conservation benefits we will lose if the President's budget cuts are implemented.

The Wetland Reserve Program in California has helped restore a portion of the 4.5 million acres of wetlands lost to agricultural conversion and development in our State. In addition to providing habitat for migratory birds, other wetlands restoration benefits include improvement of water quality, flood control, sediment abatement and recharge of groundwater. California is the primary path of the ''Pacific Flyway''—approximately 20 percent of all waterfowl pass through California's Central Valley. At the present time, the federal Wetland's Reserve Program, zeroed out in the President's budget, is the largest wetland protection program in California.

More than 60,000 acres to date have been protected in this program in California. There are more than 100 applicants on a waiting list to protect and restore their agricultural lands. One of the strongest parts of the program are the partnerships with not-for-profit organizations like California Waterfowl and the Nature Conservancy, as well as the private landowners themselves.

I have a photograph of one of the successful restorations accomplished by a conservation easement under the Wetland Reserve Program. The site is in Colusa County, CA and was enrolled in the Conservation Reserve Program in 1992. It is approximately 195 acres of seasonal wetlands that provides both winter and brood habitat for migrating and nesting waterfowl, shorebirds, migratory songbirds, and other wildlife. This easement is part of a 1,000-acre complex of wetlands and upland nesting habitat adjacent to the Sacramento River and lies in the middle of the largest migratory waterfowl corridor in North America. It is owned by the Audubon Society and acts as a sanctuary for wildlife.

Given the value and community support for agriculture conservation programs, I simply cannot see how the President can justify eliminating these kinds of programs to increase his tax cut.

Mr. President, let me sum up. We have a tax cut that was pledged as a campaign promise 2 years ago because Steve Forbes was in a debate with George Bush and said: I am for this $1.4 trillion tax cut. Times have changed. The economy has turned around since George Bush has become President. We have problems. People are not optimistic about the future of this country.

What does that mean? It means that a sensible person—this is my view—would sit back and say: I want to do this, and it is on my agenda, but maybe I can't do it all at once. Maybe I will cut it in half. Maybe I am going to invest in the people, invest in children, so that we have an afterschool program for every child, so that we have safe drinking water for every child, so that we know people are not going to get sick from air pollution.

We talk about our kids. Every one of us cares about kids. That is one of the reasons we are Senators. Do you know the leading cause of admissions in hospitals for children is asthma? They miss school. So you have to connect the dots. If you take out massive sums of money that you are going to transfer to the top 1 percent of income earners, forgetting 99 percent—everyone else—really, you have given 43 percent of the tax cut to the people in the highest income, and then you say you do not have any money to enforce the Clean Air Act or the Clean Water Act. You roll back the laws on arsenic. You take away the money to clean up nuclear contamination, while you are calling for more nuclear plants. You bring out an education bill that is so short of money that it is an empty promise and an unfunded mandate for our States. It is an unfunded mandate because we are forcing them to test, and yet we do not have enough to help those children.

Connect the dots. If you build a budget around an unrealistic, dangerous tax cut, it is going to take us back to deficits. You are not going to be able to pay down the debt. You are not going to be able to do the basics for our children. You are not going to be able to clean up the environment. And you have a problem. It is no wonder this economy is a little at sea, because this budget does not add up and it does not make sense.

Mr. President. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

## THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I would like to spend a few moments this afternoon to bring our colleagues up to date on where we are on the Elementary and Secondary Education legislation. Over these past 2 weeks we have had an ongoing exchange of ideas and views with the administration and our colleagues. We have been trying to continue to find common ground and to make important progress.

We are very much aware that this is an issue that is not only a high priority for the President of the United States, but also that it is a high priority for every family in this country, and certainly among the highest priorities for those of us on this side of the aisle.

We welcome the fact that we have a President who has placed education at the top of his agenda. Eight years ago when the Democrats lost control of the Senate, one of the first actions the Republicans took was to rescind some of the funding of elementary and secondary education. We also fought against attempts by our Republican friends to abolish the Department of Education. But that was then and this is now. We welcome the opportunity to find common ground so we can move ahead and make a difference for the children in this country and for the families across the Nation.

As we start off our debate on this issue, we have to understand the importance of preparing a child to learn, even prior to the time they enroll in elementary school. This is an area of very considerable interest on both sides of the aisle.

Our colleague from Connecticut, Senator DODD, has been a leader on these children's issues. Senator JEFFORDS has made this a special area of concern. And Senator STEVENS has been very involved in early intervention for children. It is enormously important to continue to ensure a national commitment to have the nation's children ready to learn, as we did and as the Governors did in Charlottesville some years ago.

I am hopeful we will be able to do that in a bipartisan way in Congress with solid legislation. We still have a ways to go, but we have made progress. We also have to understand the very serious and significant gap that still exists with regard to preparing children for grades K through 12th.

We are still falling behind. We fund Early Start programs at approximately 10 percent for the earliest types of intervention. And for programs from birth to 3 years of age, we are down to either 2 or 3 percent. This is an area of enormous importance. We are trying to help many children across the nation with this program. Hopefully, it will make a difference.

Unfortunately there are going to be many children who will still fall through the cracks unless we come back to revisit public policy and resources for early intervention programs.

It is all part of a mosaic. We must give our full attention to these efforts which are extremely important in preparing children for elementary school.

I was disappointed that the administration zeroed out a very modest downpayment in the Early Child Development Program that had bipartisan support in the 106th Congress from Senator STEVENS, Senator JEFFORDS, Senator DODD, Senator KERRY, many others on the Health Education Labor and Pensions Committee, and myself.

We have reached some very important agreements on the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, however, differences over funding remain. We are in the process of negotiating language for the legislation, and I expect that the earliest we could have this legislation is late Wednesday or Thursday.

Money is not the answer to everything, but it is a pretty good indication of the Nation's priorities.

Under the President's bill, there is a reduction in resources of $69 billion for the Nation. However, we will only see an extremely modest, somewhat less than $3 billion, increase in the funding for programs which are targeted on the neediest children in this country. It is that kind of disparity which is of considerable trouble to many of us.

We agree that every child should be tested each year in grades three through eight—not as a punishment, but so parents and educators know where every child stands and what more needs to be done to help them improve and achieve their full potential.

We agree to create tough standards for schools and hold them accountable for improving student achievement.

We agree that where schools fail, bold steps are necessary to turn them around, including requiring alternative governance arrangements.

We agree parents deserve more public school options to ensure their children get a quality education.

We agree that literacy programs should be expanded so every child learns to read well in the early years.

We share these priorities with President Bush and believe these reforms will make a difference in our communities.

We are still working on how to increase the flexibility while maintaining targeting and accountability. It is important that any additional flexibility is tied to strong accountability, and strong targeting to the neediest communities. We want to ensure that States and school districts do not ignore the children who need our help the most.

We are also working hard to increase accountability and support for teachers. States and districts should be held accountable for putting qualified teachers in every classroom, particularly in the neediest schools. They should also have to provide professional development and mentoring support for teachers so that teachers can make these new tough reforms work.

We are also working to ensure that after-school programs are expanded so that more children have the opportunity to catch up with their schoolwork if they have fallen behind.

We are working to ensure parent involvement and that parent involvement is a cornerstone for all the new reforms.

We are working to ensure schools and districts and States are held accountable to the public through mandatory report cards that include important information about how well their schools are doing.

We are working to ensure that the Class Size Reduction Program is continued so children can get the individual attention they need to succeed.

We are working to continue the School Renovation Program so communities can ensure children are learning in safe, modern school buildings.

We hope we can address all these issues and come to a bipartisan consensus on them.

We must also know that reforms minus resources equals failure. You cannot say education is your top priority and not put enough resources in the budget to do the job.

We are disappointed in the President's budget. According to OMB, President Bush's budget contains only a $669 million increase next year for elementary and secondary education programs. That is an increase of one-fifth of one percent of what we are spending on our public schools today at the national, State, and local levels; we are spending $350 billion a year.

Testing and accountability are important, but they are only the measures of reform, they are not reform themselves.

Investment without accountability is a waste of money, but accountability without investment is a waste of time.

We need the resources to make sure that slick, easy, and quick tests that have mostly multiple choice questions and which cost $3 or $4 will not be developed. We want to make sure we have a quality teacher teaching a quality curriculum to a quality test. That takes investment.

It is not just the money, it is the resources to do the job: well-qualified teachers, thoughtful tests, good curriculum, the examination of the tests and reporting back in a timely way.

At the current time, we are meeting only about 20 to 22 percent of the supplementary services that are necessary for children. If we are not going to have a significant increase in resources, we are not going to be able to provide the good quality supplementary services for those children who need them.

We know with a very modest increase—about $1 billion—we could provide 1.6 million children with quality supplemental after-school academic opportunities. Even if you take what was paid last year and adding about $850 million this year, we are still only reaching about a third of all latchkey children, ages 8 to 13, who go home alone in the afternoon.

Resources are important because they are translated into substantive issues that make a difference in advancing the quality of education for children.

This chart compares the investments in ESEA programs for fiscal year 2001 to the Administration's 2002 proposal. In 2001, funding for ESEA programs increased by $3.6 billion or a 24.2 percent. This Administration has requested an increase of $669 million, which is only a 3.5 percent increase.

Even with their willingness to go higher, it does not come close to the increases in 2001. This recognizes that we are only reaching one-third of all of the children who are disadvantaged or eligible under the Title I program.

Look at the appropriations for the Department of Education. In 2001 there was an 18.2 percent increase, $6.5 billion. The Bush budget for all the education, is increased by 5.9 percent or $2.5 billion.

The Department of Education over the period of the last 5 years shows a 12.8-percent increase in resources. However the proposed budget starts with a 5.9-percent increase in the Department of Education.

This is a time with record surpluses, when we are going to give back $69 billion in tax reductions. There is a great deal of talk about investing in education, but we are still not putting in the resources.

This chart is the State of Texas education equation. It shows that from 1994 to 2002, school funding went from $16.9 billion to $27.5 billion, a 57-percent increase under Governor Bush. Interestingly, we see an alarming increase in student achievement, from 56-percent of the students performing at a proficient level on the State test in 1994 to 80-percent of students performing at a proficient level in 2000—showing you cannot educate on the cheap.

The next chart shows the difference between the proposal the Democrats support and the Bush budget. We know there are 10,000 failing schools that need to be turned around. The best estimate is that it costs $180,000 to turn around a school. There are 57 different, accepted, scientifically evaluated ways in which schools can be restructured and organized that have been found to have been successful. Taking 10,000 schools and $180,000—that is, $1.8 billion—to turn around the schools that we know are in need. With the other proposal, effectively, we are leaving 7,556 schools behind.

We know what needs to be done. We know we have failing schools, and we have ways of turning them around. We know we have unqualified teachers, and we know what needs to be done to make them qualified. We know we have an inadequate curriculum, and we know what needs to be done to strengthen curriculum. We understand what will benefit the children and the teachers and we know how to strengthen their needs with supplementary services.

If we don't have the supplementary services, trained teachers, effective tests, modern and safe schools, and smaller class sizes, then we are failing ourselves. We fail ourselves when we fail to provide the resources to ensure the nation's children with a sound education.

Finally, I hope during this debate we have some discussion about the issue of IDEA. Full funding for IDEA will help

immeasurably in allowing special needs children to get additional resources.

I hope we can move ahead with ESEA and get the commitment of essential resources to meet these important needs. In doing the job, we need to give children across the nation the best opportunities which we all understand they deserve.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWNBACK). The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I ask unanimous consent that Senator CLINTON speak next for 15 minutes and I be allowed to speak after for 10 minutes, and the Republicans then be allowed to have the time they need to respond.

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

The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleague from Minnesota. I associate myself with the remarks of the education Senator from Massachusetts who so eloquently laid out our dilemma, the dilemma that will be occupying the Senate as we move forward on this very important debate.

People always talk about important debates, but it is fair to say as we debate, we will set educational policy for our Nation for the next 7 years. There is hardly a subject we can think of that will have more direct impact on our families, on our communities, on our economy, and especially on our children. We are setting the stage for determining how much we as a nation will do to make good on the promise of a quality education for all children, and particularly for our country's neediest children.

I first became involved in education reform back in 1983 with the issuance of the report called ''A Nation at Risk,'' which was issued under President Reagan's watch. Many took that call to action very much to heart that we were a nation at risk. We began looking for ways to improve education, to provide more resources to provide more accountability measures. We have made progress over those last years.

When the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was last reauthorized in 1994, we sent a strong signal that although education was absolutely a matter of local concern, it had to be a national priority; that we all had to recognize we were failing our children by not providing adequate educational resources and by not expecting them to do the very best they could do. We put a high priority on academic standards, and we worked to help teachers and administrators, parents, and communities improve education.

The results of this strong Federal response to local and State educational demands has been heartening. Mr. President, 49 States plus the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico have developed State standards and are working to implement them. These reforms are producing results.

We often only focus on the negative side of the ledger about how much we still have to do. I give some credit to the children and the young people, our students, and their parents, and especially their teachers, because we have seen progress. Reading and math scores for fourth graders in our highest poverty school districts have improved by nearly a grade level from 1994 to today. SAT scores are on the rise. More students than ever are attending college.

We cannot rest there. We know there is still far more to be done. We have too many children, particularly in our underserved urban and rural districts, who are not reading at grade level. We have too many children being taught by uncertified teachers, in overcrowded classrooms, in crumbling school buildings. We cannot stand by idly while these conditions persist. The issue is, what is the best way to address them? How better can we equip parents, teachers, communities, and our students to meet the tests of the 21st century?

I applaud President Bush for calling for greater accountability. I agree with him on the importance of that. I was among the very first in our Nation, in Arkansas in the early 1980s, to call for the testing of students and the testing of teachers because I believed then we had to know what we didn't know in order to make progress. We couldn't just pretend that everything was fine and engage in social promotion and not face up to the fact that we had children graduating from high school who couldn't read a job application. We had teachers who had been themselves passed through the education system who were unprepared to teach the substance of what it was they were assigned to teach.

Accountability is key, to me. I have been a strong supporter of that. In fact, I welcome the Republicans and I welcome the Bush administration which has gone forward with accountability measures that are like the measures Democrats have proposed for several years. Many on the other side of the aisle resisted such approaches for many years. In fact, they wanted to abolish the Department of Education. So I applaud my colleagues on the Republican side for the progress they have made in moving toward a common recognition that this is a national priority that must be beyond politics and partisanship.

The accountability that is in the bill that is proposed would ask that we test our children every year from third to eighth grade. That is designed to ensure that they are meeting high standards. But here is where the rubber really hits the road. If all we do is order more tests, if we do not combine those tests with the resources that are needed to help the children who have been left behind, then we will have, at best, a hollow victory and I believe, worse than that, we will have committed educational fraud on our children, our teachers, and our country.

The Bush plan orders more testing while providing only half the funds needed to design and implement these tests. What would this mean to the State of New York, for example? It would mean that of the $16 million that is estimated to have to be spent to comply with these new Federal requirements, our State would only get $8 million. So we would have to find 8 million more dollars, take it out of something else—from hard-pressed school districts, from teacher pay, from whatever other important objective we are already trying to meet. We should not be passing on an unfunded mandate to our States.

If it is a national priority, if it is a priority for this administration to order these tests, then the Federal Government ought to pay for these tests and make sure that, as the Senator from Massachusetts pointed out, they are good tests; they are quality tests; they are not just make-work kinds of tests.

Passing tough new accountability standards without the resources to help our schools and students is similar to handing out thermometers in the midst of an epidemic. The thermometers certainly can tell us that there are a lot of sick people, but they do absolutely nothing to help people get better. Unfortunately, the administration's proposal has plenty of thermometers but precious little medicine to help our schools improve. The administration has not even yet committed to providing the Federal funds necessary to marry accountability with student achievement.

We already know that despite the rhetoric, this is not an increase of more than 11 percent; it is only 5.9 percent because the administration tried to count money that had been appropriated last year. We are glad to have that money, but let's have honest accounting about how much more money is going in. A 5.9-percent increase barely keeps up with inflation and population increases.

What also does it mean on the school level? Let's focus and ask ourselves: If we pass this accountability measure, and everybody goes home, pats themselves on the back, there is a big press conference, and a big signing ceremony, what have we really done to help the districts such as the ones I worry about in the State of New York?

In New York City, for example, we are facing a severe teacher shortage. The city will need to hire approximately 40,000—that is right, 40,000—teachers over the next 4 years. In addition, the district is under a court order to place those certified teachers it hires in the lowest performing schools. That makes sense because right now we have uncertified teachers, ill equipped to teach, teaching the children who need the best teachers. So the idea, which is a good idea, is let's put the certified teachers in the schools

where the children need them the most.

But what has happened? Last week we learned from the chancellor of the New York City schools that the certified teachers turned down the jobs in the hard-to-teach schools. Why? Because those are the schools that are already overcrowded; those are the schools that are crumbling; those are the schools that hardly have a book in the library; those are the schools without the computers connected by the cables they need to be able to be functional, let alone to be accessible to the Internet.

We cannot in good conscience demand that school districts hire certified teachers without providing the resources to help these hard-pressed districts recruit and retain these teachers. And we have to do more to make these schools attractive to certified teachers.

Answer me, why you would go into a very difficult school to teach children who are under lots of stress at home and in their neighborhoods if the school is not well equipped to give you the resources you need to try to do a good job with those children?

I will be working with colleagues on both sides of the aisle to introduce a bipartisan teacher recruitment amendment. We all know if we do not place the recruitment of our teachers at the top of our national agenda we will have school districts that are barely able to open their doors in the next couple of years. We will be asking people literally to come off the streets and start teaching because we will not have the teachers we need. I meet people all the time who want to be teachers, but they will not, they cannot, and they should not work under the conditions under which many of our teachers are asked to function.

I am also concerned about the proposal the President includes called Straight A's. This is a demonstration project that would give 7 States and 25 school districts the chance to block grant Federal dollars. People are often talking about how important it is to give authority back to the States, and I agree with that in most instances. But we know from years of education research that block granting funds—which means taking the Federal dollars and sending them to the State capitol—means that those dollars do not get to the students and the schools that need them the most in the amount that they should. They get siphoned off in the bureaucracy of the State capitol. They get sent to other places that do not need them but, for political purposes, have the influence to get them. We should be targeting those hard-earned Federal dollars to those school districts and those students who are so far behind.

Right now in New York we know, because of a court decision, that the children in New York City do not get their fair share of education funding. So we should do everything possible to get the dollars to the students who need them the most in the schools where the teachers have a chance to try to help them.

We also know from research that smaller class sizes make a huge difference, and the Class Size Reduction Initiative has worked wonders. We now have teachers in New York who are federally funded who are helping to lower class size. We have already seen positive results from the school achievement scores.

We also know that construction funding to help schools repair their buildings and modernize them and even construct the buildings they need is very necessary. These two important programs, class size reduction and school construction, are eliminated for all purposes in the Bush administration proposal. I say this is a mistake, and I ask the administration, with all respect, to please reconsider this decision.

The administration says that reducing class size with Federal dollars and helping to construct and repair schools are not Federal responsibilities. I know they are not totally Federal responsibilities, but I do not think in today's world they are also solely local responsibilities. The districts that need the help the most are not the districts like the one I live in where, with very high property taxes from affluent people, the children have everything they could possibly dream of. But in so many districts, suburban taxpayers cannot pay another penny to fix their schools and do what is necessary to have up-to-date labs. In many rural districts they do not have the tax base to do that, and in many urban districts they don't have the dollars because they don't get their fair allocation from the State, and they cannot tax themselves to be able to meet the needs of children for whom English is not their first language, who come to school with undiagnosed mental illnesses, who live in a system of deprivation and violence and who cannot perform at the same level as the children in my district.

Let's have a shared responsibility. That was the whole idea behind the Class Size Reduction Initiative and School Construction Initiative. If education is to be a national priority, let's invest in what we know works—and we know reducing class size and providing good facilities actually works—to make for better education.

I hope we will continue in the spirit that we began in the education committee as we marked up this bill, in the negotiations that are currently ongoing with the administration. But I am very concerned that this particular proposal falls way short of what we need to be doing. It falls short for a very simple reason. The administration would rather invest in a large, fiscally irresponsible tax cut than in the education of our children and particularly those who are most needy in rural and urban districts.

I hope this will be reconsidered because this failure to properly fund education, to me, is disappointing at a time when we have surpluses, when we do not have to squander these surpluses on large tax cuts that will go disproportionately to the already wealthy whose children already attend schools that have all the computers, all the bells and whistles, all the extra help they could possibly have.

Let's, instead, take a moment and step back. I hear a lot about the greatest generation. My parents were part of the greatest generation, the World War II generation. I think they probably have to take a second seat to the greatest generation being the Founders of our Country. But there is no argument that those who survived the Depression, won World War II, and set the stage for winning the cold war, were among the greatest if they were not the greatest generation our country has ever seen.

We have been living off the investments and sacrifices of our parents and our grandparents for more than 50 years. My father, who is a rock-ribbed Republican, voted for higher school taxes because he knew the education of his children depended upon good schools. We invested in the Interstate Highway System. We set a goal to send a man to the Moon. We had big dreams, and we worked to fulfill those dreams.

Today, at the beginning of this new century, it is up to us to make the decisions, the hard decisions to invest in our children's education. And shame on us if we do not make the right decisions. We can pass a bill that is filled with testing and sounds good but 10 years from now we will still have children in overcrowded classrooms and crumbling buildings who are being deprived of certified, qualified teachers, and we will wonder what went wrong.

Let's instead be sensible about the best practices that we know work. We have research. We have practical experience. We know what needs to be done. The issue is, do we have the political will to make those decisions?

I support working hand in hand with the administration in a bipartisan way, with the parents and teachers and community leaders of our country, to make education a real national priority. But I cannot—I could not—support a bill that is a hollow, empty promise.

Let's do both. Let's increase accountability so we get better results by making sure we have the resources to hold our children and our teachers accountable. If we do that, then we will be setting the stage to leave no child behind. If we do any less, then I think we have missed a historic opportunity.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, could I ask the Senator one or two quick questions?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I have been very moved by what she said. On the question of accountability and then the whole issue of unfunded mandates, one

argument I heard the Senator make was we have to provide the funding for the actual tests to make sure these are high quality, which means we should not confuse accountability, testing, and standardized tests as being one and the same thing; is that correct?

Mrs. CLINTON. Yes, it is.

Mr. WELLSTONE. The second point I want to make and I want to be sure we are clear about is that it would also be an unfunded mandate, even if you provided the funding for the administration of the testing, without the investment in our children and our schools to make sure each and every child had the same chance to achieve and do well in these tests. Then I tried to remember what you described it as. You said it was hollow, and you said it would be an educational fraud. That is fairly strong language. I will put the Senator on the spot, but could I ask her why she feels so strongly about this point?

Mrs. CLINTON. Certainly. My feelings go back many years. As the Senator knows, children have been my passion for more than 30 years. I have worked on improving and reforming education for nearly 20 years. I know how difficult it is, today, to try to help many of our children achieve educational competence.

The reason for that is that we are not living in the same world in which the Senator and I grew up. It is harder to teach our children. Our children come to school with more problems and more stress. They are exposed to many more things than we ever faced.

We have to understand that if we don't really provide the resources to reach the children as they are today, not as we wish they would be, not as we thought they were back when I was sitting there with my hands folded and listening to every word, but as they are today with all the other pressures that are on families and children, then we are not going to have the results and the kind of achievement to which the Senator from Minnesota is referring.

But there is no reason we have to make this choice. It is not an either/or choice. We have the resources to assist our local districts so they do not have to reach any deeper. Many of the districts from my State can't afford to raise their property taxes any more.

I was on Long Island last night talking to a group of about 1,000 people. I explained to them, if we have this large Federal income tax cut, and then we have these unfunded mandates for education, where is the rubber going to hit the road? It is going to hit the road in the local property tax levies.

I would rather be, I am sure, part of an administration that gets to take credit for cutting income taxes than the poor souls down at the local level having to vote to raise property taxes in order to meet the mandates they have put on them. I think we should not be raising false hopes. We should be looking at how we help every child be successful.

Mr. WELLSTONE. When I go back to Minnesota, I try to be in the schools every 2 weeks. For the last 10½ years there has been concern about the testing, especially standardized tests; people have to kind of teach within a straightjacket. But what about the issue? I ask the Senator from New York because this is also, I think, part of her passion and part of her work. I hear a lot about two other things: The IDEA program, which isn't within ESEA, but it seems to me that we have to be very clear with some kind of trigger amount so that testing doesn't take its place unless we fully fund IDEA, because that is really a threat and a strain that a lot of districts feel. The other one is prekindergarten.

With all due respect, I want to get the Senator's opinion. If we start testing kids at age 8, I might argue at age 12 or 13, ''Schools, what have you done?'' But at age 8, I would argue that much more of what will explain how that child is doing is what happened to the child before kindergarten. Where is the administration, if the administration is going to talk about leaving no child behind? Where is the community in early childhood development to make sure that these children are kindergarten ready? Shouldn't that all fit within what is defined as reform?

Mrs. CLINTON. I think my colleague is absolutely right, because if we are looking at the comprehensive reform, we cannot leave out the funding of IDEA. We can't leave out doing something to help parents understand their obligations to be a child's first teacher and provide quality preschool.

I hear so much about the IDEA program, otherwise known as the special education program. I hear it mostly in suburban districts, interestingly enough, because suburban districts have activist parents and they know the law. The law is that we have to provide an education for every child. And I support that law. It was the first project I ever did for the Children's Defense Fund. I went door to door in communities back in—I hate to say—1973 to find out where the children were because they weren't in school. We found a lot of children with disabilities who were being kept out of school.

I am a 100-percent supporter of mainstreaming our children and giving every child a chance. But we are bankrupting a lot of our suburban school districts. We are saying you have to provide special treatment and education for children who need it and deserve it. If that means you have to shut down the band program or only have one physics session or do away with art, that is the tough choice to make.

The Federal Government said in the 1970s that you have to provide this education. Furthermore, it is not only, as our colleague TOM HARKIN likes to say, a Federal mandate, but it is a constitutional mandate to provide this quality education. The Federal Government is going to tell districts they have to provide special education. Where is the full funding so suburban districts and all other districts can try to keep up with their expenses?

I could not agree more with the second point the Senator made. Those of us who have been parents read to our children. We take them to museums. We get them a library card. We monitor their television. We worry about any kind of childcare arrangements. We know those early years make a difference. Why don't we make a commitment based on the resources we now have about the brain to do more to provide quality preschool opportunities both at home and outside the home so that more children can come to school ready to learn? That might be the very best investment we could make in terms of long-term academic success.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the Senator from New York.

In the time I have remaining, I would like to make the point that I think this is truly a matter of values and truly a matter of priorities. Either we are going to be talking about close to $2 trillion in tax cuts—most of it Robin Hood in reverse. Again, if somebody wants to prove me wrong, about 40 percent of the benefits go to the top 1 percent of the population.

Any day of the year, I would stake my reputation back in Minnesota on being able to say, as opposed to those Robin-Hood-in-reverse tax cuts, that I am going to be a Senator from Minnesota who is going to insist that if we are going to say a piece of education legislation is the best, we had better make it the best for our children. That means there is a commitment to making sure kids are kindergarten ready. That means we live up to our commitment to fully funding the program for children with special needs, which is getting to the 40-percent level and not the 14-percent level. That means we ought to be moving toward fully funding the title I program for kids who come from disadvantaged backgrounds. That means we ought to be funding afterschool programs and we ought to be talking about teacher recruitment. We ought to be talking about how we can provide the supportive services.

I say to Senators, Democrats and Republicans alike, that you will rue the day you voted for a piece of legislation that mandated that every school and every school district in your State every single year had to have tests, starting as young as age 8 and going to age 13, and you did not at the same time vote to provide the resources so that those teachers and those schools and those school districts and, most important of all, the children had the tools so they could succeed and do well.

I will tell you something. I hope my colleagues on the Democratic side will draw the line on this question. It seems to me that before we proceed to this kind of legislation, before we talk about a piece of legislation as being reform, we should say we want to make sure there is a commitment of resources. Before we have this mandate on all of our States and all of our schools, we ought to make sure we have provided the funding. If we can't

do that, then this becomes very hollow. If we can't do that, then this piece of legislation I believe does nothing but set up the schools and the kids and the teachers for failure.

My colleague was saying get it down to the school level. I sometimes think what we have been doing has a sense of unreality to it. If you go down in the trenches, and especially it you go to the schools, a lot of the inner-city neighborhoods and rural areas, you have kids on free or reduced lunch programs. You have homes where sometimes they have to move two or three times a year. You have schools that are crumbling, schools that don't have the resources, schools that don't have the laboratory facilities, and schools that don't have the textbooks. Now what you are saying is you are going to have tests and state with precision the obvious: Guess what. Children who come to school hungry, children who come from families who don't have adequate housing or are even homeless, children who are not kindergarten ready, children who do not receive all of the good stimulation and all of the nurturing that they need to have before kindergarten, those children who come to schools without the facilities, without the best teachers, without the salaries for the teachers, we are going to find out through tests that those children and those schools aren't doing as well as a lot of other schools which have all the resources in the world with which to work.

That is what the test does. Absolutely nothing—not without the resources.

I can say this from the floor of the Senate. It sounds a little jarring. But in a lot of ways I think the best way you can move to vouchers is to design a system where you guarantee over the next 4 or 5 years that many schools are not going to succeed because you don't give them the resources. Then you can state with precision the obvious; that is, the children who come from low- and moderate-income backgrounds with the least amount of help to do well are continuing to do poorly. The schools are continuing to do poorly because they do not have the resources. Then you use that as a reason for an all-out broadside attack on public education.

Some of the harshest critics of these teachers in these schools couldn't last an hour in the classrooms they condemn. I have never met a teacher and I have never met a parent who has said to me what we need is more and more tests, tests, tests.

I have had a lot of people in Minnesota talk to me about the IDEA program, the title I program, afterschool programs, how we can make sure kids are kindergarten ready, and how we can make sure we have the best teachers and get the resources to the teachers and have the support for the teachers and the kids.

We have a budget from the President of the United States of America who says education is his No. 1 priority, and it is a tin cup budget. How are you going to realize the goal of leaving no child behind on a tin cup budget? At the moment, I agree with Senator CLINTON. I think it is an educational fraud bill. Without the resources to back the rhetoric, it becomes nothing more than symbolic politics with children's lives.

I will oppose it with all of my might until we get resources to invest in our children—all of our children.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 15 minutes in morning business.

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

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, we will be turning to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act reauthorization bill soon. I want to speak a bit about the subject of education.

This will be an interesting debate and one that is very important for our country. All of us come to the Senate from different backgrounds with different interests. I happen to come from a small town of about 300 people in the southwestern corner of North Dakota, down by the Montana and South Dakota border. I graduated in a high school class of nine.

That little high school in Regent, ND, where I went to school, held its last prom this year because the high school is not going to be continuing any longer. In order to have a prom in a school that small, they have to gather a fair number of classes. That is the only way to have a prom in a school that size.

I was saddened to read that, because of the challenges facing rural areas of North Dakota, schools are seeing fewer and fewer students coming into the school system. In my State, we had 16 counties that had fewer than 25 births in a year, and in almost all of those counties they have at least two school systems. Divide up those births 5 or 6 years from now and see how many children are going to enter first grade and see what the challenges are for those schools. They are very significant.

Despite having gone to a small school, I always felt I got a very good education. It was not a fancy school. It was a school with a library no larger than a coat closet, but we had teachers who cared, and it was a school that provided an awfully good education.

Even though all of us have different backgrounds, we also share common goals. All of us want the same thing for our country. We want our country to do well, our children to be well educated, our country's economy to grow and provide expanded opportunities for people.

In this debate, we are going to talk a lot about what is wrong with education. That, I guess, is the nature of things in this country. We talk about what is wrong and how we will fix it. We almost never catch our breath to talk about what is right. In fact, when you listen to people talk about what is wrong with education in America, you wonder how on Earth this country became what it has become.

Anyone who has done any traveling throughout the world understands there is not any other country like this. Go to Europe, Asia, South America, Africa—just travel and ask yourself: Have I visited a country with the same conditions that exist in the United States? Is there a country quite as free as this, as open as this, with an economy as strong as this, where every young child goes into a school system which allows him or her to become whatever his or her God-given talent allows? That is what our school system provides our children.

This is not true in many other countries in the world. By the eighth grade, often other countries have moved kids into different tracks where only selected children have an opportunity for higher education. A lot of countries do that.

Our country has said for a long while that we believe in universal education. All children in this country, no matter their background, ought to have the opportunity to be whatever their God-given talents allow them to be.

Yet when hearing this debate, one wonders what has allowed this country to be as successful as it has been? This is the country, after all, that has split the atom and spliced genes. We have invented radar and the silicon chip. We have invented plastics. We learned to fly, and then we built airplanes. We flew those airplanes, and then we built rockets. We took those rockets to the Moon and walked on its surface. We cured smallpox and polio. We discovered how to create a telephone and then used it, invented radios, television, computers.

One almost wonders how on Earth this happened in a country like this with an education system that some say has totally failed us.

The reason all of this has happened is the education system has not failed this country at all. There are some significant challenges and some significant problems in certain areas of our education system, but by and large this education system has been the most productive in the world for a long period of time.

If one wants to evaluate where the world-class universities are, by far 80 percent of them are in the United States of America. We house the world-class universities in this country.

Let me talk a bit about the status of this country's educational system.

Some say we have an educational recession. The President, during his campaign, said that, among others.

Yet reading achievement is up in this country. The National Assessment for Educational Progress, called NAEP, says that during the last decade, reading achievement has significantly improved in all grades tested.

Are there some challenges in some schools in this country with respect to reading skills? You bet your life there are, and we need to address them.

But on the average, reading skills are up. Mathematics and science achievement is up. NAEP scores in mathematics have improved during the past decade, and in science NAEP reports scores have increased significantly for older children in the last decade.

Students were better prepared for college throughout the 1990s. Scores on both the SAT and ACT climbed steadily. Mathematics SAT scores are at an all-time high. The average SAT math score increased from 509 in 1992 to 514 in 2000. Verbal SAT scores improved over the same period from 500 to 505.

Some say if you compare the SAT scores in the United States to the same scores in other countries, the United States ranks well down the list or that our scores have decreased over time. But those people are not comparing apples and apples. Only the best students in other countries are taking the ACT and SAT, while in our country a majority take them. Thirty years ago, only the top 25 percent of U.S. students would take the SAT tests. Now, perhaps the top 60 or 70 percent of the universe of students take the same tests. Would you perhaps get a lower score on average by taking 70 percent of the universe instead of taking the top 25 percent? Yes.

But compare the top 25 percent now to the top 25 percent 30 years ago? What do you find? Higher test scores. You need to compare like comparisons if you are going to make judgments.

Our students are taking tougher courses. Between 1992 and 1997, the number of high school students taking advanced placement courses in all subjects increased by two-thirds, from 338,000 to 581,000.

It is hard to make the case we are in an educational recession.

I have two children in school. They study hard. They do their homework. They do not necessarily enjoy doing that every night, but they do their homework. They are in a good school with great teachers. The fact is that is true in much of this country.

There is a very simple formula to determine whether education is going to work, and it is true in every neighborhood in every school in this country. To make education work, we need several things: One, a student who is interested in learning; two, a teacher who knows how to teach; and, three, a parent who is going to be involved in that student's education.

When those three elements are present, education works and works well. When they are absent, we have great difficulties.

I know from firsthand experience that there are some schools with significant challenges. I visited an inner-city school that had significant challenges. I knew that at the front door. I walked through metal detectors, saw security guards, watched teachers try to deal with a series of problems in the class. Those problems were identical to the problems of the neighborhood surrounding that school: poverty, dysfunctional families, a whole series of issues that those children then brought to that school.

Some weeks after I visited that school, I read in the paper there was a shooting at that school. That was a few years ago. Some kid bumped another kid at a water fountain, and the other kid took out a pistol and shot him, despite the fact they had obviously gone through a metal detector as they walked into that school.

If schools are not safe places of learning, they are not going to be good places of learning, so we must deal with that issue.

We need good teachers, students willing to learn, parents involved in education, and a safe environment in which students can learn.

In addition to that, in this debate, we are going to have to understand that we have a responsibility as a country to send children through classroom doors into classrooms of which we can be proud. Children cannot learn in classrooms that are not modern.

I have toured schools, especially Indian schools attended by children for whom the Federal Government has a trust responsibility to educate. This is not an option. Yet these Indian schools where desks are 1 inch apart, classes are so crowded you just cringe when you see them pack these kids into those classrooms. These are schools where you cannot hook up a computer because the facilities are so old they do not have the capability of supporting a computer; schools where you would not want to send your child to school because it is in such disrepair.

Is that a good safe place in which to learn? The answer clearly is no and we need to do better. We need to deal with the issue of school construction. We built schools all over this country just after the Second World War. The GIs came home, they married, had children, and we built schools all over this country. Many of those schools are now 50 and 60 years old and in desperate disrepair.

None is in greater disrepair than the schools on Indian reservations. I talk about that a lot because we have so much to do in those areas. We have a responsibility to deal with these crumbling schools around the country. If we will have a first-class education, it ought to be in a first-rate classroom.

Second, we also know from experience and from research that children learn best in classrooms of 15 to 18 students. I have had children of mine in classrooms in mobile trailers, the temporary classrooms with 32 and 34 kids. It doesn't work well. We know that. We know a teacher who is teaching 15 to 18 children has much more time to spend individually with those children and does a much better job. We have a responsibility to try to help and do something about that as well.

At the Federal level, we only do niche financing for education. Our schools are financed, by and large, by State and local governments and especially by local school boards. No one is suggesting we change that.

But we ought not brag in this country, as some are wont to do, that we don't have any national objectives for our school system. It is not a source of pride, in my judgment, to brag that we do not have or want national standards or objectives for our children to meet upon their graduation. We ought to aspire to meet certain objectives. Of course we ought to have national objectives we aspire to reach.

In order to do that, some feel strongly we ought to improve our school buildings. This Congress can provide funding to help local school districts meet their construction and repair needs. We ought to reduce classroom size and provide funding to do that. We ought to do it in this legislation, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act reauthorization.

President Bush is correct when he talks about the need for testing. Many have stood for years on the floor of the Senate saying we need to have some testing. People also need to know what our schools are producing, how our schools are doing. I will offer an amendment dealing with the issue of school report cards. Many States have them. But there are no standards for school report cards and no parent can understand how their school is doing. They know how their child is doing because they get a report card every 6 to 9 weeks. But how is their school doing? Is this school doing a good job of educating that child? How does this school relate or compare to another school? How does our State compare to another State? What are we getting as taxpayers for the investment we are making in these schools? We have a right to know that. We have a right to get report cards on our schools. All parents have that right. All taxpayers have that right. I intend to offer an amendment on that during the consideration of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

There is so much to say about education. Let me mention two stories that illustrate the value of education.

I toured a refugee camp one day in an area near the border between Guatemala and Honduras. It was some while ago when Honduras was having a lot of terrorism and difficulties. At this refugee camp, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees was running a refugee camp and had people living in tents. As I was going around the camp, viewing the conditions, there

was a fellow, probably in his mid-sixties, who could not speak English but he knew I was a visitor to the camp. He beckoned to me and wanted me to come with him. I asked the guide from the United Nations what the fellow wanted and the guide said: I think he wants you to go into the tent area. So we did. He reached under his cot for some of his belongings, which is all he had. He had a cot and a couple of belongings stored under a cot in the refugee camp. He reached under the cot and pulled out a book. It was an education reading primer book in Spanish. It was the Spanish version of the ''See Dick Run'' book we would have had in first grade. He was, for the first time in his life, in his mid-sixties, being taught to read. He wanted to show me, a visitor, that he could begin to read. He pulled out the book and began to read in halting Spanish, ''See Dick Run.''

He had a huge smile on his face after he finished the first two lines, looked up at me with only two or three teeth, someone who was living in great difficulty, in a refugee camp, with perhaps not enough to eat, never having had an opportunity for education, and he was so enormously proud of being able to learn.

Education, even at the later stage of his life, was so important to him that he wanted to show a visitor he was learning to read. Think of that.

The second story is one I have told my colleagues about before, but I will tell it again because it also describes how important education is. It is the story of a woman who was a janitor at a tribal college, cleaning the bathrooms and the hallways of a tribal college. Her husband had left her. She had four children and was over 40, with no means of support except this job as a janitor. She wanted to go to the college somehow so she could earn a degree and find a better job. The day I showed up to give a graduation speech at the tribal college, this woman was a graduate of the college. She had pulled herself up by the proverbial bootstraps and gotten an education and was no longer the janitor of the school. She was wearing a cap and a gown and a huge smile because, despite it all, and through it all, with all the adversity in her life, she had become a college graduate. You could read ''pride'' all over her face. It is something she had done for her own future that no one will ever take away from her. She invested in herself against all the odds.

Education means so much to people at every stage: When they are retired, when they are 40, when they are 20, when they are 10. We are talking about the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. There is not much that is more important for this country than to improve this law for America's kids. There is a lot on which we can agree, some we will disagree on in the coming days, but I hope at the end we can look at this bill and say we did something very important for this country's future.

I will take the floor later in the debate and offer a couple of amendments I have described. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of Oregon). The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for 10 minutes.

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

Mrs. MURRAY. I commend my colleague from North Dakota for his eloquent statement on education. I come to the floor today to join a number of Democratic Senators who have been here this afternoon to speak about the issue of education which is going to come before the Senate this coming week. I share their passion and their concern as we look at reauthorizing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

It is critical we understand we all share the same goals. President Bush stated very rightly that no child should be left behind. Everyone in this body wants to make sure that no child is left behind. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act is our opportunity to do that because, as we all know, education is the key to a child's future. If they know how to read, they will make it in this world. If they can do math, they will be able to move on. If they can converse, they will be able to get a job and be successful. That is our goal for every single child.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act that is being worked on now has a number of compromises in it. It is not everything everybody wants, but the one concern that I want to express adamantly to this body before we bring this bill to the floor is the lack of available resources. It is so easy to say we set standards, we set goals that we demand our children and their schools reach. But if we don't provide the dollars for them to be able to reach those goals, we are simply putting out a mandate, an unfunded mandate, to districts which means the kids will fail. There is no doubt that if you want a child to learn to read, you have to provide the resources for a teacher who is capable. You need to make sure the class size is small enough, that the child has enough personal time with the teacher, an expert, to be able to learn to read.

It is not magic. It takes a qualified teacher. We want to make sure all of our kids pass the annual tests. Just giving tests as required in the bill does not assure the students will do better. I fear it means without the backing of the resources behind it, so the children can learn what is required of them to pass the test, the children will fail and drop out of school. And, yes, 5 years from now we may have a higher percentage of kids doing better on tests but nobody will be testing the kids who didn't make it, who dropped out, who failed, who are not in the school system anymore. Those are the kids we cannot leave behind.

Without the resources that are so important for success, and a commitment from this White House to have the resources available, we will have failed America's children if we move this bill forward.

We know what works in public education. Any one of us who has been to a school recently knows what makes a difference. A teacher makes all the difference. A good teacher and a good principal makes an incredible difference. A parent who is involved makes an incredible difference. Unfortunately, that doesn't happen in every school. A lot of classrooms don't have qualified teachers. That is a concern. It doesn't happen just because we mandate it. It happens because we provide the resources to recruit good teachers, to help school districts hire them, and to make sure that every child is in a classroom with a qualified teacher.

We know the facility that a child learns in makes a difference. I have been in classrooms, as I believe several of my colleagues have, where children are wearing coats, where there are buckets catching raindrops, where there is no electrical outlet for the children to even plug in a computer much less have a computer, where there isn't even a restroom facility in the building; they have to go outside across the way to get to one.

How do you expect a child to learn in that kind of environment? It does not happen. Unless we put investments into bringing our buildings up to code and providing a partnership at the Federal level for those districts and schools that need it the most, we cannot expect children to learn. We cannot require that children only pass or move on if they have the best teacher and the best classroom and the best facility. If we do, we will have failed numbers of children in this country, and that is really the wrong policy.

I will have much to say about many of these issues as we move through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in the coming days or weeks. But I just want our colleagues to know that the worst thing we can do is pass an Elementary and Secondary Education Act without adequate funding for the requirements we are making, because several years from now we will have every school district, every school administrator, every school board member, every parent, and every teacher at our door saying you passed an unfunded mandate down to us. Instead of recruiting good teachers and building our classrooms and working hard to teach our kids, we are failing them because the only thing we are doing is providing testing.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask consent to speak in morning business.

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

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, this morning as I read the Wall Street Journal, I came across Mark Helprin's article called ''The Fire Next Time.'' The thesis of Mr. Helprin is this:

> The consensus that doing much to protect America is preferable to doing too little has been destroyed. If the President does not rebuild it, we will suffer the consequences.

I commend this article to the Senate. I do not think it is totally the President's responsibility. It certainly falls on many of us to help the President and the Secretary of Defense and those in the National Security Agency and the Vice President, all of them working on what should be our defense policy, to find ways to rehabilitate our national defense. Very clearly, we do not have the defense we need for the future.

At one point in this article, Mr. Helprin says this:

> God save the American soldier from those who believe that his life can be protected and his mission accomplished on the cheap. For what they perceive as an extravagance is always less costly in lives and treasure than the long drawn-out wars it deters altogether or shortens with quick victories.

I do hope all of us will think about how we can restore our national prestige in terms of being the superpower of the world and having the power to defend that position.

I ask unanimous consent this article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 24, 2001]

THE FIRE NEXT TIME

(By Mark Helprin)

From Alexandria in July of 1941, Randolph Churchill reported to his father as the British waited for Rommel to attack upon Egypt. In the midst of a peril that famously concentrated mind and spirit, he wrote, ''You can see generals wandering around GHQ looking for bits of string.''

Apparently these generals were not, like their prime minister, devoted to Napoleon's maxim, ''Frappez la masse, et le reste vient par surcroit,'' which, vis-a-vis strategic or other problems, bids one to concentrate upon the essence, with assurance that all else will follow in train, even bits of string.

CONSENSUS DESTROYED

Those with more than a superficial view of American national security, who would defend and preserve it from the fire next time, have by necessity divided their forces in advocacy of its various elements, but they have neglected its essence. For the cardinal issue of national security is not China, is not Russia, is not weapons of mass destruction, or missile defense, the revolution in military affairs, terrorism, training, or readiness. It is, rather, that the general consensus in regard to defense since Pearl Harbor—that doing too much is more prudent than doing too little—has been destroyed. The last time we devoted a lesser proportion of our resources to defense, we were well protected by the oceans, in the midst of a depression, and without major international responsibilities, and even then it was a dereliction of duty.

The destruction is so influential that traditional supporters of high defense spending, bent to the will of their detractors, shrink from argument, choosing rather to negotiate among themselves so as to prepare painstakingly crafted instruments of surrender.

A leader of defense reform, whose life mission is to defend the United States, writes to me: ''Please do not quote me under any circumstances by name. . . . Bush has no chance of winning the argument that more money must be spent on defense. Very few Americans feel that more money needs to be spent on defense and they are right. The amount of money being spent is already more than sufficient.''

More than sufficient to fight China? It is hard to think of anything less appealing than war with China, but if we don't want that we must be able to deter China, and to deter China we must have the ability to fight China. More than sufficient to deal with simultaneous invasions of Kuwait, South Korea, and Taiwan? More than sufficient to stop even one incoming ballistic missile? Not yet, not now, and, until we spend the money, not ever.

For someone of the all-too-common opinion that a strong defense is the cause of war, a favorite trick is to advance a wholesale revision of strategy, so that he may accomplish his depredations while looking like a reformer. This pattern is followed instinctively by the French when they are in alliance and by the left when it is trapped within the democratic order. But to do so one need be neither French nor on the left.

Neville Chamberlain, who was neither, starved the army and navy on the theory that the revolution in military affairs of his time made the only defense feasible that of a ''Fortress Britain'' protected by the Royal Air Force—and then failed in building up the air force. Bill Clinton, who is not French, and who came into office calling for the discontinuance of heavy echelons in favor of power projection, simultaneously pressed for a severe reduction in aircraft carriers, the sine qua non of power projection. Later, he and his strategical toadies embraced the revolution in military affairs not for its virtues but because even the Clinton-ravished military ''may be unaffordable,'' and ''advanced technology offers much greater military efficiency.''

This potential efficiency is largely unfamiliar to the general public. For example, current miniaturized weapons may seem elephantine after advances in extreme ultraviolet lithography equip guidance and control systems with circuitry not .25 microns but .007 microns wide, a 35-fold reduction that will make possible the robotization of arms, from terminally guided and target-identifying bullets to autonomous tank killers that fly hundreds of miles, burrow into the ground, and sleep like locusts until they are awakened by the seismic signature of enemy armor.

Lead-magnesium-niobate transducers in broadband sonars are likely to make the seas perfectly transparent, eliminating for the first time the presumed invulnerability of submarine-launched ballistic missiles, the anchor of strategic nuclear stability.

The steady perfection of missile guidance has long made nearly everything the left says about nuclear disarmament disingenuous or uninformed, and the advent of metastable explosives creates the prospect of a single B–1 bomber carrying the non-nuclear weapons load of 450 B–17s, the equivalent of 26,800 100-pound bombs. Someday, we will have these things, or, if we abstain, our potential enemies will have them and we will not.

To field them will be more expensive than fielding less miraculous weapons, which cannot simply be abandoned lest an enemy exploit the transition, and which will remain as indispensable as the rifleman holding his ground, because the nature of war is countermiraculous. And yet, when the revolution in military affairs is still mainly academic, we have cut recklessly into the staple forces.

God save the American soldier from those who believe that his life can be protected and his mission accomplished on the cheap. For what they perceive as extravagance is always less costly in lives and treasure than the long drawn-out wars it deters altogether or shortens with quick victories. In the name of their misplaced frugality we have transformed our richly competitive process of acquiring weapons into the single-supplier model of the command economies that we defeated in the Cold War, largely with the superior weapons that the idea of free and competitive markets allowed us to produce.

Though initially more expensive, producing half a dozen different combat aircraft and seeing which are best is better than decreeing that one will do the job and praying that it may. Among other things, strike aircraft have many different roles, and relying upon just one would be the same sort of economy as having Clark Gable play both Rhett Butler and Scarlett O'Hara.

Having relinquished or abandoned many foreign bases, the United States requires its warships to go quickly from place to place so as to compensate for their inadequate number, and has built them light using a lot of aluminum, which, because it can burn in air at 3,000 degrees Celsius, is used in incendiary bombs and blast furnaces. (Join the navy and see the world. You won't need to bring a toaster.)

And aluminum or not, there are too few ships. During the EP–3 incident various pinheads furthered the impression of an American naval cordon off the Chinese coast. Though in 1944 the navy kept 17 major carriers in the central Pacific alone, not long ago its assets were so attenuated by the destruction of a few Yugos disguised as tanks that for three months there was not in the vast western Pacific even a single American aircraft carrier.

What remains of the order of battle is crippled by a lack of the unglamorous, costly supports that are the first to go when there isn't enough money. Consider the floating dry dock. By putting ships back into action with minimal transit time, floating dry docks are force preservers and multipliers. In 1972, the United States had 94. Now it has 14. Though history is bitter and clear, this kind of mistake persists.

Had the allies of World War II been prepared with a sufficient number of so pedestrian a thing as landing craft, the war might have been cheated of a year and a half and many millions of lives. In 1940, the French army disposed of 530 artillery pieces, 830 antitank guns, and 235 (almost half) of its best tanks, because in 1940 the French did not think much of the Wehrmacht—until May.

How shall the United States avoid similar misjudgments? Who shall stand against the common wisdom when it is wrong about deterrence, wrong about the causes of war, wrong about the state of the world, wrong about the ambitions of ascendant nations, wrong about history, and wrong about human nature?

THE PRUDENT COURSE

In the defense of the United States, doing too much is more prudent than doing too little. Though many in Congress argue this and argue it well, Congress will not follow one of its own. Though the president's appointees also argue it well, the public will wait only upon the president himself. Only he can sway a timid Congress, clear the way for his appointees, and move the country toward the restoration of its military power.

The president himself must make the argument, or all else is in vain. If he is unwilling to risk his political capital and his presidency to undo the damage of the past eight years, then in the fire next time his name will be linked with that of his predecessor, and there it will stay forever.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I ask consent I be given 10 minutes to address the Senate.

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

## OFF-SHORE DRILLING

Mr. NELSON of Florida. Mr. President, I rise today to express my strong opposition to oil and gas exploration off the coast of Florida. Specifically, the issue at hand is the sale of Lease Sale 181. I am certainly not alone. There are 16 million Floridians who join in this opposition. Senator BOB GRAHAM as well, Florida State elected officials, certainly the legislature of Florida and most of the Florida congressional delegation opposes any drilling in Lease Sale 181.

Lease Sale 181 may not be included in the current moratorium on lease sales off the coast of Florida, but in the hearts of all Floridians it is part of the moratorium. Moreover, there has never been a production drilling rig actually producing off the coast of Florida because Floridians unequivocally oppose offshore drilling because of the threat it presents to the State's greatest natural and economic resource: our coastal environment.

Florida's coastal waters provide an irreplaceable link in the life cycle of many species, both marine and terrestrial. Florida's beaches, fisheries, and wildlife draw millions of tourists each year from around the globe, supporting our State's largest industry, tourism. Florida's commercial fishing industry relies on these estuaries as nurseries for the most commercially harvested fish. Nearly 90 percent of the reef fish resources of the Gulf of Mexico are caught on the West Florida Shelf and contribute directly to Florida's economy.

Oil spills would be devastating to Florida's beaches, coastal waters, reefs, and fisheries. The chronic pollution and discharges from drilling would detrimentally effect the shallow, clean water marine communities found on the Florida outer continental shelf. For these reasons, I cannot sit back and watch as my State, one of our nation's environmental jewels, is degraded.

I know some may have differing views because other issues or concerns consume their constituents; and I respect those views. However, in Florida the environment and tourism are of paramount importance. The beaches, the abundant fisheries, and the pristine waters make Florida what it is today; and the people of Florida want it to stay that way. Just as drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge would not solve the administration's claimed energy crisis, drilling in Lease Sale 181 will not either. Increased conservation and increased fuel efficiency in our cars would do more to meet our country's energy needs than drilling in Lease Sale 181. For these reasons, I must adamantly object to and vigorously oppose the sale of Lease Sale 181; and I hope the rest of this body listens to the pleas of Floridians.

All of the oil and gas that would come out of this proposed lease sale would only give about 2 months worth of energy for the country. That is simply not a viable tradeoff for the damage it would do to our economy and our environment. We are not willing to make that tradeoff in Florida. As a matter of fact, as you talk about drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, isn't it interesting. If you put it into the context of all the barrels of oil that are projected to be pumped from that wildlife refuge, that energy consumption could be replaced if we but increased all new vehicles in their energy efficiency by 3 miles per gallon. That puts the crisis in context.

Conservation is considerably important. The use of research and development to produce more energy-efficient appliances, more energy-efficient automobiles—there is no reason why this country that has the technological prowess cannot produce a car that is economical and that will get 80 miles per gallon. We have that within our grasp. Think what that would do to our energy consumption.

As a matter of fact, when you look at the uses of energy by this Nation, the transportation sector is the sector that consumes most of that energy. Just think what future energy-efficient automobiles could do for us.

But that is a subject of larger proportions. Today, I rise on behalf of a State that has ecologically pristine beaches and the need to be kept just that way. This proposed lease sale for oil and gas drilling clearly jeopardizes the future economy and ecology of Florida.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

## SENATE BUDGET RESOLUTION

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, just prior to the Easter recess, the Senate completed action on the fiscal year 2002 budget resolution. I voted in favor of final passage of the budget resolution, recognizing that it does not reflect everything that I wanted. However, I am thankful the Senate-passed resolution does contain a fair amount of what President Bush had originally proposed in his budget plan.

Nevertheless, it is my hope that when the Senate does go to conference with the House—which has passed a more stringent budget resolution—the end result will yield a budget resolution more in-tune with the President's more responsible package.

As it was originally put forward, I felt the Bush budget plan provided much of the fiscal responsibility I have long sought from Washington prior to, and since, becoming a Member of the Senate. Specifically, it restrains the growth of spending, reduces the debt as fast as is prudent, and allows for meaningful tax cuts. This is what I like to refer to as a ''three-legged stool'' approach. For this package to work, however, we have to insist on a balanced approach, because fiscal responsibility, like a three-legged stool, cannot stand if one leg is significantly longer or shorter than the others.

Unfortunately, if we characterized the Senate budget resolution as a three-legged stool, it would be rather wobbly right now since under the Senate budget resolution, discretionary spending increases at 8 percent, and that is double the amount the President suggested.

People often forget the President's proposal increased spending by a modest 4 percent at a time when inflation is approximately 2.8 percent, meaning it contains a real increase of 1.2 percent. In contrast, the Senate budget resolution, in real terms, results in a spending increase of 5.2 percent. That is a 333-percent higher rate of growth than what the President proposes.

These increases may sound like small numbers in the grand scheme of things, or in the Senate, but do not be fooled. It adds up to tens and hundreds of billions of dollars in more spending over time.

If we continue to spend money at this rate, we will have less resources to address important national needs, such as reforming Social Security, reforming Medicare, or providing a prescription drug benefit.

Indeed, according to calculations by the Concord Coalition, the Senate budget resolution includes new and expanded entitlement spending that is going to cost $600 billion over 10 years, and discretionary spending that may total $240 billion over 10 years.

Coupled with the resulting increased interest cost of $550 billion, this package of amendments to the budget resolution could reduce the on-budget surplus by $1.4 trillion over 10 years.

I say to my colleagues, enough is enough. We have to stop this rampant

spending and, instead, prioritize what we ought to be doing with the taxpayers' money. We need to sit down and make some hard choices about where to allocate taxpayers' money, where we want to increase spending, where we want to make cuts or maybe where we want to flat-fund.

For example, with regard to the National Institutes of Health, the President has included a generous increase in the amount of money that the NIH will receive in its budget, boosting NIH spending $2.8 billion. That is a 13.8 percent increase. The Senate, not wanting to be outdone, added an additional $700 million in NIH funding. Therefore, under the Senate's plan, NIH funding will be increased 17.2 percent over last year. In other words, the Senate wants to boost the rate of spending increase some 25 percent faster than the President.

Do I think we should spend money on important health research? Absolutely. But how much is enough?

The true cost is not just the dollar figure, it is what you give up, or what you could have purchased with that money. Economists call the concept ''opportunity cost.'' When the Senate thinks about spending money on one thing, we need to recognize that we are giving up the ability to use the money for other worthy purposes.

If we follow through with the Senate's budget resolution, that means we will have fewer funds to conduct necessary Medicare reform, undertake education efforts aimed at preventive health care, provide greater access to rural health care, or fully fund the social services block grant.

Think about the social services block grant for a moment. Congress promised a funding stream of $2.8 billion for this program, but funding has actually eroded $1 billion over the past 6 years. I hear a lot about that from our county commissioners in the State of Ohio.

What most people do not realize is the fact that funds from the social services block grant go towards providing health care services for children, prenatal to age 3.

There are tough choices and dilemmas: Do you give more to NIH to fight disease, or do you give more money to the social services block grant, a program that gives children the nutrition and health services they need so they do not develop the diseases that the NIH is trying to fight?

Another thing we need to remember in figuring opportunity costs is the fact that we have a number of unmet Federal needs—needs that are a Federal responsibility, and which we should address as part of our full and balanced approach to the Federal budget.

Do we spend Federal dollars on school construction, which is a State and local responsibility, or do we prevent flood and storm damage from ravaging people's lives? As former chairman of the Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee, I personally know we have $39 billion of water resources development projects that the Army Corps of Engineers needs to fund, and yet we only provide $1.3 billion each year for such projects. Let's get serious. We will never deal with that backlog at this rate.

Addressing such unmet needs does not sound important until there is a flood situation such as the folks along the Mississippi River are enduring right at this very moment.

In addition, we have serious unmet needs in our Nation's wastewater treatment and sewer infrastructure. The costs are going up astronomically in the State of Ohio to comply with mandates from the U.S. EPA for sewer and water treatment. We have a responsibility to participate in helping to alleviate those costs.

My point is this: We should allocate our financial resources on a very deliberate and prioritized basis and make the hard choices instead of the reckless last-minute spending that has often characterized the Senate over the last 3 years.

I cannot believe what the Senate has done the last couple of years. I cannot believe it. If I as a Governor or as a mayor or as a member of a board of county commissioners spent money the way we did during the last couple of years, they would have run me out of office very quickly.

I would remind my colleagues that just last year alone, we increased nondefense discretionary authority by an astounding 14.3 percent. Think about it. This is unsustainable. In my view, we need to stiffen our backbones and bring an end to this spending habit. Families need to carefully budget their resources. So do cities and States, and so, too, should the Federal Government.

It is one of the reasons I wanted to get two points of order agreed to in the budget resolution to prevent further game playing with tax dollars. One point of order I offered would have helped stop abuses of emergency spending, and another would have prevented ''directed scoring,'' a process used to circumvent the budget process.

I am glad 51 Senators joined me and my cosponsors, Senators GREGG and FEINGOLD, in supporting this measure. It is my hope the next time we will get the 60 votes we need for adoption.

I also wanted to offer an amendment that would have extended and strengthened the current caps on discretionary spending. Unfortunately, that amendment would never have passed muster due to the excessive spending in the amendments of the budget resolution. We blew that out before I even had a chance to bring it up.

While the Senate's version of the budget resolution did not do enough, in my opinion, to keep spending in check, the silver lining is the fact that it provides for two tax cuts. I am hopeful, therefore, that we can, first, get this budget resolution to conference and that it emerges looking more fiscally responsible and that the conferees pare-down the spending; and second, that the Finance Committee begins work immediately on developing an $85 billion tax cut which I call a ''balloon-payment'' approach, using the fiscal year 2001 on-budget surplus.

I suggest this money go toward an immediate fiscal stimulus in the form of a cut in marginal rates; a cut that people will see in their paychecks directly through a change in their withholding.

We need to get the money in the people's hands right now. If we are serious about getting this reduction in marginal rates done soon, I honestly think we could get legislation considered and passed in the Senate and the House and on the President's desk by Memorial Day and the American people could see the benefits this summer. Let's get it done.

I think we are all agreed that something needs to be done to restore people's faith in the economy and bolster consumer optimism. It is at the lowest level in my State since 1992. In my view, the balloon payment is probably one of the best ways to show the doubting Thomases that the money is there and that we are doing something in Congress to address the issue. Further, I believe we need to enact a long-term marginal rate tax reduction as proposed by the President, which economists say will have a tremendous impact on stimulating our economy.

Given our economic situation, we in Congress need to follow a balanced three-legged stool approach. If we can control the growth of spending, reduce the debt and achieve quick passage of a balloon payment and implement both a long-term and short-term marginal tax cut, it will give a gigantic boost to consumer confidence and help us return to economic normalcy. We can quibble about how to distribute the balloon payment. Let's just work it out. The main thing is, get it done and connect to it a true marginal rate tax reduction.

However, there is one thing that I fear could torpedo any recovery and that is our inability to address our Nation's energy crisis. While we have already seen unprecedented home heating bills this past winter, I am concerned the worst is yet to come. Indeed, we are already seeing gasoline prices move toward the $2-per-gallon range, and it is far from the peak summer driving season. What's more, the cost of energy is skyrocketing and supplies are scarce or unreliable. We can expect California's problems to intensify and likely be duplicated in other areas across the Nation.

It is not as if we didn't see this coming. The storm clouds have been brewing for many years. Still, there has been no action on the part of Congress to consider a comprehensive energy policy along the lines of what Senator MURKOWSKI has proposed in his bill, S. 388. I fear if we don't get moving, we will not get that done, either.

We need to act on these issues quickly. The American people are watching to see if we intend to bring this Nation out of our economic downturn and back on the road to economic prosperity, or if we are going to continue to fiddle around while the country burns. I hear that from the folks back in Ohio: ''You are fiddling around in the Senate, and you are not getting anything done. Don't you understand how bad it is on the street?''

They want us to make the hard choices about spending. They want us to work together to develop solutions to our energy crisis, to pay down our debt, and provide quick and measurable tax relief. They want us to put aside the partisan bickering and the gamesmanship and act in the best interests of the Nation. After all, that is what they think they elected us to do.

We need to act in the spirit of the old Rogers and Hammerstein song from Carousel—many remember that—''You'll Never Walk Alone,'' so that the American people know that ''at the end of the storm there is a golden sky and the sweet silver song of the lark.''

Now, more than ever before, we have to restore people's faith and their confidence in the economic future of our Nation. It is in our hands.

## GOVERNOR MELDRIM THOMSON

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to my dear personal friend and political mentor, former New Hampshire governor Meldrim Thomson, who passed away last Thursday. Mel, who was 89, was one of the greatest governors in the history of the State of New Hampshire.

Mel Thomson left a lasting legacy. His legacy of country, state, family, and God will not soon be forgotten by those of us whose lives he touched so deeply. He was not only a gentleman but a gentle man, a loving husband to Gale, father of six, grandfather, and great-grandfather. He was one of my closest and most treasured friends. In politics, loyalty and friendship mean everything.

In 1993, Governor Thomson wrote a book, ''100 Famous Founders,'' for which I was honored to have written the introduction. Among the first of the Founding Fathers to step forward and put his life, property, and honor on the line for his country by signing the Declaration was Josiah Bartlett of New Hampshire. Dr. Bartlett later served as the Governor of New Hampshire. It is fitting that this magnificent book of profiles of our Nation's one hundred foremost Founders was written by one of Josiah Bartlett's most distinguished and patriotic successors as Governor, Meldrim Thomson.

Meldrim Thomson had the same trust in God, love of family, steadfast dedication to his country and state, and sense of honor that characterized the Founders about whom he wrote. Indeed, had he lived in Josiah Bartlett's time, Meldrim Thomson certainly would have been a Founder too. Had he lived during the American Revolution, he would have stood shoulder-to-shoulder fighting for the cause alongside George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Sam Adams, and General John Stark.

Meldrim Thomson, Jr., took the oath of office as the 91st Governor of New Hampshire on January 3, 1973, and served until January 4, 1979. He is the only Republican to have served as Governor of New Hampshire for three consecutive two-year terms.

Meldrim Thomson's road to the governorship began in 1954, when he moved his publishing business and his family from New York to a new home in Orford, NH. Although he was not a native son, Meldrim Thomson's strongly independent nature and his bedrock conservative principles were right for New Hampshire. In spirit, then, he quickly became a son of New Hampshire.

Plunging into New Hampshire politics, Meldrim Thomson waged an unsuccessful campaign for the U.S. House of Representatives in 1964. That same year, though, he won election to New Hampshire's Constitutional Convention.

With characteristic grit and determination, Meldrim Thomson did not let his defeats in the 1968 and 1970 New Hampshire Republican gubernatorial primaries discourage him from continuing to seek our State's highest office. His commitment paid rich dividends in 1972, when he won election as Governor. He ran and won again in 1974 and 1976. In waging his victorious campaigns, Meldrim Thomson proved himself to be a true populist. Running on the slogan ''ax the tax,'' Governor Thomson took his campaigns to the people of New Hampshire in their living rooms and meeting halls.

As Governor, Meldrim Thomson did not shrink from difficult decisions. As the spiritual descendant of the Founding Fathers, he had the courage to take grave political risks on behalf of his unfailingly conservative principles. Meldrim Thomson fought tirelessly for low taxes and strict fiscal discipline. As a result, during his time as Governor, the economy of New Hampshire enjoyed a prosperity that was unknown in the rest of New England. Attracted by the state's low taxes, significant new businesses moved their operations to New Hampshire. Wages and salaries increased Old manufacturing centers such as Manchester and Nashua demonstrated new signs of life.

Beyond his great economic successes, Meldrim Thomson did not hesitate to use his platform as Governor to speak out on vital national and international issues. He did not hesitate to criticize the foreign and domestic misadventures of the Administration of Jimmy Carter. In fact, Governor Thomson ordered New Hampshire State flags flown at half-staff to protest President Carter's pardon of Vietnam era draft resisters. It deeply offended Governor Thomson's profound sense of patriotism that a President of the United States would take such an unprecedented action to shield those who refused their country's call from the rightful legal consequences of their acts.

I have so many personal, inspiring memories of Mel Thomson. In our private moments, of which we shared many up at the farm in Orford, he would affectionately call me ''son''. I thought of him like a father, both personally as well as politically.

He always inspired me with his words of wisdom. He often said ''put principle above politics.'' He heeded his own words. Like Lincoln, Churchill and so many great men, he was unfairly criticized, but rose above it all to do what was right. He was a dedicated conservative, who was as solid as the granite in our mountains.

Mel Thomson's impact on the state, patriotism, and commitment to his values and his family will not be forgotten. I will miss him terribly, as will those many New Hampshire citizens whose lives he touched. Rest in peace, my friend. You have earned it. It has been an honor to represent you in the U.S. Senate.

## COMMENDING NAVY LT. SHANE OSBORN AND HIS CREW MEMBERS FOLLOWING THEIR DETAINMENT ON HAINAN ISLAND, CHINA

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I come to the floor to commend in the strongest possible terms the members of the United States Navy crew who were detained on Hainan Island in China for 11 long days earlier this month. I think I speak for our entire nation when I say how much we admire their dedication and the extraordinary level of professionalism they exhibited throughout their ordeal.

Under the command of Lt. Shane Osborn, this crew of 24 servicemen and women left Kadena Airbase in Okinawa, Japan, on the evening of March 31 for what was to have been a routine mission over the South China Sea.

As we all now know, what happened after they left Okinawa, and for the next 11 days, was *not* routine. It was *heroic*. The entire world witnessed the strength, discipline and courage of our Navy crew.

Every man and woman on that plane is a hero.

I am especially impressed with the skill and character of a remarkable young man who first dreamed of flying as a 3-year-old watching a small Cessna on a South Dakota farm.

We are fortunate that Lt. Shane Osborn pursued his dream to fly. And we are doubly fortunate that he put that dream to work in service of his country.

Lt. Osborn says, modestly, that he was just what he'd been trained to do when he landed his damaged aircraft safely. Others see it differently. A Pentagon spokesman described the landing

as a ''spectacular feat of airmanship.'' Experienced EP–3 pilots termed it astounding. Indeed, it was.

Think about what had just happened: The collision with a smaller, faster Chinese F–8 had dropped Lt. Osborn's EP–3 between 5,000 and 8,000 feet and turned it almost completely upside-down; two of the plane's four propellers had been clipped in the collision, rendering useless the wing flaps used to slow the plane during landing.

The collision had also sheared off the plane's nose cone.

And most of the plane's instruments were so badly damaged that they were useless.

Even so, Lt. Osborn managed to stabilize the plane, and he and his crew were able to guide it to the nearest airport, 70 miles northwest, on China's Hainan Island.

Remarkably, during that 70-mile flight, Lt. Osborn and his crew had the presence of mind to follow international procedure and issue a series of distress signals. In fact, they issued as many as 25 signals on two separate standard frequencies.

Lt. Osborn's crew and commanders say his courage and quick thinking saved 24 lives.

After landing in Hainan, with their plane surrounded by armed Chinese personnel, Lt. Osborn and his crew followed U.S. Navy procedure. They destroyed sensitive documents and technology, greatly limiting what could have been a significant intelligence loss.

For the next 11 days, Lt. Osborn's leadership, courage, dignity, and his remarkable sense of humor, helped keep the spirits of his crew high.

We are fortunate to be protected and represented by the entire crew of that Navy EP–3: Richard Bensing; Steven Blocher; Bradford Borland; David Cecka; John Comerford; Shawn Coursen; Jeremy Crandall; Josef Edmunds; Brandon Funk; Scott Guidry; Jason Hanser; Patrick Honeck; Regina Kauffman; Nicholas Mellos; Ramon Mercado; Richard Payne; Mitchell Pray; Kenneth Richter; Marcia Sonon; Curtis Towne; Jeffrey Vignery; Wendy Westbrook, and Rodney Young.

As a *South Dakotan*, I must say I am especially proud of Lt. Shane Osborn, who followed his dream from Mitchell, SD, to the Norfolk, Nebraska Civil Air Patrol, and now, into the pages of Naval history. He is a true hero, and we are proud of him.

## SMALL BUSINESS AMENDMENT TO THE 2002 BUDGET RESOLUTION

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I submit a statement for the RECORD regarding a small business amendment I offered to the fiscal year 2002 budget resolution with my colleague, Senator BOND, on April 6, 2001.

First, let me extend sincere thanks to my colleagues for supporting this amendment which restored critical funding to the Small Business Administration's finance and management assistance programs that help start and strengthen small businesses in our country. Second, let me correct the Record to reflect all the cosponsors:

Senators BOND, BINGAMAN, WELLSTONE, LANDRIEU, DASCHLE, LEAHY, JOHNSON, SCHUMER, COLLINS, LEVIN, SNOWE, HARKIN, CONRAD, and DOMENICI.

My apologies to Senators CONRAD, DOMENICI, and HARKIN who were not listed in the RECORD when the amendment passed. Again, thank you to all my colleagues for agreeing to this amendment and showing their support for our small businesses.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the amendment and the summary along with all the letters of support be printed in the RECORD.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 183

(Purpose: To revise the budget for fiscal year 2002 so that the small business programs at the Small Business Administration are adequately funded and can continue to provide loans and business assistance to the country's 24 million small businesses, and to restore and reasonably increase funding to specific programs at the Small Business Administration because the current budget request reduces funding for the Agency by a minimum of 26 percent at a time when the economy is volatile and the Federal Reserve Board reports that 45 percent of banks have reduced lending to small businesses by making it harder to obtain loans and more expensive to borrow)

On page 21, line 15, increase the amount by $264,000,000.

On page 21, line 16, increase the amount by $154,000,000.

On page 43, line 15, decrease the amount by $264,000,000.

On page 43, line 16, decrease the amount by $154,000,000.

On page 48, line 8, increase the amount by $264,000,000.

On page 48, line 9, increase the amount by $154,000,000.

---

Purpose: To amend the budget for fiscal year 2002 so that the small business programs at the Small Business Administration are adequately funded and can continue to provide loans and business assistance to the country's 24 million small businesses. It is necessary to restore and reasonably increase funding to specific programs at the SBA because the current budget request reduces funding for the Agency by a minimum of 26 percent at time when the economy is volatile and the Federal Reserve Board reports that 45 percent of banks have reduced lending to small businesses by making it harder to obtain loans and more expensive to borrow.

All funds are added to Function 376, which funds the SBA for FY 2002.

CREDIT PROGRAMS

$118 million for 7(a) loans, funding an $11 billion program

$26.2 million for SBIC participating securities, will support a $2 billion program

$750,000 million for direct microloans, funding a $30 million program

$21 million for new markets venture capital debentures, funding $150 million program

Total request for credit programs = $166 million

NON-CREDIT PROGRAMS

$4 million for the National Veterans Business Development Corporation

$10 million for Microloan Technical Assistance, total of $30 million

$30 million for the Small Business Development Centers, total of $105 million

$30 million for New Markets Venture Capital Technical Assistance

$15 million for the Program for Investment in Microenterprise

$7 million for BusinessLINC

$1.7 million for Women's Business Centers, bringing total to $13.7 million

$250,000 for Women's Business Council, bringing total to $1 million

Total request for non-credit programs = $98 million

Total request for credit and non-credit programs = $264 million

THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENT GUARANTEED LENDERS, INC.,

*Stillwater, OK, April 5, 2001.*

Hon. JOHN F. KERRY,
*U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.*

DEAR SENATOR KERRY: I am writing on behalf of NAGGL's nearly 700 members in support of your amendment, number 183, to the Budget Resolution that would revise the proposed budget for the Small Business Administration in fiscal year 2002. Specifically, your amendment would restore $264 million to the SBA's budget in fiscal year 2002 of which $118 million is earmarked for the agency's 7(a) guaranteed loan program. We strongly believe it is in the best interest of small business that your amendment be adopted.

The present budget proposes no fiscal year 2002 appropriations for the 7(a) loan program and instead proposes to make the program self-funding through the imposition of increased fees. The previous SBA Administrator testified before the House Small Business Committee last year that the 7(a) program was already being run at a ''profit'' to the government. This statement was confirmed in a September 2000 Congressional Budget Office report entitled ''Credit Subsidy Reestimates, 1993–1999.'' Unfortunately, the budget as currently proposed would, in our view, have the effect of imposing additional taxes by increasing program fees. This result would be ironic given the Administration's push for tax cuts.

A recent survey of NAGGL's membership, who currently make approximately 80 percent of SBA 7(a) guaranteed loans, shows that if the budget were adopted as proposed, most lenders would significantly curtail their 7(a) lending activities. Therefore, small businesses would find it more difficult and expensive to obtain crucial long-term financing. The proposed budget would increase the lender's cost of making a loan by 75 percent and would increase the direct cost to the borrower by 12 percent. Any fee increase is unacceptable when the program is already profitable for the government.

The small business consequences of a slowdown in 7(a) guaranteed lending are manifold. Currently, according to statistics available from the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the SBA, approximately 30 percent of all long-term loans, those with a maturity of 3 years or more, carry an SBA 7(a) guarantee. This is because lenders generally are unwilling to make long-term loans with a short-term deposit base. Therefore, reducing the availability of 7(a) capital to small businesses will have a significant effect on them and on the economy.

The average maturity for an SBA 7(a) guaranteed loan is 14 years. The average conventional small business loan carries an average maturity of one year or less. For those

conventional loans with original maturities over one year, the average maturity is just three years. The majority of SBA 7(a) borrowers are new business startups or early stage companies. The longer maturities provided by the SBA 7(a) loan program give small businesses valuable payment relief, as the longer maturity loans carry substantially lower monthly payments.

For example, if a small business borrower had to take a 5 year conventional loan instead of a 10 year SBA 7(a) loan, the result would be a 35%–40% increase in monthly payments. The lower debt payments are critical to startup and early stage companies. Small business loans, where they can be found, would have vastly increased monthly payments. This at a time when the economy appears to be struggling and when bank regulators have spurred banks to tighten credit criteria, the current budget only proposes to worsen the situation for small business borrowers.

Your amendment would help mitigate this problem. It would provide small businesses far better access to long-term financing on reasonable terms and conditions at a time when their access to such capital is critical. We urge your colleagues to support your initiative and adopt your amendment.

Respectfully,

ANTHONY R. WILKINSON.

---

U.S. HISPANIC CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
*Washington, DC, April 5, 2001.*

Hon. JOHN F. KERRY,
*Ranking Member, Senate Small Business Committee, Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.*

DEAR SENATOR KERRY: We write in support of the Kerry/Bond Amendment to restore $264 million of the proposed cuts to the Small Business Administration's (SBA) budget. We further support the amendment's proposal to have these funds come out of the contingency fund and not the tax cut or the Medicare/Social Security trust fund. Your amendment would ensure that the small business programs at the SBA are adequately funded and continue to provide loan and business assistance to Hispanic-owned small businesses in this country.

The United States Hispanic Chamber of Commerce (USHCC) represents the interest of approximately 1.5 million Hispanic-owned businesses in the United States and Puerto Rico. With a network of over 200 local Hispanic chambers of commerce across the country, the USHCC stands as the preeminent business organization that promotes the economic growth and development of Hispanic entrepreneurs.

The SBA programs that are currently in jeopardy of losing funds have been extremely instrumental in helping our Hispanic entrepreneurs start and maintain successful businesses in the United States. Without these programs, the Hispanic business community will suffer huge setbacks to the strides we have been able to achieve over the years. It is therefore necessary to restore and increase funding to these programs so that the Hispanic business community will continue to experience economic growth and success in this country.

We support your efforts and urge other members of the Senate to support the Kerry/Bond amendment in restoring these necessary funds to the SBA.

Respectfully submitted,

MARITZA RIVERA,
*Vice President for Government Relations.*

INDEPENDENT COMMUNITY BANKERS OF AMERICA,
*Washington, DC, April 5, 2001.*

*To: Members of the U.S. Senate.*
*From: Independent Community Bankers of America.*
*Re: ICBA support the Kerry-Bond amendment to preserve small business loan programs and to prevent new fees.*

On behalf of the 5,300 members of the ICBA, we support the Kerry-Bond amendment to the FY 2002 budget and urge all Senators to join in support of this important bipartisan amendment. The amendment to be offered by Senators John Kerry (D-Mass) and Christopher Bond (R-Missouri) would prevent new hidden taxes in the form of additional fees imposed on small business lenders and borrowers. The proposed FY 2002 Budget pending in the Senate would levy significant new fees on the SBA 7(a) loan program. These increased fees would jeopardize needed lending and credit to small business at the worst possible time as our economy has slowed dramatically and small business lending has become more difficult. Therefore, the Kerry-Bond amendment would restore the appropriation for the 7(a) small business loan program and prevent onerous new fees from being levied on borrowers and lenders.

This amendment shares bipartisan support. The Chairmen and Ranking Members of the Senate Small Business Committees oppose new taxes on small businesses in the form of higher loan fees. Specifically, Small Business Committee Chairman Chris Bond and Ranking Member John Kerry have asked for the $118 million appropriation to support the 7(a) loan program to be restored in the FY 2002 Budget. The ICBA applauds the bipartisan efforts of Senators Kerry and Bond in offering their amendment.

We urge every Senators' support for the Kerry-Bond amendment so that small businesses have continued access to needed credit and that the 7(a) loan program is not devastated by taxing new fees.

---

ASSOCIATION OF SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTERS,
*Burke, VA.*

Hon. JOHN F. KERRY,
*Ranking Minority Member, Senate Small Business Committee, Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.*

DEAR SENATOR: We wish to commend you for prosing an amendment to the Budget Resolution calling for the restoration of funding for the Small Business Development Center (SBDC) and 7(a) Guaranteed Loan Programs. During this period of economic downturn, it is even more important that funding for these two critically important programs not be compromised as hundreds of thousands of small businesses will need management and technical assistance and long term debt financing more than ever.

As for the SBDC Program specifically, we are proud to report that the most recent impact survey of the program found that in one year SBDC's helped small businesses create 92,000 new jobs, generate $630 million in new tax revenues, increased by 67,000 the number of entrepreneurs counseled above previous levels, and provided training to more than 84,000 small business owners than were trained during the last reporting period. In all, over 750,000 small business and preventure clients received SBDC assistance in the last fiscal year. And that was during good economic times.

Your seeking funding of $105,000,000 for the SBDC Program is bipartisan as Senator Kit Bond, Chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee in his Views and Estimates letter to the Senate Budget Committee called for the same funding level. Likewise Senator Bond opposed any funding cut for the 7(a) Guaranteed Loan Program. Both recommendations we applaud.

We also understand that your amendment would restore funding for the New Markets and PRIME programs. This association has taken no formal position regarding funding for these well intended programs.

Thank you for soliciting our views. We appreciate your leadership regarding these two outstanding SBA programs.

Sincerely,

DONALD T. WILSON,
*Director of Government Relations.*

---

WESST CORP,
*Albuquerque, NM, April 5, 2001.*

Hon. JOHN F. KERRY,
*U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.*

DEAR SENATOR KERRY: On behalf of the Association of Women's Business Centers, I am writing to voice our full support for the amendment you have introduced (#183) which would provide adequate funding for the Small Business Administration's programs targeted to lending and business assistance.

As you know, the SBA programs serve the credit and business development needs of women, minorities, and low-income entrepreneurs all across the United States and Puerto Rico. It is absolutely critical that these programs, particularly the Women's Business Centers Program, the Microloan Program, PRIME, and the National Women's Business Council, receive the funding you have recommended in your amendment so that existing and emerging entrepreneurs throughout the country continue to have opportunities to realize the American dream of business ownership.

As an advocate for tens of thousands of women business owners across the country, the AWBC applauds your vision and leadership in helping to ensure that these critical SBA programs continue to serve the entrepreneurial and credit needs of the American people.

We look forward to working with you in the months ahead to ensure the passage of this amendment.

Thank you very much for your ongoing support.

Sincerely,

AGNES NOONAN,
*Chair, AWBC Policy Committee, Executive Director.*

---

THE ASSOCIATION OF WOMEN'S BUSINESS CENTER,
*Boston, MA, April 5, 2001.*

Hon. JOHN F. KERRY,
*U.S. Senate,*
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR SENATOR KERRY: As the President of the Association of Women's Business Centers (AWBC), I am writing on behalf of the 80+ Women's Business Centers who have been funded by the Small Business Administration's Office of Women's Business Ownership. We write to support your amendment #183 to increase funding for the SBA programs and, in particular, to fund the Women's Business Center Program at $13.7 million.

The President's budget only provides level funding of $12 million for the WBC program, which is inadequate at this time as women are continuing to start two-thirds of all new businesses. Clearly, we need an increase in funding at this time to continue to ensure that we are keeping pace with this fast growth and providing services to as many women business owners as possible.

Thank you very much for your continued support and advocacy on our behalf.

Sincerely,

ANDREA C. SILBERT,
*President, AWBC, and CEO Center for Women & Enterprise.*

HOUSTON, TX,
*April 5, 2001.*

Senator JOHN KERRY,
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR SENATOR KERRY: Since I work with small business owners every day to help them obtain the financing they require to start a new business, acquire a business or expand an existing business, I wanted you to know that I strongly support you and your efforts regarding Amendment 183.

Thank you for your continued good work.

Sincerely,

CHAIRMAN ROSALES.

## TAIWAN ARMS SALE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the Administration recently informed Congress of its arms sales package to Taiwan. Having long followed political developments both in Taiwan and the People's Republic of China, PRC, and having visited both sides of the Strait, I wanted to make a few brief comments.

First, weapon systems and military hardware aside, the political message transmitted to Taipei through the sales is that America's commitment to Taiwan remains steadfast and strong. This is an appropriate message delivered in a timely manner by the new Administration and with the encouragement and support of Congress.

Second, the package generally reflects a balanced approach to Taiwan's defensive needs, particularly on and under the sea. While the Arleigh Burke-class destroyers equipped with the Aegis radar system are not part of this year's sale, and would not be operational until 2010, the Administration has left open the option to pursue Aegis-equipped destroyers at a future date. Aegis is still on the table. America has bolstered Taiwan's defensive capabilities through Kidd-class destroyers, P–3 aircraft, submarines, and other weapons, and has deferred decisions on other sales, such as tanks and helicopters, pending a review of Taiwan's ground forces needs.

Finally, the PRC must understand that its continued buildup of short-range ballistic missiles opposite Taiwan and aggressive modernization of its military for offensive purposes will all but guarantee the future sale of Aegis-equipped destroyers, or other technologically advanced weapons system. If the Mainland is serious in wanting a peaceful resolution of differences with Taiwan, senior military and civilian leaders must accept America's obligations under the Taiwan Relations Act to provide ''defense articles and defense services in such quantity as may be necessary to enable Taiwan to maintain a sufficient self-defense capability.''

Simply put, every Chinese offensive military action will have a Taiwan-U.S. defensive reaction. Beijing can make clear its intentions by immediately renouncing the option to use force against Taiwan, and by reducing its military deployments across the Strait.

I intend to continue to follow political and military developments not just in Taiwan and the PRC but throughout the region. I urge Beijing and Taipei to continue dialogue as the means of resolving their differences.

## ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I want to speak today in order to commemorate the Armenian Genocide. As you know, today marks the 86th anniversary of this tragic occurrence. It is important that we take time to remember and honor the victims, and pay respect to the survivors that are still with us.

April 24th marks the inception of brutal genocidal campaign to eliminate Armenians from the Turkish Ottoman Empire. From the period of 1915–1923, approximately one and a half million Armenians perished under the rule of the Turkish Ottoman Empire. During this horrific period, the Armenian people fell victim to deportation, conscription, torture, starvation and murder.

The Armenian genocide was the result of a consciously orchestrated government plan. The German Chancellor to the Ottoman Empire, Count Wolff-Metternich, stated at the time that, ''In its attempt to carry out its purpose to resolve the Armenian question by the destruction of the Armenian race, the Turkish government has refused to be deterred neither by our representations, nor by those of the American Embassy, nor by the delegate of the Pope . . .''

In a century filled with loss and bloodshed, the Armenian Genocide marked the first effort of the century to systematically eliminate an entire people. Unfortunately, the world did not learn from this massacre, and the past 86 years have been stained by reminders that there are those who will stop at no means to spread their agendas of hate and intolerance.

Nobel Laureate writer Elie Wiesel has said that the denial of genocide constitutes a ''double killing'' for it seeks to rewrite history by absolving the perpetrators of violence while ignoring the suffering of the victims. We must acknowledge the horrors perpetrated against the Armenian people to preserve the memory of the victims and to remind the world that we cannot and will not forget these crimes against humanity. However, it is not enough to simply remember those who have perished. We must speak out against such tragedies, and dedicate ourselves to ensuring that evils such as the Armenian Genocide are not revisited on our planet. This is the highest tribute we can pay to the victims of any genocide.

The Armenian people have preserved their culture, faith and identity for over a thousand years. In the last century alone, the Armenian people withstood the horrors of two World Wars and several decades of Soviet dominance in order to establish modern Armenia. I hope all my Senate colleagues will join me in honoring and remembering the victims of the Armenian Genocide.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, today marks the 86th anniversary of the beginning of one the great human tragedies of history, the Armenian genocide. Between 1915–1923 as many as 1.5 million Armenians were systematically murdered by the Ottoman Empire and hundreds of thousands more were forced to flee their homeland. These Armenians were victims of a policy intended to isolate, exile and even extinguish the Armenian population.

Although nearly a century has passed since this tragedy occurred, we must not wipe it from our consciousness and let it become the forgotten past. Rather, we must continually learn from mistakes of the past so that they are not repeated again and again in the future. Recent history in Bosnia, Rwanda and Kosovo tells us that systematic brutality, that the attempt to wipe out an entire population because of its ethnicity, is still possible. The atrocities that took place in these countries remind us that we still have much to learn.

The international community has made some progress, standing up for justice, holding those responsible for genocide and other serious violations of international humanitarian law accountable for their crimes. By establishing war crimes tribunals, like the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, ICTY, and the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda, ICTR, we have begun to send the clear message that such atrocious crimes will not go unpunished. I am pleased that the former Yugoslav leader Slobodan Milosevic, who has been wanted on international war crimes charges for his role in the campaign of violence and hate in the Balkans, has finally been arrested. I hope that his arrest marks the beginning of full justice being served with regard to him and others responsible for the unspeakable crimes committed in the Former Yugoslavia.

Each day we continue to read about and witness ethnic violence and violations of human rights in countries across the globe. Sadly, in many places this is simply the norm. Clearly there is a great deal of work that still needs to be done to prevent human tragedy. So today as we commemorate the Armenian genocide, let us honor the men, women and children whose lives were lost between 1915–1923, as well as the other countless victims of violence throughout history, and recommit ourselves to efforts that foster acceptance of others, respect for human rights, democratic principles, and peaceful relations between people and nations at all levels.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, today marks the 86th anniversary of the beginning of the Armenian Genocide. I rise today to acknowledge and commemorate this terrible crime and to help ensure that it will never happen again.

On April 24, 1915, the Ottoman Empire launched a brutal and unconscionable policy of mass murder. Over an eight year period, 1.5 million Armenians were killed, and another 500,000 were driven from their homes, their property and land confiscated.

We who enjoy the blessings of freedom and liberty must commemorate this event to ensure that it does not happen again. Far too often during this century we have remained silent as men, women, and children have been singled out, rounded up, and killed because of their race, ethnicity, or religion. By acknowledging the Armenian Genocide we state loud and clear: Never again.

Never again will we let brutal violations of human rights go without condemnation. Never again will we turn our backs on the oppressed and give comfort to the oppressors. Never again will we fail to stand up for justice and human dignity. Never again will we allow genocide to be perpetrated on this Earth.

Even as we remember the tragedy and honor the dead, we also honor the living. I am proud that my home State of California is home to a vibrant Armenian American community, a half a million strong. They have enriched the culture of our state and have participated in every aspect of civic life. They are a shining example of a people who overcame the horrors of the past to create a better future.

Let us never forget the victims of the Armenian Genocide. Let us ensure that they did not die in vain. Let us come together to remember the crimes of the past and to pledge to one another that they will not happen again in the future. Let us look ahead with Armenia and the Armenian American community to a brighter tomorrow.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I rise today to commemorate the 86th anniversary of the Armenian genocide. From 1915 to 1923, 1.5 million Armenians were executed in the first genocide of the 20th Century.

Sadly, there are some people who still deny the very existence of this period which saw the institutionalized slaughter of the Armenian people and the dismantling of Armenian culture. To those who would question these events, I refer them to numerous documents kept by the United States National Archives, which detail these horrifying events. The entire Armenian population in the Ottoman Empire was forcibly removed from their historic homeland in present-day eastern Turkey. A million and a half people were massacred and another 500,000 were exiled. As the United States Ambassador to the Ottoman State at the time, Henry Morgenthau, said, ''I am confident that the whole history of the human race contains no such horrible episode as this. The great massacres and persecutions of the past seem almost insignificant when compared to the sufferings of the Armenian race in 1915.''

Tragically, the Armenian genocide was the first in a series of genocides in the 20th Century. Adolf Hitler, in preparing his genocide plans for the Jews, predicted that no one would remember the atrocities he was about to unleash. After all, he asked, ''Who remembers the Armenians?''

And that is why we come together every year at this time to remember. The genocide of the Armenians did take place, and we do remember. That memory must be kept alive, to keep us vigilant in our efforts to prevent such atrocities from ever happening again.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise to join with Armenians throughout the United States, in Armenia, and around the world in commemorating the 86th anniversary of the Armenian Genocide.

This week, members and friends of the Armenian community will gather together to remember April 24, 1915. On that day, nationalist forces of the Ottoman Empire started an eight year campaign of massacre and deportation that would impact the lives of every Armenian in Asia Minor.

Armenian men, women, and children of all ages fell victim to murder, rape, torture, and starvation. By 1923, an estimated 1.5 million Armenians had been systematically murdered and another 500,000 had their property stolen and were driven from their homeland. With World War I occupying center stage at the time, the Armenian people's situation went unaided.

Unfortunately, the residents of Armenia still suffer today. Armenian efforts at democracy and economic development have been hindered by regional conflict, natural disasters and internal strife. Yet, despite these setbacks, the Armenian people have maintained a persevering spirit that has kept hope alive. In the past few months, optimism has grown as internationally mediated peace talks between Armenian President Kocharian and Azerbaijani President Aliyev have made progress.

Commemoration of the Armenian genocide is important not to keep alive the memory of those Armenians who died, but to remind the world of its duty. As Archbishop Desmond Tutu noted in 1999, ''It is sadly true what a cynic has said, that we learn from the history that we do not learn from history. And yet it is possible that if the world had been conscious of the genocide that was committed by the Ottoman Turks against the Armenians, the first genocide of the twentieth century, then perhaps humanity might have been more alert to the warning signs that were given before Hitler's madness was unleashed on an unbelieving world.'' It is my hope that the world has begun to pay attention to history because, unlike in 1915, the international community heeded the warning signs in Kosovo and did not sit back and watch, but reacted quickly and decisively. We must always bear witness to the terrors of yesterday so that we can respond to acts of oppression in the future, ensuring that the deaths of all victims of hatred and prejudice are not in vain.

Therefore, on the 86th anniversary of the terrible tragedy of the Armenian genocide we remember the past and rededicate ourselves to supporting Armenia as it looks to the future.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, April 24 marks the 86th anniversary of the beginning of one of the most tragic events in history, the Armenian Genocide. In 1915, the Ottoman Turkish Government embarked on a brutal policy of ethnic extermination. Over the next eight years, 1.5 million Armenians were killed, and more than half a million were forced from their homeland into exile.

In the years since then, the Armenian diaspora has thrived in the United States and in many other countries, bringing extraordinary vitality and achievement to communities across America and throughout the world. The Armenian Assembly of America, the Armenian National Committee of America, and other distinguished groups deserve great credit for their impressive work in maintaining the proud history and heritage of the Armenian people, and guaranteeing that the Armenian Genocide will never be forgotten.

One of the enduring achievements of the survivors of the Genocide and their descendants has been to keep its tragic memory alive, in spite of continuing efforts by those who refuse to acknowledge the atrocities that took place. In Massachusetts, the Armenian Genocide is part of that curriculum in every public school. Legislation was introduced last year in the U.S. House of Representatives to support recognition of the Armenian Genocide, and the French government approved a law to recognize the Armenian Genocide in January.

It is time for all governments, political leaders and peoples everywhere to recognize the Armenian Genocide. These annual commemorations are an effective way to pay tribute to the courage and suffering and triumph of the Armenian people, and to ensure that such atrocities will never happen again to any people on earth.

## LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 2001

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about hate crimes legislation I introduced with Senator KENNEDY last month. The Local Law Enforcement Act of 2001 would add new categories to current hate crimes legislation sending a signal that violence of any kind is unacceptable in our society.

I would like to detail a heinous crime that occurred in my own home State of Oregon in 1995. A twenty-seven year old Stockton, California man murdered a Medford, OR couple, Roxanne Ellis, 53 and Michelle Abdill, 42. The women, who ran a property management business, disappeared December 4, 1995

after showing the man an apartment for rent. He shot them both in the head, and the bodies were left bound and gagged in a truck bed. The Stockton man later confessed, saying he targeted the women because they were lesbians, and he figured they wouldn't have families that would miss them.

I believe that government's first duty is to defend its citizens, to defend them against the harms that come out of hate. The Local Law Enforcement Enhancement Act of 2001 is now a symbol that can become substance. I believe that by passing this legislation, we can change hearts and minds as well.

## FINAL PASSAGE OF S. 27

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on Monday, April 2, the Senate took long awaited action to approve legislation to address what the American people believe is the single most egregious abuse of our campaign finance system—that is the unlimited flow of soft money permeating our elections system. If the McCain-Feingold legislation did nothing else but close the soft money loophole, it would still be reform.

But my colleagues have accomplished much more in this legislation. I congratulate Senators MCCAIN and FEINGOLD for their vision in recognizing the powerfully negative influence of the money chase on our political system and their dogged persistence and patience in striving to craft a consensus on reform legislation that seeks to address the worst aspects of the current system.

But the Senate would not have passed this bill were it not for the equally determined leadership of TOM DASCHLE and the Democratic caucus. No member has been more consistent in support of reform than our leader, and no member has worked harder behind the scenes to hold the Democratic caucus together in support of this measure.

At the same time, I must also acknowledge the powerful influence of my colleague, the chairman of the Rules Committee, for his unstinting devotion to the principles of free speech and his unyielding belief that most, if not all, proposed campaign finance reforms are not only unwise, but unconstitutional.

While a majority of this body clearly do not share Senator MCCONNELL's views, I appreciate his willingness to allow the debate to continue unhindered, unlike debates in the past, by repeated cloture votes.

This debate has exemplified the Senate at its best. The free flow of debate, the unrestricted offering of well reasoned amendments, and the opportunity for all members to be heard are the hallmarks of this, the world's greatest deliberative body.

Finally, I must express my great respect to my colleagues in the Democratic caucus, under the very able leadership of Senator DASCHLE, who, along with a small group of courageous Senators across the aisle, have put aside their own short-term political interests and voted time and again in favor of comprehensive, commonsense, and badly-needed campaign finance reform.

I predict that this debate will find its place in history as one of the greatest Senate debates in the last decade, both in terms of its content and its impact on our system of democracy.

I have been privileged and honored to serve as floor manager of this measure, along with the Senator from Kentucky. As my colleague from Kentucky has alluded, the stakes in this debate were considerable for many interested parties.

And although members disagreed over the need for this measure, and amendments to it, Senators were not disagreeable in their debate. I thank my colleagues for their patience and cooperation throughout this debate.

I also compliment my good friend, the Majority Leader, for his willingness to allow the Senate to have a free-flowing debate. This issue is of paramount importance to the continued health of this democracy, and his willingness to provide for free and open debate on the McCain-Feingold measure has produced, in this Senator's mind, an even better bill than was originally brought to the Senate floor.

I am hopeful there will be an opportunity to make further improvements in this measure in the House. Although I am supporting the McCain-Feingold legislation, there are two provisions, in particular, that cause me concern.

First is the so-called millionaire's provision which purports to level the playing field for candidates who face wealthy challengers. While that may be a laudable goal, the amendment ignores the fact that many incumbents who face wealthy challengers are sitting on healthy campaign treasuries, sometimes amounting to several million dollars. In those instances, this amendment serves as an incumbent protection provision.

As I stated before passage of the Durbin-Domenici-DeWine amendment to fix this inequity, I am not satisfied that the Durbin amendment went far enough to recognize the considerable war chests that some incumbents have. I urge my colleagues in the House to carefully consider this provision with an eye to improving it.

Secondly, although I reluctantly supported the Thompson-Feingold amendment to increase the individual hard money contribution limits, I did so only in the context of achieving broader reform. Quite simply, the increase in the hard money limits was the price to be paid to gain sufficient support from our Republican colleagues for banning soft money and reining in so-called sham issue ads.

Of particular concern to me is the indexing of these increases which only ensures the continuing upward spiral of money into our political system. While I understand the desire of some to avoid a future debate on reform, the fact that the hard money limits had not been increased since 1974 is what created both the pressure and the opportunity for this reform.

Again, I urge my colleagues in the House to consider these limits and avoid the temptation to increase them ever higher; otherwise, there may come a time when the price for reform becomes too great for this Senator.

I am hopeful that the House will act expeditiously on this measure. While I do not suggest that House members forego their responsibility and right to thoroughly debate and amend this legislation, I encourage them to do so in a manner that will allow this bill to reach the President's desk before the end of this year.

I also thank the numerous staff who have assisted in facilitating consideration of this measure, not the least of which are our Democratic floor staff, including Marty Paone, Lula Davis, and Gary Myrick, along with the outstanding Democratic cloakroom staff.

I also extend my special appreciation to Andrea LaRue of Senator DASCHLE's staff. She, along with Mark Childress and Mark Patterson, were invaluable in offering much needed expertise and guidance on this legislation.

Of equal assistance were the staffs of Senators FEINGOLD and MCCAIN, including Bob Schiff, Ann Choiniere and Mark Buse, as well as Laurie Rubenstein of Senator LIEBERMAN's staff and Linda Gustitus of Senator LEVIN's staff.

I also wish to acknowledge the contributions of Senator MCCONNELL's staff, including Hunter Davis of his personal staff, and Tam Somerville and Andrew Siff of the Rules Committee staff.

Finally, I thank Shawn Maher of my personal office staff, and Veronica Gillespie, my Elections counsel on the Rules Committee staff, as well as Kennie Gill, the Democratic staff director and chief counsel of the Rules Committee.

One final point, Mr. President. The great justice, Learned Hand, once spoke of liberty as the great equalizer among men. In his words, ''the spirit of liberty is the . . . lesson . . . (mankind) has never learned, but has never quite forgotten; that there may be a kingdom where the least shall be heard and considered side by side with the greatest.''

That, my colleagues, should be the ultimate test of whether any matter considered by this body is worthy of support. The McCain-Feingold legislation passes that test.

## THE ARKANSAS PLAN

Mrs. LINCOLN. Mr. President, today I am announcing my vision for the design of the tax cut and I am sending a message to my Chairman and to the President that I am willing to work with them on a tax cut as long as it recognizes that Arkansas taxpayers

also work hard and have earned a share of the surplus in the form of a tax cut.

The President's tax rate cuts are skewed to the rich and the average Arkansan won't see a real cut, if at all, until 2006. Forty-nine percent of Arkansans have adjusted gross incomes under $20,000 and the average household income in Arkansas is $29,019. About 85 percent of Arkansas families don't make enough to qualify as one of the ''model families'' that President Bush has been talking about in his speeches. In other words, only about 15 percent of Arkansans would get a $1,600 tax cut. The other 85 percent of Arkansans deserve a real tax cut too.

I believe in creating a new ten percent bracket like the President, but under my plan it be fully implemented this year. That will bring thousands of dollars to Arkansas families immediately and over the next 5 years will mean significantly more to the Arkansas economy than will the Bush plan.

I also want to expand the 15 percent bracket by $10,000. This will mean that 85 percent of Arkansas taxpayers and small businesses never make it out of the 15 percent bracket and will never pay more than about an 11 percent effective Federal tax rate. Expanding the 15 percent bracket would mean that a couple earning $55,000 would get $980 more than they would under the Bush plan, regardless of whether they have children or not. The only way for average citizens to get a significant tax cut under the Bush plan is to have children. Single people and people who are no longer raising their children deserve a tax cut too, and I propose to give them one.

I do believe in doubling the child tax credit as the President proposes. However, I believe it should be partially refundable for working taxpayers as their Earned Income Tax Credit is phased out. Approximately 140,000 Arkansas families, or 37 percent of Arkansas families with children, will not benefit from the President's plan because their incomes are too low to owe federal income taxes. By making the child tax credit partially refundable, low-income working parents would get the benefits of the child tax credit just like I do. At the same time, I believe it is unfair to phase out the value of exemptions and credits for high income individuals. What's good for the goose is good for the gander. If we are going to give a $1,000 per-child tax credit to working families, then we should give that credit to all working families, rich and poor.

We also must fix the Alternative Minimum Tax, AMT. I have asked the President in person, I have asked him in writing, ''How will your Administration address the AMT?'' Many of you may not know that the AMT, which is designed to prevent affluent taxpayers from sheltering their tax liability in credits and deductions, will soon have an unintended consequence for 37 million Americans. These middle income workers will be paying higher rates and filing out more forms if we do not act. At a minimum, the AMT exemptions should be raised and indexed, and family credits should be protected from the AMT's bite.

With our private savings rate at a negative for the first time in our history we should encourage more private savings by increasing the IRA and 401(k) contribution limits as part of an overall retirement security and expansion act. Increasing private savings is an important way to keep capital reserve up and interest rates low. The fiscally conservative thing to do is include the pension bill in this year's tax relief.

I support eliminating the so-called marriage penalties in the tax code, but we should do it in a way that is fair to widows and singles. Taxpayers should not be punished for getting married, but nor should they be punished when their spouse dies or if they choose not to get married.

Lastly, the estate tax should be repealed within the next three years. While the revenue estimates of repealing the estate tax have been high, I believe there are many ways we can ensure that death is no longer a taxable event without breaking the treasury. In the short run, we may have to provide for a mark-to-market fee to provide for a stepped-up basis for inherited property or a higher capital gains rate for inherited property, but no tax would be paid unless the asset was sold. In short, the U.S. tax code should not be an obstacle to family farmers and small business people who want to pass on their legacy.

At the end of the day, Vice-President CHENEY would get about a $1 million tax cut under my plan, instead of the $2.4 million he would get under the Bush plan. However, average Arkansans would see thousands more and those dollars will be spent and saved in Arkansas where they belong. A family of four with a $30,000 income would get a $1,600 per year tax cut which is approximately $484 more per year than they would get under President Bush's plan. My plan would put more money in Arkansas and the South, and would cost $400 billion less than the President's $1.6 billion plan. That cost savings is important, because ultimately, I will not support any tax cut plan that would endanger the long-term solvency of Social Security and Medicare and inhibit our ability to retire the national debt.

## THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Monday, April 23, 2001, the Federal debt stood at $5,673,969,614,244.57, Five trillion, six hundred seventy-three billion, nine hundred sixty-nine million, six hundred fourteen thousand, two hundred forty-four dollars and fifty-seven cents.

Five years ago, April 23, 1996, the Federal debt stood at $5,106,372,000,000, Five trillion, one hundred six billion, three hundred seventy-two million.

Ten years ago, April 23, 1991, the Federal debt stood at $3,433,997,000,000, Three trillion, four hundred thirty-three billion, nine hundred ninety-seven million.

Fifteen years ago, April 23, 1986, the Federal debt stood at $1,959,815,000,000, One trillion, nine hundred fifty-nine billion, eight hundred fifteen million.

Twenty-five years ago, April 23, 1976, the Federal debt stood at $600,771,000,000, Six hundred billion, seven hundred seventy-one million, which reflects a debt increase of more than $5 trillion, $5,073,198,614,244.57, Five trillion, seventy-three billion, one hundred ninety-eight million, six hundred fourteen thousand, two hundred forty-four dollars and fifty-seven cents during the past 25 years.

## TRIBUTE TO SENATOR ALAN CRANSTON

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following tributes by current and former members of the Senate and House of Representatives at the memorial service for the late Senator Alan Cranston be printed in the RECORD.

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

MEMORIAL TRIBUTE TO SEN. ALAN CRANSTON BY SENATOR MAX CLELAND

On February 6, over 200 admirers gathered in Hart SOB 902 to pay tribute to our dear friend Alan Cranston, who left us on the last day of the year 2000. Joining with me as sponsors of this event were the Senators from West Virginia (Mr. Rockefeller), California (Mrs. Feinstein and Mrs. Boxer), and Massachusetts (Mr. Kennedy), and the former Senator from Wyoming (Mr. Simpson). Ten members and former members spoke, and a short film about Senator Cranston's recent activities was shown. At the end of the program, Alan's son, Kim, spoke. It was a memorable afternoon for all in attendance.

The Program Cover pictured Alan and his beautiful, now seven-year old, granddaughter Evan. On the second page appeared the following words of the Chinese poet and philosopher Lao-Tzu, which Alan carried with him every day:

A leader is best
When people barely know
That he exists,
Less good when
They obey and acclaim him,
Worse when
They fear and despise him.

Fail to honor people
And they fail to honor you.
But of a good leader,
When his work is done,
His aim fulfilled,
They will all say,
''We did this ourselves.''—Lao-Tzu

The program participants and sponsors were shown on the third page as follows:

Musical Prelude: United States Army Strings.

Introductions and Closing: Judge Jonathan Steinberg.

Speakers: Senator Max Cleland, Senator Alan Simpson, Senator Edward Kennedy, Senator Diane Feinstein, Senator Barbara Boxer, Representative G.V. (Sonny) Montgomery, Representative John A. Anderson,

Representative George Miller, Senator John Kerrey, Senator Maria Cantwell, and Kim Cranston.

Family in attendance: Kim Cranston, Colette Penne Cranston, Evan Cranston, and Eleanor (R.E.) Cranston Cameron.

Event Sponsors: Senators Cleland, Simpson, Rockefeller, Kennedy, Feinstein, and Boxer.

The back page of the program set forth Senator Cranston's Committee assignments and the acknowledgments for the Tribute, as follows:

Senator Cranston's 24 years of service in the United States Senate exceeded that of any California Democratic Senator and was the second longest tenure of any California Senator. He was elected Democratic Whip seven times, and his service of 14 years in that position is unequaled. His Committee service was:

1969–93: Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

1971–73 and 1975–79: Chairman, Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization.

1973–75: Chairman, Subcommittee on Small Businesses.

1979–85: Chairman or Ranking Minority Member, Subcommittee on Financial Institutions.

1985–87: Ranking Minority Member, Subcommittee on Securities.

1987–93: Chairman, Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs.

1969–81: Committee on Labor and Public Welfare (Human Resources).

1969–71: Chairman, Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs.

1971–73: Chairman, Subcommittee on Railroad Retirement.

1971–81: Chairman, Subcommittee on Child and Human Development.

1981–93: Committee on Foreign Relations.

1981–85: Ranking Minority Member, Subcommittee on Arms Control, Oceans, International Operations, and Environment.

1985–93: Chairman or Ranking Minority Member, Subcommittee on East Asian and Pacific Affairs.

1977–92: Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Chairman or Ranking Minority Member.

In addition, Senator Cranston served on the Committees on the Budget (1975–79) and on Nutrition and Human Needs (1975–77), and on the Select Committee on Intelligence (1987–93).

Event Planning and Arrangements: Bill Brew, Fran Butler, Kelly Cordes, Chad Griffin, Bill Johnstone, Susanne Martinez, Dan Perry, Ed Scott, Jon Steinberg, Lorraine Tong, Elinor Tucker.

As I said at the Tribute, I would not be in this body were it not for Alan Cranston. My colleague, the Senator from Washington (Ms. Cantwell), expressed that same sentiment in her remarks. Alan Cranston will always be an inspiration for us. He will live in our memories and the memories of all those who served with him and were touched by the causes he championed and in the hearts and minds of those he so ably represented in his beloved State of California. Following are the transcript of the Tribute, and the document, ''Legislative Legacy, Alan Cranston in the U.S. Senate, 1969–1993,'' that was distributed at the Tribute.

A LEGISLATIVE LEGACY—ALAN CRANSTON IN THE U.S. SENATE, 1969–1993

AN OVERVIEW

As an eight-year-old boy, Alan Cranston lost his first election to be bench monitor in his Los Altos grammar school. As an adult, he became the state's most electable Democrat and one of the most durable and successful California politicians of the 20th Century. During decades of political and social turbulence, when no other California Democrat was elected more than once to the U.S. Senate, Alan Cranston won four Senate terms in the Capitol, serving a total of 24 years. It is a California record unmatched except for the legendary Hiram Johnson, a Republican who held his Senate seat from 1917 to 1945.

In addition, Cranston was elected to seven consecutive terms as the Senate Democratic Whip, the number two party position in the Senate. That, too, is an all-time Senate record for longevity in a leadership post. Alan Cranston is credited with rebuilding the Democratic Party in California through grass- roots activism and organization. In the mid–1950s, he organized the then- powerful California Democratic Council, a vast network of party volunteers that in 1958 helped sweep Republicans from most statewide offices. Edmund G. ''Pat'' Brown was elected governor, Democrats seized the California Legislature, and Cranston began two terms as State Controller of California.

Senator Cranston sought the Democratic Party nomination for President in 1984. His campaign, though ultimately unsuccessful, raised to new heights public support for international arms control and a superpower freeze on nuclear weapons.

In terms of political style, Senator Cranston drew upon an earlier Earl Warren tradition of bipartisanship, and was well served by a diversified base of political support. Representing the California mega-state in the Senate, Cranston skillfully balanced a wide array of insistent and sometimes conflicting state interests. He steered a delicate course between the state's giant agribusiness interests and those of consumers, family farmers and farm workers; he weighed the claims of home builders and growing communities with the need to preserve open space and wildlife habitats; and he nurtured and led the California epicenter of the national arms control and peace movements, while effectively representing the home of the nation's defense and aerospace industry.

The record of Congressional measures from 1969 to 1993 adds up to a catalogue of literally tens of thousands of legislative actions on which there is a Cranston imprint. These include the large events of the past quarter century—Vietnam, the Cold War, civil rights, the rise of environmentalism, conflict in the Middle East, Watergate, the energy crisis, and equal rights for women.

The Cranston mark is on thousands of bills and amendments he personally authored affecting virtually every aspect of national life. Without this legislative record, America would be a different and poorer place in the quality of life and environment for a majority of our people. Rivers would be more polluted, the air less clean, food less safe. Fewer opportunities would be open to all citizens, fewer advances made in medicine and science; there would be less safe conditions in workplaces.

Despite facile and careless cynicism about the work of government, the achievements of the nation's Legislative Branch from the mid–1960s to the early 1990s have made a distinct and meaningful difference in the lives of millions of Americans. Alan Cranston's particular contributions to progressive legislation is notable. The difference a single U.S. Senator can make is demonstrated by a study of all votes cast in the Senate over two decades in which the outcome was decided by less than five votes and often by a single vote. Between 1969 to 1989 there were over 2,500 such votes in which Alan Cranston's influence often was critical to the outcome.

The figures do not include thousands of legislative decisions reached by less narrow margins. Nor do they reflect the additional influence of Senator Cranston as a behind-the-scene strategist, nose-counter, marshaler of forces and shrewd compromiser who always lived to fight another day. The sum of thousands of ''small'', quiet, often little-noticed and uncelebrated legislative actions over near a quarter-century adds up to steady progress in nearly every area of American life.

As for one man's place in such a record, former Vice President Walter Mondale called Senator Cranston: ''The most decent and gifted member of the United States Senate.''

Even with so diverse a legislative record, certain points of emphasis and priority emerge. Although never an ideologue, Senator Cranston was passionate in pursuit of world peace, for extending opportunities for those left out of the mainstream, and for protecting the natural environment. Asked by a reporter what he ''goes to the mat for,'' Cranston replied: ''Peace, arms control, human rights, civil rights, civil liberties. If there's an issue between some very powerful people and some people without much power, my sympathies start with those who have less power.''

During the eight years that remained to him after he left the Senate, Alan Cranston worked tirelessly on issues of war and peace, speaking out for human rights, and for preserving the environment of the planet for present and future generations. In 1996, he became chairman of the Global Security Institute, a San Francisco-based research organization which he founded together with former Soviet President and Nobel Peace Prize winner Mikhail S. Gorbachev to promote world peace and the abolition of nuclear weapons.

EARLY HISTORY

Few people in modern history have entered the U.S. Senate as freshmen better prepared than Alan Cranston to combine lifelong concerns over foreign and domestic policy with an understanding of the inner procedural, political and human workings of the institution. It was a preparation which made it possible to gain and hold on to Senate power as Democratic Whip for 14 of his 24 years in Congress.

In 1936, as a 22–year-old foreign correspondent he joined the International News Service (later part of United Press International), immediately after graduating from Stanford University. He was sent on assignments to Germany, Italy, Ethiopia and England in years leading up to the outbreak of World War II. He personally watched and listened as Adolph Hitler whipped his audiences into mass frenzy. He saw Mussolini strut before tens of thousands in Rome. He covered London in the fateful years ''while England slept,'' and he watched as the world seemed helpless to act against the dark march of fascism.

Three years later, following his return to the United States, Cranston learned that an English-language version of Hitler's ''Mein Kampf'' was being distributed in the U.S. He was alarmed to discover that, for propaganda purposes, parts of the text had been purposefully omitted. These were passages which would have made clear the nature and full extent of Hitler's threat to the world. To warn Americans against Hitler, he wrote a complete and accurate version of the book, with explanatory notes making the Dictator's real intentions clear. It was published in tabloid form and sold a half-million copies before a copyright infringement suit brought by agents of the Third Reich put a stop to its further distribution.

Senator Cranston's strong commitment to human rights and peace, and his alertness to the dangers of totalitarian one-man rule, were clearly shaped by witnessing first hand the rise of fascism in Europe and the deadly chain of events leading to the Second World

War and its Cold War aftermath. His first work in Washington, serving in 1940 and 1941 as a representative of the Common Cause for American Unity, entailed lobbying Congress for fairness in legislation affecting foreign born Americans. This activity gave him an opportunity to learn at close range the inner workings of the Senate.

With the outbreak of war, Cranston served as Chief of the Foreign Language Division of the Office of War Information in the Executive Offices of the President. When offered a draft deferment in 1944, he declined it and enlisted in the Army as a private, where he was first assigned to an infantry unit training in the U.S. Because of his experience as a foreign correspondent and journalist, he became editor of *Army Talk*. His rank was sergeant by VJ Day.

While still in the Army, he began researching and writing a book in hopes of influencing international decision-making in the post-war world. It was an account of how, in the aftermath of the first World War, a handful of willful men in the U.S. Senate, opposed to President Wilson and the 14–point peace plan, managed to prevent U.S. participation in the League of Nations, ultimately undermining the peace and setting the stage for a second World War.

In 1945, ''The Killing of the Peace'' by Alan Cranston was published. The New York Times rated it one of the 10 best books of the year. The book served to warn against the folly of repeating the same isolationist mistakes that followed World War I. The Cranston book also presented a meticulous description of the byzantine inner workings of the U.S. Senate during the debate over ratification of the League of Nations treaty. At age 31, the future Senator revealed a full appreciation of the critical role played by individual egos, personalities and interpersonal relationships in the legislative process, and showed how awareness to such human factors could be critical in determining the outcome of a vote.

The immediate post-war years in Washington and publication of *The Killing of the Peace* marked the real beginning of Cranston's determination to become a member of the Senate. He wanted to enter that institution where he could promote world peace and causes of social justice.

From 1949 to 1952 he served as national president of the United World Federalists, dedicated to promoting peace through world law. He was a principal founder of the California Democratic Council, established to influence the direction of the Democratic Party in the state, and was elected as the first CDC President in 1953 and served until 1958.

He was elected California state controller in 1958, which placed him among the top ranks of the party's statewide elected officials. He was reelected in 1962 and served until 1966.

SENATE ACHIEVEMENTS

*Foreign affairs*

Elected to the Senate in 1968, during the height of fighting in Vietnam, Senator Cranston quickly allied with so-called ''doves'' which were a distinct minority in Congress at that time. Together with Senator Edward Brooke of Massachusetts, Alan Cranston coauthored the first measure to pass the Senate cutting off funds to continue the war in Southeast Asia. The Brooke-Cranston Amendment paved the way to the U.S. Congress ultimately asserting its prerogatives over military spending and provided for the orderly termination of U.S. military involvement in Vietnam.

Senator Cranston played key roles in shaping the SALT and START arms pacts, and in framing debate on virtually every new weapon system, arms control issue and foreign treaty from 1969 to 1993. A recognized leader on the Foreign Relations Committee, Alan Cranston was a highly respected voice on behalf of arms control, nuclear non-proliferation, peaceful settlement of international conflict, human rights around the world, sensible and compassionate approaches to immigration and refugee issues, foreign trade and long range solutions to problems of famine, disease and oppression in the Third World.

In addition to U.S.-Soviet relations, those specific areas of foreign policy in which Senator Cranston made a significant impact include the passage of the Panama Canal Treaty, efforts to bar military aid to the Nicaraguan contras, aid to Israel and efforts toward peace in the Middle East, helping to bring a halt to U.S. involvement in a civil war in Angola, and opposition to apartheid in South Africa.

*Environmental legislation*

Among the legacy of Alan Cranston's years in the Senate is a wealth of parks, wilderness areas, wildlife refuges, wild rivers, scenic areas and coastline protection measures. With just two bills in which Alan Cranston and Rep. Phillip Burton of San Francisco teamed—the Omnibus Parks Act of 1978 and the Alaska Lands Act of 1980—as much acreage was placed under federal protection as all the parks lands created earlier in the 20th Century combined. Senator Cranston was the Senate sponsor of legislation creating the Golden Gate National Recreation Area, the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area, the Channel Islands National Park, a 48,000 acre addition to the Redwoods National Park, and the inclusion of Mineral King into Sequoia National Park. He sponsored 12 different wilderness bills which became law between 1969 and 1982. He helped close Death Valley National Monument to open pit mining and was an architect of the Endangered Species Act and the Marine Mammal Protection Act.

He worked diligently throughout his Senate years for the California Desert Protection Act, that called for setting aside millions of acres of desert lands as wilderness and park preserves, and creating better government conservation efforts for a vast portion of the California desert ecosystem. His efforts ultimately came to fruition when Senator Dianne Feinstein, during the first Clinton term, was able to enact into law the Cranston crusade for desert preservation.

Even this long list does not tell the complete story of Senator Cranston's environmental record, which includes clear air and clean water legislation, control of toxic wastes, liability for oil spills, restoration of fish and wildlife resources, and support for new technologies for cleaner fuels. No other period in American history has seen so much been accomplished for environmental protection as the last three decades of the 20th Century, and Senator Cranston was an essential but largely unheralded architect of these policies.

*Civil rights/Civil liberties*

In his first term as a Senator, Alan Cranston wrote the amendment that extended to federal workers the civil rights protections earlier mandated to private employers. He also played a key strategic role in ending a filibuster which threatened the extension of the Voting Rights Act. He authored the first Senate bill to redress grievances of Japanese-Americans interned in relocation camps during the Second World War. Cranston coauthored landmark legislation protecting the civil rights of institutionalized persons. He was the first U.S. Senator to employ an openly-gay person on his staff, and he fought official discrimination against homosexuals in immigration laws and access to legal services.

Aware from his days as a journalist of the importance of protecting news sources, Senator Cranston fought the Nixon Administration to preserve an unfettered and free press in America. He successfully blocked legislation in 1975 that would have created an Official Secrets Act threatening First Amendment freedoms.

*Health care*

Both on the Senate and Human Resources Subcommittee on Health and Scientific Research, and as Chairman of the Senate Veterans Affairs Committee, Senator Cranston worked to secure for all individuals access to health services necessary for the prevention and treatment of disease and injury and for the promotion of physical and mental well-being.

He authored the law, and extensions and refinements of it, that provided for the development nationwide of comprehensive medical services (EMS) systems and for the training of emergency medical personnel. He steered the original Emergency Medical Systems Act through Congress, then persuaded a reluctant President Nixon to sign it into law. A few years later, the Cranston measure was quite possibly responsible for saving another President's life. It was at a special trauma care unit at George Washington University Medical Center in Washington, D.C., established in part by the EMS law, where President Reagan's life was saved following an assassination attempt in 1981.

Senator Cranston also wrote laws that have made a broad range of family planning services available to individuals who cannot otherwise afford or gain ready access to them. He authored legislation that improved services to families of sudden infant death syndrome (SIDS) and encouraged expanded research efforts. Legislation to support community efforts to control venereal diseases and tuberculosis were shaped by Senator Cranston. He authored several provisions of law substantially increasing funding for AIDS research, education, and public health activities.

He wrote the law that expanded and coordinated federal research in arthritis, and he helped create the National Institute on Aging. Totally separate from his role as a federal legislator, he helped establish the private, non-profit Alliance for Aging Research to spur research scientists to find answers for the chronic disabling conditions of aging, including Alzheimer's Disease.

His commitment to healthy aging was also personal. A lifelong physical fitness buff and accomplished runner, he set a world record for his age group in 1969, running the 100–yard dash in 12.6 seconds. He broke his own record three years later running in the University of Pennsylvania Relays at age 59.

*Rights for persons with disabilities*

When Alan Cranston came to the Senate, disabled persons had virtually no legal protection against unjust discrimination and there had been little progress toward removing physical barriers that excluded them from public buildings and facilities. He was acutely aware of these injustices due to crippling disabilities suffered by members of his immediate family. He often characterized people with disabilities as ''the one civil rights constituency any of us can be thrust into without a moment's warning.'' He led efforts to enact legislation in 1973 for the first time outlawing discrimination in federally-funded programs and requiring that federally-funded buildings be made accessible to disabled individuals, and promoting the employment and advancement of persons with disabilities by the federal government and federal contractors. The sloping sidewalk

curbs for wheelchairs on nearly every street in the nation stem from Alan Cranston's early advocacy for disabled people.

*Children and families*

Senator Cranston authored a rich body of legislative reforms that humanized and vastly improved adoption assistance, foster care, child custody and child care. He was a leader in sponsoring child abuse and neglect prevention laws and in investigating the abuse of children in institutions.

He was responsible for extending the original authorization of the Head Start preschool education program. He authored successful bills extending Medicaid coverage for prenatal health care for low-income pregnant women. He co-wrote the landmark L975 law designed to provide educational opportunities for handicapped children, and he was a strong supporter and developer of children's nutrition and feeding programs throughout his time in the Senate.

Many private organizations honored Cranston for his work, including the North American Conference on Adoptable Children, which named him ''Child Advocate of the Year'' in 1979, the California Adoption Advocacy Network, the Child Welfare League of America, the Day Care and Child Development Council of America, the California Child Development Administrators Association, and the JACKIE organization, which cited ''his leadership in obtaining national adoption and foster care reform.''

*Veterans*

Though opposed to the Vietnam War, he was deeply compassionate toward those who fought America's most unpopular war. Able to separate the war from the warriors, he was an early champion for the Vietnam veterans, especially for improving health care in VA hospitals and clinics.

In his first year in the Senate, Alan Cranston was assigned chairmanship of a Labor Committee subcommittee dealing with veterans. He used that post to draw national attention to inadequate and shocking conditions in VA hospitals, which were overwhelmed by the returning wounded from the Vietnam war. When a full Committee on Veterans Affairs was established in the Senate, he chaired its subcommittee on health and hospitals and later chaired the full committee for a total of nine years.

Among a few highlights of this record: improvements in compensation for service-connected disabled veterans, education and training programs tailored to Vietnam-era veterans, requirements for federal contractors to give preference in hiring for Vietnam-era and disabled veterans, and a long list of initiatives to improve health care in the VA medical system.

Alan Cranston wrote the law that created a national network of VA counseling facilities known as ''Vet Centers'' to aid returning Vietnam veterans in coping with readjustment to civilian society, and helping to identify and treat the condition known as post-traumatic stress syndrome.

He was among the first to draw attention to the health problems believed associated with exposure to Agent Orange and he gave the VA specific authority to provide Vietnam veterans with medical care for those conditions. He also helped bring to light health problems of veterans who were exposed to nuclear radiation as part of U.S. government atomic testing in the 1940s and 50s, and he fought to allow compensation for subsequent medical effects of the exposure.

For more than a decade he fought to allow veterans legal rights to appeal VA decisions on claims for benefits and ultimately succeeded in establishing the United States Court of Veterans Appeals. His very last day in the Senate, Alan Cranston was responsible for passage of three veterans bills: Veterans Re-employment Rights, Veterans Health-Care Services, and the Veterans Health Care Act.

*Women*

Another constant throughout the Cranston Senate career has been his efforts aimed at eradicating sex discrimination and providing equal opportunities for women.

He worked hard, both in the U.S. Congress and in the California legislature, for passage and ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment. He authored provisions of the Equal Employment Opportunity Act precluding discrimination in hiring and retaining women employees and those who are pregnant. On the Banking Committee he pioneered laws prohibiting discrimination against women in obtaining credit and benefitting from insurance policies.

He consistently championed women's access to health care and reproductive health services. He was the Senate author of the Freedom of Choice Act to codify into federal law the *Roe* v. *Wade* court decision.

ADDENDA

Any summary of the Cranston record would be incomplete without also noting the following:

Senator Cranston helped lead the opposition in the U.S. Senate to G. Harrold Carswell and Clement Haynsworth, both nominated by President Richard Nixon to the Supreme Court. Both nominations were defeated.

When Robert Bork was nominated to the Court, it was a vote count taken by Democratic Whip Alan Cranston that first showed the nomination could be overturn. Senator Cranston skillfully used this information to persuade swing vote Senators to reject the Bork nomination.

During the Carter Presidency, when Cranston had the patronage power to recommend federal judicial appointments, he instead established a bipartisan committee with the California Bar Association to assist in screening candidates based on merit. Under this system four women, four African-Americans, two Latinos and one Asian were appointed to the U.S. District Court in California. In addition, one African-American, one woman, and one Latino were appointed as U.S. Attorneys.

He long championed federal support for mass transit, including the Surface Transit Act, which for the first time opened up the Federal Highway Act to allow mass transit to compete for federal funds on an equal basis with highways.

As Housing Subcommittee Chairman on the Banking Committee, he lead efforts to pass the Urban Mass Transit Act of 1987, the McKinney Homeless Assistance Act, and the Housing and Community Development Act of 1987 and then succeeded in gaining enactment of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act in October 1990, a landmark law that set a new course for federal housing assistance, stressing production of affordable housing units, improved FHA insurance, elderly and handicapped housing expansion, special housing for people with AIDS, and reform of public housing. Passage of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 culminated Senator Cranston's 24 years of major legislative achievements steadily aimed at making housing more available and fostering community economic growth.

He helped strengthen the Resources Conservation and Recovery Act, the basic law which allows the federal government to regulate hazardous waste material to insure that it is safely managed.

He headed efforts in the Senate to break the filibuster mounted against Labor Law Reform.

Over more than two decades, he provided diligent oversight and direction for all federal volunteer programs, including the Peace Corps, VISTA, the ACTION Agency, Foster Grandparents, and the Retired Senior Volunteer Program.

POST-SENATE CAREER

From 1993 until his death just hours before the first day of 2001, Alan Cranston pursued the opportunity afforded by the end of the Cold War to abolish nuclear weapons. He worked on the issue as Chairman of the Gorbachev Foundation, and then as President of the Global Security Institute in San Francisco, which he helped establish. An important accomplishment of the Institute was to put together, with a coalition of groups called Project Abolition, the Responsible Security Appeal, which calls for action leading to the elimination of all nuclear weapons. At Cranston's urging, this document was signed by such notable people as Paul Nitze, General Charles Horner, and former President Jimmy Carter. Project Abolition, founded by Cranston, promises to be the foundation for a wider nuclear abolition campaign in the years ahead.

During the decade of the 1990s, he traveled to the Indian Subcontinent, in Central Asia and elsewhere, working with national leaders to accommodate peaceful change in the world, especially the development of pluralistic, free societies in the former Soviet Union. In the very last years of his life, he was more often at home, in the sprawling Spanish Colonial style residence in Los Altos Hills, where he was surrounded by three generations of his family. He assembled a magnificent library encompassing a wide range of California, American and International history and politics, in thousands of books, artworks, memorabilia and photographs. To this library would come many friends, political allies old and new, former staff and an occasional journalist intent on an interview. Former Senator Cranston made this assessment of his priorities in one interview, just months before his death:

''I am an abolitionist on two fronts. I believe we have to abolish nuclear weapons before they abolish us, and I think we have to eliminate the incredibly important and significant role of money in politics before we're going to have our democracy working as it should work. If we blow ourselves up in a nuclear war, no other issue, no matter how important it may seem to be, is going to matter. And until we get money out of politics, money is going to affect every issue that comes along, often adversely to the interest of the public. So let's abolish both.''

Years earlier, while preparing to retire from the United States Senate, he expressed gratitude for the opportunities to make a difference on behalf of California and people throughout the world:

''It has been a privilege I have cherished and for which I can never adequately thank the people of California. It is my hope that many of the accomplishments achieved over these past 24 years in the areas of world peace, the environment, and in the effort to secure a better quality of life for millions of Americans will survive and serve as the basis of continued progress by others in behalf of future generations.''

---

FEBRUARY 6, 2001, 2:00 PM, MEMORIAL TRIBUTE TO ALAN CRANSTON, U.S. SENATOR 1969—1993, HART SENATE OFFICE BUILDING, ROOM 902, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Judge JONATHAN STEINBERG. On behalf of the sponsors, Senators Cleland, Simpson, Rockefeller, Kennedy, Feinstein, and Boxer, welcome to this Memorial Tribute to Senator Alan Cranston. At the outset, I want to express our appreciation to the U.S. Army

Strings for their Prelude musical offerings today. Also, thanks to C-Span for covering this event. This turnout today is itself a wonderful testimonial to the work of this man of the Senate, Alan Cranston, and we are absolutely delighted that his family has journeyed here from California to share in this Tribute—his son, Kim, and daughter-in-law Colette, and their child and Alan's granddaughter, Evan, who graces the program cover with Alan, and we are so happy that Alan's wonderful, 91-year-old sister, R.E., who wrote a biography about Alan, is with us as well.

During his 24 years as a Senator, Alan Cranston did much to better the lives of the people of his state and the people of this country and all countries. You will hear much about those efforts and achievements today. In my role, I am a proxy for the scores of staff who worked for Alan Cranston over his Senate career. I began in March 1969, almost at the beginning, and stayed 21 and a half years. I've always thought that one could tell a great deal about the kind of person someone was by how those who worked most closely with him felt about him. I think it speaks volumes about Alan Cranston—and Alan is the way he asked his staff always to refer to him—that so many worked with him for so long. In fact, five worked for him for his full 24 years; two others worked more than 20 years; five others for 15 years or more, and three or four for 10 or more years. I doubt that any Senator has surpassed that record for staff loyalty and staff satisfaction.

Alan was wonderful to work for and with. He was not a saint, of course, but he was a gentlemen, through and through. He gave respect to get respect. To me he was a mentor, a teacher, an inspiration, and a friend. I loved him. I will always remember him. And when I do, I will think back to our last meeting—at dinner on November 13. He was strong and vibrant and full of passionate commitment to the cause of the elimination of nuclear weapons. I remember our hugging goodbye. It was a great hug, but I wish I had held on a littler longer.

A few announcements before we get to our speakers: First of all, I want to remind each of you to please sign one of the guest books in the lobby before you leave. I hope you've each gotten a program. If not, you can pick one up on the way out. And also on the way out, there is a paper on Senator Cranston's legislative legacy in the Senate.

Before I introduce our first speaker, I want to note the presence here—now or expected—in addition to those who will speak, of many distinguished members of the Senate and House: Senator Rockefeller, who is one of our sponsors; Senator Lugar, Senator Leahy, Senator Dodd, Senator Bingaman, Senator Sarbanes, Senator Dorgan, former Senator DeConcini, and Representatives Waxman, Filner, Roybal, Capps, and Harmon. Also with us is former Senator Harris Wofford, who spoke so eloquently at the Grace Cathedral in San Francisco on January 16, and Mark Schneider, former Director of the Peace Corps, which Harris Wofford was instrumental in starting, in which Senator Dodd served as a volunteer in Central America, and in which Alan Cranston believed so deeply. We are also honored to have the presence of three Cabinet members, all from California—Secretary of Transportation Norman Mineta, Secretary of Agriculture Ann Veneman, and Secretary of Veterans Affairs Tony Principi.

Our first speaker has timed it impeccably. (Laughter.) Our first speaker is, fittingly, the lead sponsor of today's tribute. Simply put, Alan Cranston loved Max Cleland—as do I. They first met in 1969, and I'm sure Senator Cleland will talk about that. Alan was truly overjoyed at Max's election to the Senate in 1996. I want to express my gratitude to Max personally and to his staff, Bill Johnstone, Farrar Johnston, and Andy VanLandingham, for all of their help with the arrangements for this event.

And now our first speaker, Senator Max Cleland of Georgia. (Applause.)

Senator MAX CLELAND. Thank you all very much and thank you Jon Steinberg for being uncharacteristically brief. (Laughter.)

I see so many of my colleagues here. Really my first real exposure to the United States Senate came about because Alan Cranston cared. He was an unusual individual. I visited the Dirksen Building here for the first time in December of 1969. I was still basically a patient in the VA hospital system when I was asked to appear before something called the Senate Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs about how the VA was handling returning Vietnam war veterans. That meeting was chaired by a tall, lean freshman California senator named Alan Cranston. I really didn't know him then, but it became the start of a three-decade friendship.

In 1974, I ran unsuccessfully for Lieutenant Governor in Georgia, and, other than my own priority for my own race, my second priority in the whole world in terms of politics was to make sure Alan Cranston got reelected in 1974. Actually, Alan was very kind to me, and brought me out to California, and I got a chance to campaign for him and kind of clear out some of the cobwebs that I had in my own mind about politics and about life. We campaigned together and I found him just as inspiring and invigorating in that campaign as when I had met him in '69.

It's amazing how life works. Little did I know that, as someone from Georgia, someone from California would be critical in my continued service in public life. I did lose my race for lieutenant governor in 1974 and, therefore, was unemployed. Christmas Eve, 1974, I called my friend Jonathan Steinberg, and said "I just wanted to wish you the happiest of holidays" and said "by the way, if you're looking for anybody who wants to work, I'm available." He said, "are you serious?" And I said "I am deadly serious." Well, it was Alan Cranston that made it possible for me to get a $12,500-a-year job on the staff of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee in the spring of 1975. That was more money than I'd ever made in my whole entire life.

I was there a couple of years and, in the summer of 1976, when a young man from Georgia named Jimmy Carter seemed like he was destined to win the Democratic primary, Alan Cranston talked to me and said "I think you ought to be the new head of the Veterans' Administration." That scared me to death. I said, "well, if you really think I can do it, let's go for it." He talked to Senator Nunn and talked to Senator Talmadge. By the August convention of the American Legion, a convention in Seattle, Senator Cranston pulled Jimmy Carter aside and said "I have two requests." I don't know what the other one was, but he said "the second one is to make Max Cleland head of the VA." And Jimmy Carter replied, "I love Max Cleland."

So President Carter wound up in January 1977 as President of the United States, and Alan Cranston wound up as Chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, and I only had two friends in Washington; one was President, and the other was Chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee. (Laughter.) So I was nominated in March of 1977, as the youngest head of the Veterans' Administration, and, thanks to Alan Cranston, I was confirmed in record time, and took over that agency, with really the support of Jon Steinberg and Alan. They were my constant guides, and sometimes spurs, and encouraged me all the way.

One of the things I'm proudest of that we were able to do, is put together something called the Vet Center Program. Alan Cranston, since 1971, had been introducing in the Senate something called psychological readjustment counseling for Vietnam veterans and their families. It would usually pass the Senate, die in the House, and had no Presidential support; but I was able to talk to President Carter, we were able to put the administration behind this legislation. It passed, and we were able to sign it into law, and I put together one of the very first Vet Centers in 1980 in Van Nuys, California. Now, there are some 200 scattered around the country. Some three-and-a-half million veterans and their families have received counseling through this program, and Alan Cranston was basically responsible.

Let me just say that, in 1973, he helped to pass legislation that helped the disabled in this country, that required that federally-funded buildings be made accessible, that promoted the hiring and advancement of people with disabilities by the Federal government. He established something called the Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board, which has the responsibility for setting standards for accessibility and for assisting and forcing compliance with accessibility laws. I was named to that Board by President Carter in 1979.

Throughout the remainder of the 70s, Alan worked to revamp federally-assisted state voc-rehab programs, sponsoring laws that gave priority to the most seriously disabled. In 1980, he sponsored legislation to make some improvements in that program at the VA, and in 1990 he was a leading cosponsor of the Americans with Disabilities Act, which has been a pioneer piece of legislation, as we all know.

I just want you to know that I wouldn't be in the United States Senate, I wouldn't have ever been head of the Veterans' Administration, without the mild-mannered distinguished gentleman from the great state of California. I mourn his passing, and we will miss him. God bless you. (Applause.)

Judge JONATHAN STEINBERG. Thank you very much, Max. Speaking of the ADA, I see Senator Harkin here. We welcome you.

Alan referred to our next speaker as his best friend on the Republican side. They served together as their respective party leaders on the Veterans' Affairs Committee and as Assistant Floor Leaders, or Whips, as they were also called. Another tall, lanky, hairline-challenged Alan, former Senator Alan K. Simpson of Wyoming.

Senator ALAN K. SIMPSON. Jonathan and former colleagues and friends and family, Kim, Colette, Evan, and Eleanor, and Cabinet members, including one Norm Mineta, who I met at the age of 12 in the war relocation center at Hart Mountain. He was behind wire, I wasn't, and I should have been and he shouldn't have. (Laughter.) But, anyway, it's a long, wonderful friendship, with a guy I love, and I'm so damn proud of you, pal, even when you did that when you were in Boy Scouts, I'll never forget. (Laughter.)

Well, it's a great honor and privilege to honor my old friend. To be asked is very, very moving to me, and I want to share just a few memories and thoughts about a very special friend. I came to the Senate in '79. Al was Chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, and that's when I first met Max. I said, "Max, you have a wonderful job there, Secretary of Veterans Affairs; veterans never pick on each other—ha, ha, ha." Well, anyway, it was an interesting time, Max, wasn't it? Well, enough of that. Butch is here and he would correct anything that I said. But it fell to my pleasant luck to soon become the ranking member in 1980, the Reagan Administration. Well, I knew who Al was, I knew of

his journalistic prowess, of his warning to his countrymen about Adolf Hitler, and the two versions of ''Mein Kampf'', one for domestic consumption and one for the naïve and the unwary, and Alan was sending out the alert. I knew of his athletic achievements and his stamina, and I very soon learned of his powerful loyalty to America's veterans.

He was so cordial to me, and his staff, so very helpful to this new, pea-green freshman. And what a staff it was: Jon Steinberg, Ed Scott, Bill Brew, Babette Polzer. Well, I sought their counsel, and plumbed their expertise. Al would occasionally check up on me, ''how are you? Can we be of more help?'' I said, ''I need a lot more help.'' But then I built my own staff. And, oh, to all of you who will be deprived of staff one day. Staff deprivation is a serious issue (laughter); it is the most shocking of the transitions (laughter), and my wife, a beautiful woman of 46 years, she said ''Alan, your staff is gone, you have no staff, they are not here, and I am not one of your staff.'' (Laughter.) But, there was Biblical precedent for this, you look it up in the Good Book, it says, ''Jacob died leaning on his staff''. (Laughter.) Now, so along came Ken Bergquist and one Tony Principi, in those early years. Tony seems to have moved along nicely in life, a wonderful human being with rare gifts, who has been bestowed again on the veterans and the people of this country. He will be serving very wisely and very well as Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and I'm damn proud of you, too, pal.

Tom Harvey then came on. But Tony and Jon Steinberg became a very dynamic duo, they worked with Tom Harvey in those early years. And, as I say then, in '80, I became in the majority, and the first call I received after the election was from Al Cranston. Of course, who else? In that cheery voice, he said ''congratulations, Mr. Chairman.'' Well, I thought, the power, I felt the surge . . . (laughter) . . . and I thought how like him to do that. Well, we cranked out some good legislation together. With Sonny here, another dear friend on the other side of the aisle, and John Paul Hammerschmidt, then Bob Stump, those were men of my faith, my political faith. And Sonny used to sit next to me and say: ''Don't do it pal. I know what you're going to do. Just shut up, won't you?'' (Laughter.) I know we're not going to let that get away now, Sonny.

Anyway, the changing of the guard went well. The only hitch was that all of the veterans organizations had selected National Commanders and Officers from California. Well, you know how that goes. And now their guy was gone, and the cowboy from Wyoming was in the saddle. Well that was very much fun to watch, I loved it. It was painful for Jonathan, but I loved it. And we were able to, when I took over, we were able to get Steinberg's statutory language down to one paragraph in one page. We never let him go two pages with one paragraph. And he had a tendency to do that.

Then, in 1984, I was honored to become the Assistant Majority Leader, and who was the Assistant Minority Leader? Al Cranston. We worked closely together. We enjoyed each other, we trusted each other. We gave good support and counsel to Bob Dole and George Mitchell, and we thought it was a silly idea, but that we oughta make things work. And even when Al was running for President, imagine me, being the ranking member of a committee with Kennedy and Hart and Cranston, all three of them running for President. I went to them and I said ''you cannot use these chores of mine for your great cycle, and I won't ever use the committee to embarrass you'' That's the kind of friendship I had with Ted, with Al, with Gary, it was very special, and it can be that way again. I urge it upon you all. Anyway, he ran for President, he gave it his all, as he did in every phase of his life, but the brass ring eluded, eluded his grip, and he came back to his Senate home, his pride intact. The only time I really, really flustered him, I was flush with power. Now a member of the majority, the fever of the majority burned in my bosom like a hot Gospel. I ambled over to his offices, his spacious offices, great view, two fireplaces, couches, cozy chairs, comfort, oh, and I said ''Al, yes I think this will do very nicely [(laughter)] for my new Whip office.'' And the blood drained from his face. And I said: ''No, no, just kidding, Al. You represent millions, I represent thousands. But when the wind shifts around here, and you Dems have the horses, don't let 'em come around my office with a tape measure and some greedy looking guy with a clipboard.'' And he said, ''it's a deal.'' And we had a handshake. Then the time came, and no one ever darkened my door, no unworthies with tape measures ever came to see me.

So, we legislated together, we argued, we collaborated, we joshed and laughed with each other, we took pleasure in confusing people. Same first name, same hairstyle; ''hairing impaired'' is what we called it in political correctness. Same gaunt, emaciated frame. Same gait, same grin. And, people would come up to me and say, ''I just think the world of you and you ran for President, and your views on the environment and nuclear freeze thrill me to death.'' (Laughter.) And I'd say, ''No, no; I'm Al Simpson,'' and they'd say ''Not you!'' (Laughter.) And Al said he got that in reverse about, you know, twice a month, too, so we would compare that, and our constituents were often not in alignment, you might imagine. But the best one, though, and then I'm going to stop: Cheney, Gulf War, Secretary of Defense, he called and he said, ''we're going over to a game in Baltimore; bring Ann'', and we went over to the game, and 53,000 Oriole fans, ''Hey Cheney, we love ya! Great stuff!'' You know, I said ''Boy, this is getting bad in here.'' We left in the seventh inning and went back down through the bowels, where all the guys, the beer drinkers and the cigar smokers, were, and they went ''Hey, Cheney, baby, you're all right—we love ya!'' And I turned to him and I said, ''You know, they never treated you like this in Casper.'' And a guy from the audience said ''Hey, I know the big guy, too; that's Al Cranston!'' (Laughter.) So, I can assure you he loved that story (laughter), when I told him that.

Well, he handled life well. Stuck to his guns, worked through pain, met life full in the face, as if in a track meet, headed for the tape, and he loved that thrill. Many would have buckled; not Al. The pain of loss of the Presidency, the pain of loss of family members, the pain of loss of Norma to Parkinson's Disease that withered her, that withered their union. The pain of cancer, the pain of accusation and assault by the media, the pain from his peers at that time; we talked about that, oh yes we did, of that sense of being singled out, very painful.

And he left the Senate and went on to vital other things, and meaningful things in his life, undaunted, head high, smile on his face, fire in the belly, finishing the course laid out. And we knew on one unknown day he would be taken from us. And we shall miss him. But not mourn him. For he was a man of vigor and joy and vision. And my life is much richer for having shared a significant piece of it with Alan Cranston. A race well run, my old friend. God rest his soul. (Applause.)

Judge JONATHAN STEINBERG. Senator Simpson, we greatly appreciate your having rearranged your schedule to come down here from New York and we know you have to leave to go back there.

We're going to show a very short film now, it's only two or three minutes, but we thought we ought to have Alan with us.

*Film*

NARRATOR. Moscow, Winter, 1998.

VOICE. Alan, you don't wear a coat in the Russian winter?

ALAN CRANSTON. I don't believe in them.

VOICE. He doesn't believe in them. It's like John Kennedy, it's . . .

NARRATOR. That was Alan in retirement. For most people, a time to slow down. But at 84, as he approached the Russian Duma, Alan Cranston was a man on a lifelong mission.

ALAN CRANSTON. I got into all this way back shortly after Hiroshima and Nagasaki. I met Albert Einstein. He told me, as he told others, that the whole human race could be wiped out by nuclear weapons. I've been working on it ever since.

NARRATOR. And forty years later, after trillions had been spent on weapons of mass destruction, Alan emerged with a collection of allies that astonished even him.

ALAN CRANSTON. One very dramatic moment, when Lee Butler, who had command of all of our nuclear weapons, gave his first public address at the State of the World Forum, in San Francisco, revealing the concerns he had developed about the whole deterrence policy and the ongoing dangers from reliance on nuclear weapons. And, as he spoke, presiding right next to him was Mikhail Gorbachev, the leader of the country that we would have destroyed. At the very end of this remarkable speech, Gorbachev and Butler stood up and embraced each other. That was a very dramatic moment.

Two weeks ago, General Butler and I made public a statement by 48 past and present heads of state and some 75 other national leaders from 48 nations, advocating specific steps towards abolition. Despite these and other favorable developments, there is significant doubt, skepticism, cynicism, and outright opposition to much of this. So, plainly, there is much to do, and we have a lot of hard thinking to do about what is in order. But let me say in closing that I do not believe that we need to wait, and I do not believe that we can afford to wait, until the end of the next century, to fulfill the obligation of our generation to all generations that preceded us and all generations that hopefully will follow us, to deal with the threat to all life that exists and is implicit in nuclear weapons. Thank you.

JUDGE JONATHAN STEINBERG. That film that was pulled together from a larger documentary by George Crile, a former CBS producer, who has developed documentaries on nuclear arms for ''60 Minutes'' and CNN. We are indebted to him and the Global Security Institute, of which Alan Cranston was President, for making that film available to us.

And now we will go a little bit out of order, and hear from one of this event's sponsors, the Senior Senator from California, whose work with Alan Cranston goes back many, many years and who, among many other achievements, carried on successfully with some very important environmental initiatives that Senator Cranston began.

Senator Dianne Feinstein of California. (Applause.)

Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN. Thank you very much. Thank you. It's really a great honor and a privilege to be here. I just want to recognize two members of the California House delegation that came in. First is Lois Capps, from the Santa Barbara area, and Jane Harmon, from the southern Los Angeles area. And I'm not sure whether Paul Wellstone and Jeff Bingaman were introduced earlier, but I want everybody to know that they're here, too.

Alan Simpson is a hard act to follow, there's no question about that. I look at life this way: That we're here but for an instant in an eternity. No one really knows when that instant is over, and the only thing that really matters is what we do with that instant. Because, when it's over, there's nothing we can take with us other than the legacy, leave behind. Alan Cranston first came into my life in 1962, and that's when I first met his sister, R.E., and it was in his campaign for State Controller; believe it or not, it was the first campaign for which I ever volunteered, and so I've always kind of taken a special interest in a lot of his achievements. From that point on, I found this former long distance runner really to be a tireless workhorse for all Californians, and, as a matter of fact, for all Americans. This was a man who really loved the intricacies of the legislative process. He was the consummate vote counter. He possessed the uncanny ability to assess competing camps, to quickly find where votes would fall and determine whether the best course of action was to fight or compromise. Unfortunately, neither my friend Barbara Boxer nor I really had an opportunity to work with him in his nearly quarter of a century here in the Senate, but I think these traits are legendary, I think they're known by all.

Alan Cranston yielded a whole array of wonderful accomplishments, but I want to just concentrate today on a few things in the environment. And, in the true sprit of the legendary Californian conservationist John Muir, Alan Cranston became a very passionate architect of measures to preserve our God-given natural treasures. Alan Cranston was the original author of something called the Desert Protection Act. Shortly after I won in 1993, and knew I was coming to Washington, the phone rang, and Alan said, ''Would you be willing to take over the effort to pass a Desert Protection Act?'' And I said, ''Of course.'' And we came back and we revised the language, rewrote the bill somewhat, changed some of the concepts, and moved it ahead. But, the basic originator of this, let there be no doubt, was Alan Cranston. The bill was filibustered, but we were lucky in the Senate, we got it through, and it became a reality in 1994. And the legislation created the largest park and wilderness designation in our nation. Over six million acres, two new National Parks, Death Valley and Joshua Tree, and one National Preserve, the East Mojave. And so because of that, we have actually protected, well I said six, but it's actually closer to seven million acres of pristine California desert wilderness for all time. Thank you, Alan Cranston.

He was also the lead sponsor of legislation which established the Golden Gate and the Santa Monica National Recreation Area, the Channel Islands National Park, a 48,000 acre addition to the Redwoods National Park, and the inclusion of Mineral King into the Sequoia National Park. He also sponsored twelve different wilderness bills that became law between 1969 and 1982. He helped close Death Valley National Monument to open-pit mining. He helped craft the Endangered Species Act, the Marine Mammal Protection Act, and with just two bills, on which he teamed with the late and wondrous Phillip Burton of San Francisco, the Omnibus Parks Act of 1978, and the Alaska Lands Act of 1980, as much acreage was placed under federal protection as all the park lands created earlier in the twentieth century combined.

So, I can truthfully say, without his service, America would have been a different, and certainly a poorer place, in terms of our environment and the quality of life for many of our citizens. Alan Cranston leaves a legacy of preservation that will be remembered and enjoyed and certainly by his beautiful seven-year granddaughter Evan, who is here today. And I think, for my granddaughter, for Barbara's grandson, and for all of us, who really look at this land and want to do what we can to protect it.

This was a very special Californian. And life wasn't always easy for Alan, either. But I think his ability to keep his eye on the goal, to establish what he established, whether it was from the translation of Mein Kampf, to his work against nuclear devastation, to his environmental record, Alan Cranston truly lived that instant in eternity, and he has truly left us a good legacy. Thank you very much. (Applause.)

Judge JONATHAN STEINBERG. I'm sure there are others that I failed to mention. I thank Senator Feinstein. I know that Senator Reid is also here, and again I apologize if I missed anyone.

No Senator has worked on more causes closer to Alan Cranston's heart and soul than has Senator Edward M. Kennedy. I am particularly grateful to him, because it was through his chief counsel, Jim Flug, who is also here today, that I was introduced to and came to work for Alan in 1969. Senator Cranston and Senator Kennedy served together for 12 years on the Labor and Human Resources Committee, which Senator Kennedy chaired from 1987 to 1995 and again for 17 days this year.

Our next speaker, Senator Ted Kennedy of Massachusetts. (Applause.)

Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY. Thank you, Jonathan. To Kim, and Colette, and Evan, and R.E.—let me begin by saying that I loved Alan Cranston too. I will never forget the 24 years of friendship and leadership and achievement with which he graced the Senate and the nation. And so it's a special privilege and honor for me to be part of this tribute today. Alan is profoundly missed by his family and friends, his colleagues in the Congress, and by all those around the world who pursue the great goals of hope and progress and peace.

I must say—I grew up thinking Cranston was a city in Rhode Island. But Alan taught each of us that Cranston stands for something else as well—the very best in public service.

Alan loved to lead behind the scenes—for 14 of those 24 Senate years with us, he was our Democratic whip, and he wrote the book about the job. In those great years, we used to tease Alan about the position, because so few people outside Congress knew what it involved. Since Alan was from California, a lot of people thought the Minority Whip was the name of a Leather Bar in Malibu. (Laughter.)

But seriously, Alan was a giant of his day on many issues, and his concern for social justice made him a leader on them all. We served together for many years on the Labor Committee and especially the Health Subcommittee, and his insights were indispensable. I always felt that if we'd had another Alan Cranston or two in those years, we'd have actually passed our Health Security Act, and made health care the basic right for all that it ought to be, instead of just an expensive privilege for the few.

Perhaps the greatest legacy that Alan left us was his able and tireless work for democracy and world peace. Every village in the world is closer to that goal today because of Alan. No one in the Senate fought harder or more effectively for our nuclear weapons freeze in the 1980's, or for nuclear arms control. His hope for a nuclear-free future still represents the highest aspiration of millions—even billions—throughout the world.

I also recall Alan's pioneering efforts to press for Senate action to end the war in Vietnam, and his equally able leadership for civil rights at home and human rights around the world. We know how deeply he felt about injustice to anyone anywhere. And his leadership in the battle against apartheid in South Africa was indispensable.

Throughout his brilliant career, the causes of civil rights and human rights were central to Alan's being and his mission—and America and the world are better off today because Alan Cranston passed this way.

A key part of all his achievements was his unique ability to translate his ideals into practical legislation. Few if any Senators have been as skilled as Alan in the art of constructive legislative compromise that fairly leads to progress for the nation.

He was a vigorous supporter of the Peace Corps, a strong overseer of its performance, and a brilliant advocate for all the Peace Corps Volunteers. He was a champion for health coverage for returning Volunteers, and one of the first to understand that good health coverage had to include mental health services as well.

In many ways, his first love was the Peace Corps, and I know that President Kennedy would have been very proud of him. Even before he came to the Senate, he had his first contact with the Corps, as a consultant to Sargent Shriver. As Alan often said, he became involved because he was so inspired by my brother's vision of a world where Americans of all ages could work side-by-side with peoples throughout the world to put an end to poverty.

Because of Alan, the Peace Corps today is thriving as never before—free of the partisan tensions that divide us on other issues—spreading international understanding of Alan's and America's best ideals—educating new generations of young Americans about our common heritage as travelers on spaceship earth—teaching us about the beauty, the richness, and the diversity of other peoples, other languages, other cultures and about the enduring importance of the greatest pursuit of all—the pursuit of peace.

Near the end of John Bunyan's ''Pilgrim's Progress,'' there is a passage that tells of the death of Valiant:

''Then, he said, I am going to my Father's. And though with great difficulty I am got hither, yet now I do not regret me of all the trouble I have been at to arrive where I am. My sword I give to him that shall succeed me in my pilgrimage, and my courage and skill to him that can get it. My marks and scars I carry with me, to be a witness for me, that I have fought his battle who now will be my rewarder.

''When the day that he must go hence was come, many accompanied him to the riverside, into which as he went, he said, 'Death, where is thy sting?' and as he went down deeper, he said, 'Grave, where is thy victory?' So he passed over, and all the trumpets sounded for him on the other side.''

We loved you, Alan. We miss you. And we always will. (Applause.)

Judge JONATHAN STEINBERG. Thank you, Senator.

Our next speaker was elected to the Senate seat that Alan occupied when he retired in 1993. She and Senator Cranston collaborated on many matters while she served in the House of Representatives, and she authored with Senator Feinstein a lovely resolution of tribute to Senator Cranston that was adopted by the Senate on January 22. On behalf of Alan's family and his extended family and all his friends, we express our gratitude for this most gracious action.

Senator Barbara Boxer of California. (Applause.)

Senator BARBARA BOXER. Thank you. To Alan's family, beautiful family, and to my dear colleagues who are here, it certainly has been my honor for the past eight years to serve in the seat that was held by Alan Cranston for 24 years.

Alan was a deeply caring human being and he cared even for those whose distant cries were not always heard in Washington.

From civil rights to arms control, from cleaning up the environment to improving the lives of our nation's veterans—Alan's work knew no geographic boundaries. But, sometimes Alan's legacy on women's rights gets overlooked and that is what I'm going to speak about today.

From his earliest days in the Senate, Alan made improving the lives of women a priority. In 1969, he supported the Equal Rights Amendment. Remember the ERA. It failed. But, in 1972 he became a proud cosponsor again of the ERA, and it passed. But he didn't stop there—he wrote letters and he got on the phone to California legislators considering the measure, urging their support, and his work paid off and California ratified it that same year. Unfortunately, not all the states followed suit. But Alan did not stop his advocacy. He continued over the next decade to push for the Amendment's ratification and when time ran out, he cosponsored another ERA in 1983 and another one in 1985, even before he knew he was going to have a granddaughter. Alan would not give up.

He worked to eliminate gender discrimination in the workplace. He was the principal author of the Equal Employment Opportunity Act Amendments of 1972, which extended protections against gender discrimination to federal employees in the workplace. And he was the very first member of Congress to introduce legislation aimed at eliminating wage discrimination in the federal workplace.

Alan understood the challenges faced by working mothers. He worked to provide child care for this nation's working families, introducing some of the first ever legislation to provide care both before and after school. He knew that many kids were without adult supervision, and I was so proud when under the Clinton Administration, we saw after-school funding increase from $1 million in 1997 to $845 million in 2001. Alan, you laid the ground work for that.

He also worked tirelessly to protect a women's right to choose, authoring the Freedom of Choice Act to codify *Roe* v. *Wade*. I proudly carry that bill now. He pushed for increased access to family planning services for low-income women and teenagers, and fought to provide medical care to low-income pregnant women, who otherwise would have been left without it and would not have had healthy babies.

And he didn't stop there. He sought to level the financial playing field for women, pushing for laws prohibiting discrimination against women trying to obtain credit. And we forget today when we open our mailboxes and we keep getting all these applications for credit cards, there was a time when a woman could not get any credit. We thank you, Alan, although we have to restrain ourselves now and then. We appreciate the work you did.

Alan was responsible for the first appointment of a woman to the federal court bench in California. I've personally, and I know Dianne, we've recommended many women; five of those that I recommended to President Clinton were nominated and confirmed. Alan laid that ground work too.

An advocate for equal education for young women, he fought hard for Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, and you know what that is, equal opportunity for our children, for our girls in athletics.

And the list goes on and I will stop there with it, because it could go on and on. But I stand before you today, as a Senator who is carrying on the progressive work of Alan Cranston. His belief that women are equal has borne fruit.

If you look around today in the Senate, there are 13 women Senators from both parties. That's just in this building. Next door—and we have a couple here—there are 61 women in the House. We are doing better now, but as my friend Barbara Mikulski often says, it takes the ''Sir Galahads,'' to get us there, and Alan was definitely a Sir Galahad.

I'm just going to tell you one quick personal story, and then I'll end. Alan decided to retire, I ran for the seat and won the seat, and about a year later, he made an appointment to come to see me. Now, I know this, the family must know this, but unlike the Whip's office, which someone else must have decorated, Alan's personal office here in the Hart building was not the most beautiful place, because this was not important to Alan. It was dark; it was dark leather and dark walls and the blinds were drawn, and that was it. Alan just saw it as a place to work—files all over the floor. So when I got into the office, I said: ''Let's brighten it up. Let's bring California.'' And I ordered all of these green plants, and we opened up all the shades and we painted the walls peach and we got peach and green fabrics, and I mean, it was different. So I thought, you know, Alan was coming to see me about arms control, but I was excited that he was going to see what had happened to his office. And he came in and he sat down, and he sat there and his first thing is, ''You've got to be more aggressive on arms control.'' Now that's the first time anyone ever told me to be more aggressive on anything. (Laughter.) But he started to lecture me and, you know, time went on, it was an hour, he still hadn't said a thing about the room. So, finally, I got up my courage, and I said, ''So Alan, what do you think of the office?'' And he looked around, and he looked around, and he said, ''You moved my desk.'' (Laughter.) That was it.

Alan said about his role as Senator, and I quote him, when he retired: ''It has been a privilege I have cherished and for which I can never adequately thank the people of California.'' Let me take this moment on behalf of the people of California to say to Alan Cranston thank you and your work lives on. (Applause.)

Judge JONATHAN STEINBERG. Thank you very much, Senator Boxer, and thank you for being with us so long. I couldn't help but note when you talked about women and forging the way for women, that the U.S. Army Strings that played at the beginning of our ceremony today was composed of four women from the U.S. Army. And no men.

I want also to acknowledge the presence here of Senator Daniel Akaka, of the Democratic Leader, Senator Tom Daschle, and of Senator Hollings of South Carolina. We appreciate their presence with us very much.

Known to all veterans' advocates as ''Mr. Chairman'', our next speaker was the counterpart in the House to Senator Cranston and Senator Simpson as the Chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in the other body, as it is affectionately called. He and Alan had to resolve many sticky and tricky issues over the 14 years that he led the House Committee, and they were always able to do so with congeniality and mutual respect.

He has been a great friend to me personally, as has been his Committee staff. I now introduce Former Representative Sonny Montgomery of Mississippi, ''Mr. Chairman''. (Applause.)

Representative G.V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY. Thanks very much, Jon.

To the family of Senator Cranston, my colleagues on this panel, cabinet members, other distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen.

I'd like to thank you, Judge Steinberg and others for letting me participate in the remarks of this Memorial Tribute to Senator Alan Cranston.

Alan and I became friends because he was Chairman of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee and I was Chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee, and we both enjoyed working for veterans and their families. Alan was a veteran of World War II and had really a good feel for veterans issues.

You know, at first, I was a little uncomfortable working with the great Senator from California. I am kinda the hand-shaking, pat-on-the-back congressman whereas Alan was in great physical shape, and he would look down on me and say ''I am sure we can work together'' and we did.

He had a couple of veterans functions out in California and asked me to come out.

Going from one veterans meeting to another in different towns in California, we stopped at this restaurant, and he said they made the best vegetable soup in California. People recognized him when he walked in, but Alan wanted the soup and didn't work the crowd, so to speak.

I said to Steinberg, ''explain to me'', and he did, in California you had millions of people and you just don't work the crowds. (Laughter.) So, I found out about that.

Alan did many good things for veterans, and I will mention a few.

He was the architect of the Veterans Readjustment Counseling Act that Max Cleland mentioned. There are 206 centers to help Vietnam veterans to readjust and Alan did pass this legislation in 1979.

He had a strong interest in veterans health care and he passed legislation that gave thousands of veterans more access to health care. He pushed for more outpatient clinics, and more veterans use outpatient clinic facilities now and the VA, I'm happy to say, has been able to cut back on the number of hospital beds in our 172 hospitals, because of Alan Cranston and our outpatient clinics.

He was part of our team that established the U.S. Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims and worked very hard for the upgrade of the VA to a Cabinet department.

Some member of Congress, and what a mistake he made, introduced legislation to tax veterans disability compensation. Senator Cranston went berserk, he killed this tax legislation before it even saw the light of day, and he was right.

Alan was very helpful in establishing educational benefits for veterans who completed their military obligation, and, he saw to it that the educational benefits go to the actives as well as the National Guard and Reserve.

As big as California is and the many government programs that the state has, I believe he really enjoyed working for veterans and their families more than other issues in government.

He was a friend of the veteran and veterans organizations knew they could count on Alan, and he came through for them.

We all miss him and know even in Heaven Alan has an exercise program going. (Laughter and applause.)

Judge JONATHAN STEINBERG. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I want to note Senator Jeffords who has just joined us. We appreciate your being here.

Next, we will hear from a former colleague of Alan's who knew him long before he became a United States Senator or held any public office. He very graciously called last Thursday to offer to say a few words in tribute to Alan. I now introduce former Representative and Independent Presidential candidate, John B. Anderson of Illinois. (Applause.)

Representative JOHN B. ANDERSON. Thank you very much, Judge Steinberg, and my distinguished former colleagues in both the

House and the Senate, distinguished members of the cabinet, and Alan's family. I count it an honor indeed to be included in the group that is privileged this afternoon to say just a few words about the career of this very remarkable man. You have already heard a great deal about his commitment to the cause of civil rights, women's rights, conservation, the environment, veterans' affairs. I will not attempt to repeat the comments or the praise that could continue to be heaped upon him for the efforts that he exerted in all of those fields. But, as a member of the ''other body'' for 12 of the 24 years that Alan Cranston served in the Senate, I was well aware of the distinguished record that he had compiled in that body. And I would simply again state what has already been remarked that earlier than most he saw the folly of our entanglement in Southeast Asia, and I remember his very clear and clairvoyant voice calling for an end to the struggle there. He called for more than that, for an end to the arms race.

And it's really to that vision that he had in this particular realm of international affairs that I wanted to direct my very brief remarks this afternoon. Because, as a very young man he was gifted with a passion for achieving peace in our time that was shaped as someone said about a former President, I forget who it was, he had a vision that enabled him to peer around a corner of history, to see what lay beyond. In short, he was, indeed, a globalist long before globalization had become a term used in common parlance.

And it was just two years after the founding of the United World Federalists in Asheville, North Carolina, that young Alan Cranston at the age of 35 became the President of that organization and served until 1951. One of his mentors was the late, distinguished Grenville Clark, who, along with Lewis B. Sonn, wrote that very magisterial work on world peace through world law. And that indeed was the vision that Alan Cranston had. He had a vision of a democratic world federation that would emerge from what was then, when he was president of the United World Federalists, still a very nascent United Nations. He maintained that interest and served on the Board of Advisors of the World Federalists Association until his recent death.

Upon his retirement from the Senate in 1994, and this is the point, I think, that I wanted the opportunity to emphasize here this afternoon, he did not regard his career as ended. I read the account of the marvelous memorial service conducted in San Francisco just three weeks ago, in Grace Cathedral, where his son was quoted as saying that he had said that ''when the end comes, I want to be able somehow to still struggle across the finish line with my head up.'' And he added to that that when the end came, he was still sprinting; he was not merely struggling, he was sprinting in pursuit of the goals that he sought. And he became a leading and a very strong voice in civil society in the area that, at the end of his life, I am convinced, lay closest to his heart. It was the interest in disarmament, an end to the threat of nuclear war and the achievement of world peace through world law. And he believed that that could be achieved only through the application and the use of the same federalist principles that had inspired the Framers of our Constitution to write a Constitution that would bring about peace and domestic tranquillity among the then 13 independent sovereignties who had found that under the Articles of Confederation their bonds of unity had become frayed. And it was Alan's belief, building on that historical fact, that only with a restructured and an empowered United Nations, one capable of maintaining peace with justice, that we would recognize the goal that he sought, of world peace through world law.

It's been mentioned, I think, already, that he served as President of the Global Security Institute, a non-profit organization dedicated to disarmament and world peace. He saw security not simply as an issue confined within the narrow boundaries of nationalism but as an issue that required the forging of new bonds of global cooperation.

And one of the last and most vivid memories that I personally have of Alan Cranston was less than three years ago, when the Hague Appeal for Peace drew thousands of peace activists from around the world to the Hague, to celebrate, to commemorate the one-hundredth anniversary of the first Hague peace conference. Alan was there as one of the leading spokespersons from the United States. And again, one of the memorable experiences of that international meeting was to attend one of its sessions and to hear him describe how he was even then busy working on a book, a book on sovereignty, a book that would seek to explain that, in this new millennium, the old Westphalian theory of state sovereignty was simply not sufficient unto the needs of our present age, and we had to reconceptualize that term in a way that would allow the formation of democratic global institutions that would carry out the goals of disarmament and build a world in which peace could be achieved through reliance on the rule of law.

Those are the memories that I will certainly carry with me, as inspiration for the remainder of my life, and I thank you, Alan Cranston, for the things that you did, both in the Senate, and then in those very important years when you carried forth your ideas and lived for your ideals as a strong member of American civil society. (Applause.)

Judge JONATHAN STEINBERG. I think that gave us all an important glimpse of the formation of Alan Cranston's philosophy and thinking and I know that there are a number of people from those early days in the United World Federalists who are here today, including Neil Potter and Ted Waller, who worked with Alan so many years ago at the founding of that organization.

Our next speaker has served for 26 years in the House of Representatives. He worked very closely with Alan on many initiatives of significance to their California constituents and particularly to the children of their state and the children of the entire country. We are very grateful that he has taken time to be with us throughout this entire ceremony this afternoon.

Representative George Miller of California. (Applause.)

Representative GEORGE MILLER. Well thank you, and to all of you, to family and friends, and colleagues. I am very, very pleased to be able to participate in this memorial to an extraordinary life, to clearly one of the leading California statesmen of the 20th century.

My familiarity with Alan Cranston goes back long before my politics, when as a young boy, I sat in the living room of our home and listened to Alan Cranston and my father and many other California politicians plot campaigns and create and organize the California Democratic Council, which changed the politics of California, changed the Democratic Party in California, launched their careers, and later the careers of so many other progressive politicians in the State of California. It was a profound organization, in terms of its influence in California. In the post-war, in the conservative years, it was an organization, that led by Alan, would speak out on nuclear arms control, on civil rights, on the rights of labor—these issues that became the cornerstone for so many of us who later sought to run for political life in the State of California.

I think it's rather fitting that we remember Alan at this time. Because we can remember when a conservative administration came to this town twenty years ago and sought to launch an attack on programs for the poor, on women and the ill, on foster care and adoption, on child health, on handicapped education, and so many other programs that were targeted for elimination. Alan and his colleagues not only led that fight, but participated in it, stood their ground, and fought against those efforts, and today, when we see a new administration arriving in town, we're no longer talking about the elimination of these programs, we're talking about making them work better. We recognize the beneficiaries of these programs, and the benefits to our society. We now see that, in fact, because of the fight that was made a long time ago, we now have a legacy of understanding the role and the importance that government plays in so many American's lives, and the necessity of it. We've heard it with respect to veterans, we've heard it with respect to the environment, to women, and to so many others in American society.

Many of us would think that if you look at the last quarter of the 20th century in American politics, you would think of extreme ideological behavior, you'd think of political chaos, and you would suggest that not a lot got done. But, as already had been mentioned here, if you look at the legacy and the workload and the work product of Alan Cranston, you would recognize that, in fact, it was a golden age of legislation for people like Alan Cranston. He was able to put his signature and his work into so many efforts that became the law of the land. I recall two of those, working with him as a colleague in the House. One was in the 70s; in the late 70s, after five years of working together, of holding hearings, site visits, talking with families and children, we put together legislation to deal with the problems of foster care, to children who were trapped in a system from which they could not escape, families who could not get their children back from that system, and the impact that it had on these children. That law was later signed by President Carter, and it was Alan's tenacity that allowed us to get it through.

The other one of course, that's been mentioned here, is the California Desert. Alan started pioneering that effort so many years ago, so many years before we actually considered it on the floor of the House or the Senate. Where he walked over those areas, he hiked over them, he spent time with the constituents who were interested in them, with the organizations that were trying to preserve them. Kim has spent much time in that area. And, after Alan left the Senate, I managed the bill on the floor of the House. The opponents were numerous; we used to have to have security and armed guards to go into the hearings on the California Desert Bill. They held the controversial ones in Beverly Hills, so that people would have trouble getting there, it was a grand ploy. And it worked. But, in any case, the opposition in the House was incredible. We spent many, many, many, many days debating this legislation, on again, off again, part of the day, into the night. They filed numerous amendments, all of which had unlimited debate time. They had a coterie of people who would speak on every amendment for the maximum time allowed, so that they could delay this bill and not see it enacted. I called Alan and I said, ''Alan, we've got to accept some amendments to speed this along. The members of the House are starting to call me Moses, they've said they've been in the desert for so long on this legislation.'' I said,

''Some of these amendments, what can we accept to narrow this down'', and he said, ''None''. And I said, ''Alan, this is the House, it will never stop'', and he said, ''None''. He said ''We can't accept them''. I talked to him about a couple of amendments to move the boundaries, he said, ''No, I've been there; I've been there and if you go to the bottom of that canyon, you're going to find a little spring down there—most people don't know it exists. You can't put that outside the park, that's going to have to be in.'' Well, it's turned out he was right. Dianne managed the bill on the Senate floor, and Bill Clinton signed it into law, and now it's one of our leading attractions in the nation and certainly in the State of California. Those who opposed it are now seeking authorizations and appropriations for visitors centers and various support systems for the park. (Laughter.) The Chambers of Commerce now think that this is a cash register and they'd like to have it expanded, they'd like to have the boundaries expanded, they'd like to have the protections upgraded, so that more visitors would come and bless their economy. It was Alan Cranston's foresight that brought that about.

You know, the political mentor to so many of us, Phil Burton, used to say to us that when you came to the House or you came to the Senate, that it was a privilege and it was an honor, and you had to pay the rent, you had to pay the rent all the time to stay there. And I think that Alan fully understood that while this clearly was the world's most exclusive club, he still had to pay the rent, and he did over and over and over again, on behalf of so many Americans, on behalf of our environment, on behalf of world peace, on behalf of human rights. He paid the rent constantly to earn his right to stay here and to work and to work and to work on behalf of all of us. And I think we should thank him, for all of the fights that he made, and all of the ground that he stood, on behalf of America, and all of its people. Thank you very much, Alan. (Applause.)

Judge JONATHAN STEINBERG. Thank you, Representative Miller.

Next, we will hear from a Senator who served on two Committees with Alan—Banking and Foreign Relations—where they shared many common interests. Senator Kerry was a highly decorated veteran of Vietnam and a co-founder of the Vietnam Veterans of America, an organization which was to play an important role in the enactment of much legislation that he and Senator Cranston championed, particularly the Veterans' Judicial Review Act that created the Court on which I am honored to serve along with another former Member of Congress who is also with us today, Chief Judge Ken Kramer.

Senator Kerry succeeded to the Democratic leadership of the Banking Committee's Housing Subcommittee, which Senator Cranston had chaired from 1987 to 1993. Also, I know that Senator Kerry shares the passion that Senator Cranston lived and breathed for ending the threat of nuclear annihilation.

Senator John Kerry of Massachusetts. (Applause.)

Senator JOHN KERRY. Thank you, Jonathan. Kim, Colette, Evan, and R.E., it's a very special privilege to join with all of you today in remembering the remarkable life and achievements of our friend, Alan Cranston.

As we've heard today, and as we all know, Alan was a sprinter, a record-holding sprinter, who, in his sixties, was only two seconds slower than he was in his twenties when he set the records. And I think it's safe to say that those who knew him well would agree that he really sprinted through life; he sprinted through the United States Senate, always with a yellow pad in his hand and a felt-tip pen, covered with ink, with more things on that pad to do in one day than most of us would venture to accomplish in a week or a month, and he got them done. And always with this incredible, mischievous twinkle in his eye. He had fun advocating and challenging the system.

One of the most enduring images of Alan would be at the Iowa caucuses in 1984 at the Holiday Inn in Keokuk, Iowa, where he was seen sprinting barefooted down 40-meter hallways, then he'd walk back, and he'd repeat the exercise for about 40 minutes. And I think that understanding that, we can understand why it was no coincidence that Alan's favorite hotel was the Chicago O'Hare Hilton, where they had 250-meter hallways. (Laughter.)

Three weeks ago in California, we had a tender goodbye to our friend, this sprinter, at a memorial service—calling to mind the many ways in which he enriched our lives and this country.

There in the Grace Cathedral, we heard Colette Cranston say that in death Alan Cranston ''has become my Jiminy Cricket—that little voice in [her] conscience that says, 'Colette, think before you leap.'" It would not be an exaggeration to say that that warning was a characteristic of Alan—think before you leap, and, most of all, he wanted us to think, he wanted us to look, and, by God, he wanted us to leap. He implored us to put a public face on policy. He wanted us to think not in terms of statistics and numbers and programs, but in terms of people; and the people he spoke of most often, as all of my colleagues who served with him will remember, were senior citizens, children, those without decent housing, immigrants, those in need of a helping hand regardless of race or religion. He was a moral voice, a voice of conscience, someone who understood that even as he remained vigilant in defending the needs and wishes of his home state of California, he was also a global citizen and he knew and felt the responsibilities of this institution, towards the rest of the world.

Through four terms as a United States Senator, he also remained a man of enormous humility—on his answering machine he was simply ''Alan''—as he was to so many who worked with him and knew him. And this personal sense of place and of restraint made it easy to underestimate the contributions that he made to the Senate, and to our country. Certainly he never paused long enough to personally remind us of the impact of his service, of the history that he was a part of and the lives that he touched.

I first met Alan in 1971 when I had returned from Vietnam and many of our veterans were part of an effort to end what we thought was a failed policy in that country. In Alan Cranston we found one of the few Senators willing not just to join in public opposition to the war in Vietnam, but to become a voice of healing for veterans of the war—a statesman whose leadership enabled others, over time, to separate their feelings about the war from their feelings for the veterans of the war. At a time when too many wanted literally to disown this country's own veterans, Alan Cranston offered them a warm embrace. He was eager to do something all too rare in Washington: To listen—and he listened to veterans who had much to say, much of it ignored for too long. He honored their pride and their pain with his sensitivity and his understanding.

That's when I first came to see the great energy and the commitment that he brought to issues affecting veterans, especially those of the Vietnam era. He was deeply involved on veterans' health care issues, among the first to fight for the recognition of post-Vietnam stress syndrome, a leader in insisting, together with Sonny Montgomery, on the extension of coverage under the VA, under the GI Bill. And when the Agent Orange issue came to the fore, Alan insisted on getting answers from a government that was unresponsive. He made sure that veterans and their families got the care that they needed. Under his leadership, together with his partner in the House, they increased GI Bill benefits for Vietnam veterans—and I tell you that that was a time when veterans too often had to fight for what was their simple due, whether it was a memorial here in Washington, or simply to have the government recognize that it was a war, and not simply a conflict. Alan's leadership made all the difference. It's a sad truth in our history that a weary nation indeed seemed eager to turn its back on the entire war by also turning its back on so many veterans. It should forever be a source of pride to the Cranston family that Alan was chief among those who insisted that America honor that service and keep faith with sons who left pieces of themselves and years of their lives on the battlefield in Vietnam.

This was a man who fought with extraordinary passion for everything. And he fought at the most difficult of times. Not just for veterans, but as we've heard from others today, he fought against all that war represents—remembering that war, and the killing that follows it, is the ultimate failure of diplomacy.

Alan Cranston was above all else a man of peace. And he was a man of peace not as a matter of public policy, but as a matter of personal passion. Remember: This was a man who, in 1934, found himself in the same room as Adolf Hitler. Five years later, he wrote a critical English translation of Adolf Hitler's ''Mein Kampf'' in an effort to reveal the German leader's true plans. And he wore Hitler's ensuing lawsuit as a badge of honor, proud that he had stood up to try and warn the English-speaking world about the evils of Nazism.

Throughout the rest of his service he used public office to force Americans to listen to other prescient warnings—about nuclear war, about the arms race, about hopes for peace that he refused to give up even as others chose to beat the drums of war.

Senator Cranston came to his famous commitment, as we learned from the film, after meeting with Albert Einstein in 1946. And he left that meeting convinced that he had found his mission and he would indeed spend the balance of his life arguing that conviction before the world.

As a member of the Senate leadership and a senior voice on the Democratic side of the Foreign Relations Committee, he worked tirelessly to reduce the nuclear threat. Obviously, there were many of those efforts, but one of the most unpublicized was his effort through the 1970s and 80's, when he convened a unique group known as the ''SALT Study Group''. A senators-only gathering monthly in his office, off the record, face-to-face to define the confines of the debate. He knew the impact that quiet diplomacy could have on the issues, but on this issue above all that he cared about the most.

He loved the Peace Corps, and he fought for it. He fought to attach human rights conditions on aid to El Salvador. He was a leading national advocate for the mutual verifiable freeze. He was always an idealist whose increase in political power, gratefully, was always met by progress for the issues that he cared about so deeply. It was not just the work of a career, but the work of a lifetime—and after he left the Senate, we all know the remarkable commitment that he

continued with Mikhail Gorbachev and ultimately in his founding of the Global Security Institute.

He did that because he sensed that the end of the Cold War, with all of the opportunity that it afforded, which he understood, still left us a world that was more dangerous, and he was haunted by the threat of nuclear terrorism. We missed his voice in the debate on the test ban treaty, and we miss him even more today.

When he left the Senate, Alan reflected on his service and he said of his own legacy, simply: ''Most of all, I have dedicated myself to the cause of peace.''

That dedication was real, it was lasting, and the legacy of peace for a good and peaceful man who gave living embodiment to Culbertson's simple, stubborn faith that ''God and the politicians willing, the United States can declare peace upon the world, and win it.'' That belief was Alan Cranston—and it's a belief still worth fighting for. (Applause.)

Judge JONATHAN STEINBERG. Our concluding speaker from this body is also one of its newest members. She traveled to California three weeks ago, as did Senator Kerry, as he told us, to attend the ceremony attended by over a thousand persons at the Grace Cathedral in San Francisco. For reasons that I know she will share with us, she will be—along with Max Cleland—a living legacy of Alan Cranston in the United States Senate.

Senator Maria Cantwell of Washington. (Applause.)

Senator MARIA CANTWELL. Thank you. To Kim and Colette and Evan and R.E., thank you for allowing me to share this occasion to remember Alan and to have been there a few weeks ago and to see so many of the friends and faces that Alan touched.

People today have talked about Alan's legislative career—the many pieces of legislation that will live with us for a long time. But I'd like to share with you today maybe a different Alan Cranston that I knew as I worked on his Presidential campaign in 1983 and 1984. Some people might think running for President is a glorious task, but it is a very difficult one that I think Alan knew would help aid the cause and message that he wanted to fight for. In fact, I'm not from Washington state originally; it was Alan Cranston that dropped me off there in 1983. In fact, the first time I ever visited, I was a part of his presidential campaign staff, in which he left me at SEA–TAC Airport in Seattle and went on about his business to campaign. But people who knew Alan knew that he jumped into that race to deliver a message for the right reason. I was fortunate enough to have read R.E.'s book about Alan, and knew all the things that Alan had fought through in his life, some of the things that have been mentioned today. About being sued by Adolf Hitler for translating in next to no time a version of ''Mein Kampf''. Being a pre-World War II journalist and being smart enough to understand what was going to be advocated and running back to the United States and having that published. And all of the other wonderful things that Alan did in helping women, and on the environment; one thing I haven't heard mentioned today is his work with Native Americans, which is something that I recognize.

But what was amazing about Alan from a personal perspective, and you definitely get to know someone from a personal perspective when you travel with him on a presidential campaign, is that Alan was very self disciplined. John Kerry talked about his running, and that was something that was very important to Alan on a daily basis. And, yes, I can attest to the fact that he did sprint in the hotel corridors when you didn't schedule time for him to run outside. But, when Alan, challenged with the fact that maybe some of the other hotel guests found it shocking to find somebody so tall and long running down the halls at 7:30 in the morning, the Senator replied, ''well maybe I should start at 6:30 instead.'' (Laughter.)

But Alan never complained about that task. And for me, in Washington state, there were lots of World Federalists, a lot of people part of the nuclear freeze movement, a lot of people very appreciative of his efforts on the environment. But Alan was also a very self-deprecating person when it came to making a moment light. And I'll never forget the time in Vancouver, Washington, where hundreds of people had showed up at eight-thirty on a Sunday morning, I think it was the Fourth of July, to hear his message about the nuclear freeze. And when he mistakenly called the host of the event, whose name was ''June'', ''Jane'', and he heard a gasp from the audience, he quickly looked down at his program and saw that he had mistakenly called her the wrong name, and all of a sudden started pounding on his chest, saying, ''Me Tarzan! You Jane!'' (Laughter.) Which put everybody at ease, and Alan went on to give his very important remarks to a community that I don't think has seen since the likes of Alan Cranston.

And yet, when you run a Presidential campaign, you also are a spokesperson for your issues. But I never saw Alan take advantage of that situation, where he was trying to make more than the situation called for. In fact, he was very reserved in his comments. I remember being with him on August 31, in 1983, when the Korean Airline flight 007 was shot down. We happened to be in Anchorage, Alaska, at that time, and many of you probably know the various controversies that arose out of that; 269 people were killed. And I remember waking up that morning to a press event where probably 200 different people were there, including the national press, all wanting Alan to make a statement right away; because he was a Presidential candidate, because his remarks would be all over the news. And yet Alan had the self discipline not just to say something immediately that morning, but to say, in a calming way, ''let's find out the facts, first.'' And when I think about that as a human being, particularly in my new post and job, in which the world moves so fast and in which people go about promoting their idea and concepts, the very human side of Alan Cranston remains with me, and I hope it does with each of you.

I talked to him in October of this year, in which I was out campaigning in Bellingham, Washington, one of the last places I had to campaign with him, and I said to him, ''Senator, you dropped me off here almost seventeen years ago, and you never picked me up.'' And Alan reminded me that is was time to work together. So I guess I say to Kim, and Colette, and R.E., and to those of you who are going to carry on the Cranston legacy, that he left in each one of us a piece of that flame that he carried for so long. You saw it on the film. It started when Albert Einstein said to him, ''nuclear arms could wipe out a whole race of people.'' I think Alan started saying that from that moment on, and reminded people about it until his last days. And so I hope that each and every one of you, as I will, carries part of that torch and flame that Alan had of self-discipline, knowing that he was not the message, but the messenger, in helping this fight. Thank you. (Applause.)

Judge JONATHAN STEINBERG. And now we'll hear from Alan Cranston's son Kim, who I know is committed to seeing that Alan's lifelong commitment to securing world peace is carried on as his most important bequest to his granddaughter Evan and all the children of our planet.

Kim. (Applause.)

KIM CRANSTON. Thank you, all. Those of you who were familiar with the legal pads that Alan carried around and the black pens will be happy to know that Evan is over here busy making a ''to do'' list. (Laughter.) I'm not sure what it all includes.

Jonathan, thank you very much for helping to organize this, and everybody else who was involved in this, the Senate sponsors, and each of the other speakers; I deeply appreciate your kind and touching words about Alan and his work here. It's good to see all of you, so many old friends. It's sad under the circumstances that we come together, but it's wonderful to see you all again. I know how much Alan cherished your friendship and collaboration over the years.

I was really truly blessed, I feel, to have, through the genetic lottery, ended up as Alan's son, and had the opportunity to get to know him as my father, as my dearest and oldest friend, and as a wonderful collaborator, mentor, teacher, and leader. And I know his loss as a leader is a loss we all share.

I've been reflecting over the last month on many of the things that I've learned from Alan and our work together, living with him, and a few things stand out that I wanted to share today. One thing that stood out for me was the remarkable style of leadership he had. Inside the program is the poem that he carried, the Lao-Tzu quote, for most of his life, that really informed the style of leadership that he practiced. It concludes with:

But of a good leader,
When his work is done,
His aim fulfilled,
They will all say,
''We did this ourselves.''

And so today, we're here, recognizing what we accomplished together with Alan. And so it's an opportunity not only to mourn his loss, but to celebrate what we accomplished together, and I think, beyond that, to recommit, and commit to the ongoing causes that we engaged in with him.

Another lesson that has stood out in the last month for me was something that I really remember when I first began hearing it from him. I was told the central purpose of life was to make the world a better place, or, as one of Alan's heros, Martin Luther King, Jr., once said, ''life's most persistent and urgent question is 'what are you doing to serve others?' '' And it was certainly in that spirit that Alan conducted his life and committed most of his public life.

And, finally, one other thing that stands out very strongly for me, both in terms of the work that he did here in Washington, and to the work that he continued to do after he left Washington, was his recognition of the extraordinary moment in history in which we all live. In that regard, I just note that a friend commented after Alan had left the Senate, that they had seen him, and they said, ''Kim, you know, he doesn't seem to be slowing down, he seems to be speeding up.'' And I think that was true, because he said to me that he'd felt since he left the Senate that he could really focus in on the things that he was most concerned about, to devote 100% of his energy to those causes that were of greatest concern to him. And I think the cornerstone of that was an understanding that we have entered a new age during our lifetime, when we're facing global challenges that can be addressed only at the global level, and that we need to come up with effective new approaches for dealing with those challenges.

After he left the Senate, the cause did continue, most recently in the form of the Global Security Institute, which is continuing,

and it has a great board, and a wonderful director, Jonathan Granoff, our CEO, who is here today. And I would really urge those of you who are here today who shared in those causes with Alan to look forward to opportunities to collaborate with us, because the work goes on, and Alan was just the messenger.

In closing, I'd just like to say something I know Alan closed most of his speeches with, which was, ''I thank you for all you are doing, and urge you onward.'' Thank you. (Applause.)

Judge JONATHAN STEINBERG. Thank you, Kim. I know your father would be proud of your personal actions to pick up the torch and deeply moved by your words.

I want to close with some expressions of thanks to many people. Again, I want to note how grateful all of us are to the sponsoring Senators and to all who spoke so eloquently and movingly about the man who will live forever in my heart as ''Alan,'' as the most important influence on the lives of so many of us in this room today.

The presence here throughout this entire ceremony of three Cabinet officials in this new Administration should remind us all of Alan's abiding belief that it was possible to form an alliance with every Senator on one issue or another, and of his commitment to do just that. Common ground and common sense was much more important to him than party affiliation or political philosophy. We thank the three Secretaries who joined us today and helped remind us of how important those sentiments are for the welfare of our country.

There are an enormous number of people who volunteered their time and did just incredible work to make this tribute as successful and meaningful as we hope that it has been. If I leave anyone out, I apologize—as I do, and as I did before, if I left out any former officeholder, who I should have recognized earlier. So, I offer special thanks, on behalf of the family and myself, alphabetically, to Zack Allen, Bill Brew, Fran Butler, Monique Ceruti, Kelly Cordes, Chad Griffin, Bill Johnstone, Susanne Martinez, Katie O'Neill, Dan Perry, Valerie Rheinstein, Alexandra Sardegna, Ed Scott, Martha Stanley, Loraine Tong, Joel Wood, and one most special person, Elinor Tucker, without whose highly efficient logistical support we would never have made it to this point. I thank Senator Rockefeller for allowing her to put in so much time and effort and to do so in such an effective way. Finally, an even more personal thanks to my wife, Shellie, for helping to keep me on an relatively even keel over the past month as this event was pulled together.

And, finally, thanks to all of you who joined us in tribute today to Senator Alan McGregor Cranston, a great American who lived his life by the philosophy of a Chinese poet Lao-Tzu, whose words on leadership, printed in today's program, Alan carried with him every day.

That concludes this Tribute. Please remember to sign the guest book, and thanks again for coming. And we'll go out to the theme song from Alan's Presidential campaign, ''Chariots of Fire''. (Applause.)

## ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

### CONGRATULATING WE THE PEOPLE PARTICIPANTS FROM WYOMING

• Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, on April 21–23, 2001 more than 1,200 students from across the United States met in Washington, D.C. to compete in the national finals of the ''We the People'', The Citizen and the Constitution program. I am proud to report that the class from Cheyenne Central High School from Cheyenne represented the State of Wyoming in this national event. The fine students in this class include: Joe Bergene; Skye Bougsty-Marshall; Cory Bulkley; Michelle Cassidy; Ryan Day; Sara De Groot; Chris Heald; Nat Linter; Steve Lucero; Geoff Luke; Caroline Morris; Ben Silver; and Annaliese Wiederspahn. I would also like to recognize their teacher, Don Morris, who deserves much of the credit for the class' success.

These young scholars worked diligently to reach the national finals and through their experience gained a deep knowledge and understanding of the fundamental principles of our constitutional democracy.

I am pleased to have had the opportunity to support the ''We the People'' program through my work on the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee and the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. I am particularly proud to note that the Better Education for Students and Teachers Act will allow schools, which choose to do so, to use federal funds to incorporate the We the People program into their study of civics and American government.

I once again want to congratulate Don Morris and these students from Cheyenne Central High School.•

### TRIBUTE TO STEPHEN J. RAPP

• Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I'd like to take a few minutes to honor Stephen J. Rapp, United States Attorney for the Northern District of Iowa.

Steve Rapp has been a trailblazer in my home state of Iowa since he began his career in public service in his early twenties. Back in 1972, he won a seat in our House of Representatives, and at the tender age of twenty-five, he came within a hair's breadth of winning the Third District Congressional seat. He did eventually join us on Capitol Hill a few years later when he served as Staff Director and Counsel of the U.S. Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency.

After his stint in Washington, Steve returned to Iowa and served another four years in our House of Representatives where he distinguished himself as a leader on anti-crime legislation. Steve was instrumental in passing our state's rape shield law and our strong anti-drunk driving regulation. And he wrote the law that forbids release pending appeal of criminals who are guilty of forcible felonies.

In 1993, Steve was appointed as a United States Attorney for the Northern District of Iowa, and under his stewardship, the Northern District became a national torchbearer in criminal prosecutions. Steve filed America's first prosecution under Title II of the Brady Law. He also filed the nation's first prosecution under the federal ''Three Strikes'' law, and the first prosecution under the Lautenberg amendment that prohibited convicted domestic violence offenders from owning a gun.

But Steve wasn't content merely to do a stellar job on the day to day duties of United States Attorney. He became a member of the Attorney Generals Advisory Committee, serving on the working Group on Interior Enforcement Immigration Law and on Subcommittees handling violence against women, organized crime, victim crime, juvenile justice and Native American issues. In addition, he served as chair of the Midwest High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area and has held forums across Northern Iowa to educate citizens and help reduce methamphetamine use.

When I think of all the work Steve Rapp has done for our state and our country, I'm reminded of the words of President John F. Kennedy who once noted, ''Law is the strongest link between man and freedom.'' Steve Rapp has worked tirelessly to keep the people of Northern Iowa and America free, free from crime and violence, and free to raise their families and live their lives in safe, secure communities.

Steve has been honored by groups ranging from the Afro-American Community Broadcasting to the NAACP to the Black Hawk County Legal Secretaries Association. And it is my pleasure to add myself to that list and offer my deepest gratitude for his long and distinguished record of service.•

### RECOGNITION OF THE 125TH BIRTHDAY OF ST. MARY PARISH OF NEW BALTIMORE, MICHIGAN

• Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate join me today in congratulating the St. Mary Parish of New Baltimore, MI on their upcoming one hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary. Since 1876, the St. Mary's has been serving the spiritual needs of it's congregation as well as the community at large.

The history of St. Mary Parish is too long and rich for me to recount here in full, but it is important to point out that New Baltimore has been home to a Catholic community since 1805, when ''horseback priests'' from Canada and Detroit would come to minister in private homes. It was in 1876, as America was celebrating its centennial, that Father Aloysius Lambert was appointed the first resident pastor and the St. Mary Parish was born. Father Lambert worked to establish a church and chapel, a grade school and a rectory. Other important events in the history of the Parish include the mortgage being paid off and burned in 1938, the addition of a war memorial shrine in 1949, and the completion of a new gymnasium in 1951. This gymnasium would serve as a temporary church when the 83 year old building burned to the ground in 1958. In 1963, the cornerstone was laid in

what was now to be known as St. Mary Queen of Creation.

The 1960's also saw the creation of a new mission for St. Mary Parish. A chapter of St. Vincent de Paul was opened to serve the needs of the poor in New Baltimore and seventh-grader Mary Jane Plague began a music ministry. This legacy of community stewardship grew with the addition of Sister Loretta Demick to the St. Mary Parish in 1974. Sister Demick began what was known as Sister Loretta's Closet, which helped feed the poor, elderly and infirmed of the Parish. Also in 1974, the former convent was turned into a home for women who are developmentally disabled. People with special needs are still being served in this building, and it is known as the Horizons Residential Centers. In the last decade, the St. Mary Parish has expanded outreach programs to help the homeless and those with HIV/AIDS.

Over the years, St. Mary Parish has grown from a few families to thousands of parishioners and along the way has dedicated itself to bettering the lives of everyone in its community. The community of New Baltimore and all of Macomb County have benefitted from many good deeds and continuing works of generosity that the St. Mary Parish has undertaken. I trust that my Senate colleagues will join me in wishing St. Mary Parish a happy one hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary, and hoping that the next century and a quarter are as fruitful as the last.●

## RECOGNIZING THE STUDENTS FROM CENTURY SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL

● Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, today I had the privilege to meet with twelve accomplished students from Century Senior High School in Bismarck, ND, who are in town to compete in the national finals of the ''We the People. . .'' competition. This competition focuses on the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, and these students have worked hard to reach the national finals.

These students are Adrienne Buckman, Nicole Elkin, Jessica Fritz, Nathan Grenz, Gwen Hobert, Chris Holzer, Reed Hushka, Whitney KreingKrairt, Rudie Martinson, Paul Nehring, Grant Neuharth, and Russel Pearson. They are ably led by their teacher, Jeff Aas, who also deserves credit for the success of the class.

I am proud of this class and their dedication to this project. The Constitution is not just a historical document; it is the basis for our entire system of government. The brilliance of the Constitution lies in its flexibility which has allowed it to stand the test of time. The Bill of Rights is a fundamental part of our national culture and has been the basis of freedom principles that have been adopted in other countries around the world.

The knowledge that these students have gained by studying the Constitution will serve them well for years to come. Congratulations to these outstanding students from my home State.●

## TRIBUTE TO DENNIS H. BLOME

● Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I would like to take a few moments today to honor Dennis H. Blome for his outstanding work as United States Marshal for the Northern District of Iowa.

Before he even set foot in the U.S. Marshal's office, Dennis Blome had already distinguished himself with over two decades of dedicated law enforcement service. During these years, he took on just about every position in the field of law enforcement, and he performed them all with diligence, passion and honor.

Dennis started out as a Deputy in the Linn County Sheriff's Office in 1971. He then took on the positions of Jail Officer, dispatcher and patrolman before becoming First Deputy for Sheriff Walter H. Grant. And he later served as Jail Administrator, Sergeant, Lieutenant and head of Detectives for the Sheriff's Office.

In 1984, Dennis was elected as Sheriff, and he took the lead in helping build a new jail and provide critically needed training for jail personnel throughout Iowa. He was also an enthusiastic member of the legislative Committee of the Iowa State Sheriffs' and Deputies' Association and of the National Sheriffs' Association.

Dennis' passion for learning and taking on new challenges led him to continue his education at the FBI National Academy, the National Institute of Corrections and Mount Mercy College where he got his BA degree in Criminal Justice and Psychology. He also took advantage of special training seminars through the National Sheriffs' Conference and the International Chiefs of Police.

Dennis' extensive job experience and solid education served him well when he was appointed as United States Marshal for the Northern District of Iowa back in 1994. He focused his boundless energy on a number of projects, most notably, that of strengthening security in our courthouses. Today, thanks to Dennis, our courthouses in Cedar Rapids and Sioux City have interior and exterior camera systems as well as recording systems and multiple monitoring systems.

But even more important than what Dennis accomplished is how he accomplished it. Dennis never considered any job to be ''beneath'' him. He was always willing to pitch in whether it meant being present in court, transporting prisoners or doing anything else necessary to keep the agency in good running order. His humility and commitment to his work made him a popular leader.

Dennis Blome embodies all of the highest ideals of public service. He's served our state with honor and loyalty for thirty years, and it is my pleasure to offer my deepest gratitude for his considerable contributions.●

## HONORING BILL BRADLEY

● Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, today we celebrate the long career of dedicated public service rendered by Mr. Bill Bradley of Ware, MA. His deep love of policy and politics has inspired me and many others, and I am fortunate to have Bill's friendship and counsel in my life.

This weekend, Bill's friends and colleagues will gather to look back on 25 years of service to two United States Senators, a Congressman, the US Department of Agriculture and the people of Massachusetts. Bill retires from a distinguished career of government service, most recently having held the post of Regional Director for the Department of Agriculture's Rural Development Program and today I join his extended political family in this celebration.

The same interest and passion that Bill brought to his USDA service can be found in earlier chapters of his life. As a freshman in high school, he pursued an early interest in politics by working as a congressional page in Washington D.C. in 1962, and his sponsor was a son of Dorchester who went on to become the great Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, John W. McCormack. Bill was a page through the next two years, and capped his early Washington experience by witnessing Lyndon Johnson's inauguration in 1965. After graduating from the University of California and serving a brief stint with the U.S. Forest Service in Alaska, Bill got his first job on Capitol Hill as a Legislative Aide for Congressman Dale Milford of Texas during the Carter Administration. Soon he moved closer to his Massachusetts up north to run a mobile office for my predecessor in this chamber, the late Paul Tsongas. From 1979 to 1983, Bill traveled in this capacity through the same towns he would later serve through the USDA. Once established in Western Massachusetts with Senator Tsongas, Bill dug deeper into the issues closest to the heart of those communities, and soon his knowledge and understanding of the region and its needs was exemplary. Even greater was his passion to serve them.

Bill coordinated these cities and towns in my first Senate campaign in 1984 and later became the Director of Constituent Services for my whole state-wide operation. Throughout the nine years he spent on my staff, he held positions that ranged from Director of Western Massachusetts to Director of Local Relations. In each position, Bill demonstrated the same tenacity and dedication to improving people's lives he carries to this day.

It came as no surprise to those who worked with and knew Bill that President Clinton would recognize and embrace these same qualities as he assumed office in 1993. The President appointed Bill to the position of Regional

Director for the Department of Agriculture's Rural Development Program, and the success of his tenure is well known to everyone in the three-state region he served. He oversaw more than 65 employees in six offices throughout three states. The program's successes throughout this time are numerous; he worked with other agencies and officials to obtain new fire trucks for the Palmer Fire Department, and worked with Congressman NEAL and the Ware Selectmen to help move the police station to its current location. During his eight years of directing this agency, Bill coordinated the distribution of over $870 million dollars in rural housing programs that helped rural towns foster and maintain economic development. Concurrent with this service, Bill was a Member of the Electoral College for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and I congratulated him along with his friends and colleagues as he cast his vote for the re-election of Bill Clinton and Al Gore.

Throughout all of these national and State-wide efforts, Bill Bradley has maintained an iron-clad commitment to community and his neighbors. He has served as Director of the Ware Cooperative Bank, and mobilized State and Federal money through the Ware Community Development Authority. His love of politics is surpassed only by music and his devotion to his wife, Linda, and I congratulate both of them as they begin this new chapter in their lives. I have been very fortunate to have some of the best people I have ever known be involved in my campaigns and on my staff. Bill Bradley is a credit to his community and the State of Massachusetts. He has performed 25 years of public service with a professionalism and dedication that is increasingly rare, and it is with great pride, respect and affection that I celebrate his contributions to the lives of people throughout Massachusetts and the United States of America.●

## RECOGNITION OF THE LIGHTHOUSE OF OAKLAND COUNTY, INC. AND THE DEDICATION OF THE ROBERT H. & MARY G. FLINT CAMPUS OF CARING

● Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, today I want to congratulate and honor the Lighthouse of Oakland County, Inc., an independent agency, that has served as a beacon of hope and opportunity for countless individuals. Residents in my home state of Michigan will be gathering this Thursday April 26, 2001 to celebrate the grand opening of the Robert H. & Mary G. Flint Campus of Caring.

The Lighthouse is a remarkable institution that began as an ecumenical ministry to assist seniors and low-income families, but has grown to become a dynamic independent agency dedicated to providing vital services that enable people to make the transition from joblessness and despair to independence and empowerment.

The mission of the Lighthouse is administered by three subsidiaries: Lighthouse Emergency Services, Lighthouse PATH and Lighthouse Community Development. Independent of one another, these subsidiaries would be an important agent for social welfare and justice. Together, these three branches are a comprehensive service provider that is able to assist individuals and communities as they strive for betterment.

Lighthouse Emergency Services provides a full range of services including food, housing, medical treatment and clothing assistance to those who require immediate assistance. The PATH program combines a full-time residency program with intensive case management that provides residents with the assistance needed to form clear and concrete goals for self-improvement. As residents complete their education or enter job training programs, the Lighthouse PATH provides an array of services such as child care, legal assistance and domestic abuse counseling. The Lighthouse Community Development program has worked, primarily in Pontiac's Unity Park neighborhood, to ensure that safe and affordable housing is available for low and moderate income families. Home ownership can ensure the economic well-being and stability of families and neighborhoods, and this program makes home ownership a reality by providing home ownership classes, rehabilitating abandoned houses and building new homes.

The Lighthouse's success at administering these myriad programs has not gone unnoticed. In 1990, the volunteers of the Lighthouse were recognized by then President Bush as the 376th Point of Light for their dedication and service to their community. Lighthouse PATH was a recipient of the Richard F. Huegli Award for Program Excellence. In addition, Crain's Business Detroit made the Lighthouse first Runner-up for best managed non-profit of 1994. In 1997, the Lighthouse deservedly won this award.

None of the Lighthouse's many awards or important programs would be possible without the dedication and sacrifice of the many staff and volunteers who have freely given of their time, talents and resources to make this program the vital community asset it is today. I have mentioned only a small portion of the dynamic history of the Lighthouse of Oakland County, Inc. and the many ways in which this organization has assisted its community. I know my colleagues will join me in honoring the Lighthouse of Oakland County, Inc. for its service to the people of Oakland County and the State of Michigan.●

## TRIBUTE TO PHYLLISS HENRY

● Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, Phylliss Henry has been a pioneer in my home State of Iowa, shattering glass ceilings, blazing a bold new trail for women in law enforcement, and reaching out to help others follow after her. Her tireless work to stamp out crime and to bring women to the table in law enforcement have made a lasting impact on our state.

Back in 1972, Phylliss became the first woman ever to receive a law enforcement degree from Des Moines Area Community College. She was then hired as the first female patrol officer in the Des Moines Department, and she remained the only female patrol officer until 1977. She later became a Sergeant with the Special Crime Unit and with the Communication Section where she helped with minority recruitment and acted as a role model for other women in law enforcement.

Phylliss then made the courageous decision to continue and expand her education, and she focused her energy on obtaining a Bachelor of General Studies degree in 1984, an MA in Communications Studies in 1986, and a PhD in Communication Research in 1988, all from the University of Iowa.

In December of 1990, she became the Support Services Manager of the Iowa State University Department of Public Safety. As in all her previous positions, she took the job to a new level, creating new crime prevention, security and assault awareness programs.

In 1994, Phylliss' outstanding record led to her appointment as a United States Marshal, the first woman ever to hold this position in the state of Iowa, and for seven years, she served with distinction. She was instrumental in leading building renovations projects in Des Moines and Davenport and in helping to finish up the Court Annex Building. She also led the initiatives to bring Iowa Communication Network access to the district.

And she was a one-woman army when it came to getting funding for critical projects in the district and to stretching every dollar to its limits. In a few years, she was able to automate the entire district with limited funding. And during a time when the district was being hit hard by increases in prisoner populations and decreases in bed space, she obtained a State of Iowa contract and greatly reduced the crisis need for federal prison beds.

In addition, throughout her career, Phylliss has never been content to use her energy only in the workplace. She has contributed to organizations ranging from the Young Women's Resource Center, the International and Iowa Associations of Women Police, Children and Families of Iowa and many more. She even managed to find the time to co-found the Iowa Association of Women Police.

She has been honored by groups ranging from the Greater Des Moines YWCA to the Des Moines Metro Women's Network to the International Association of Women police and more. And it is my pleasure to add myself to that list and offer my deepest gratitude for her long and distinguished record of service to our State.●

## EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

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

E–1417. A communication from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a cumulative report on rescissions and deferrals dated April 19, 2000; transmitted jointly, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, as modified by the order of April 11, 1986; to the Committees on Appropriations; the Budget; and Foreign Relations.

EC–1418. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''25 CFR 183, Use and Distribution of the San Carlos Apache Tribe Development Trust Fund and San Carlos Apache Tribe Lease Fund'' (RIN 1076–AE10) received on April 23, 2001; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC–1419. A communication from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of the Farm Credit Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the proposed fiscal year 2002 budget; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–1420. A communication from the President and Chairman of the Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a transaction involving U.S. exports to the Turkey; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1421. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the national emergency with respect to Colombia; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–1422. A communication from the Chief of the Regulations Branch, U.S. Customs Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment to Wool Duty Refund Program'' (RIN 1515–AC85) received on April 19, 2001; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1423. A communication from the Chief of the Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Applicable Federal Rates—May 2001'' (Rev. Rul. 2001–22) received on April 19, 2001; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1424. A communication from the Chief of the Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Section 29(c)(1)(C) Solid Fuel Produced From Coal'' (Rev. Pro. 2001–30) received on April 23, 2001; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1425. A communication from the Chief of the Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Appeals Settlement Guidelines: Excise Tax on Virtual Private Networks'' (UIL: 4251.03–01) received on April 23, 2001; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1426. A communication from the Chief of the Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Rev. Proc. 2001–17'' received on April 23, 2001; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–1427. A communication from the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense, Technology Security Policy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the delay of a report concerning national security; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1428. A communication from the Deputy Under Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relating to the notification of total obligations exceeding $5.0 million in fiscal year 2001; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–1429. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to overseas surplus property; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1430. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''VISAS: Documentation of Immigrants and Nonimmigrants—Visa Classification Symbols'' (22 CFR Parts 41 and 42) received on April 19, 2001; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1431. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Legislative Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the progress made in an investigation in Kenya; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1432. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual SEED report for Fiscal Year 2000; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1433. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Annual Report concerning the Strategic Petroleum Reserve; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–1434. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Office of Environment, Safety and Health, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Guide of Good Practices for Occupational Radiological Protection in Uranium Facilities'' (STD–1136–2000) received on April 18, 2001; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–1435. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Office of Environment, Safety and Health, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Software Quality Assurance'' (N 203.1) received on April 18, 2001; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–1436. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Office of Environment, Safety and Health, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Department of Energy Facilities Technology Partnering Programs'' (O 482.1) received on April 18, 2001; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–1437. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Office of Environment, Safety and Health, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Reporting Unofficial Travel'' (N 470.2) received on April 18, 2001; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–1438. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Office of Environment, Safety and Health, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Security Conditions'' (N 473.6) received on April 18, 2001; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–1439. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Office of Environment, Safety and Health, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Extension of DOE O 311.1A, Equal Employment Opportunity and Diversity Program'' (N 311.1) received on April 18, 2001; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–1440. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Office of Environment, Safety and Health, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Explosive Detection Program'' (N 473.7) received on April 18, 2001; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–1441. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Office of Environment, Safety and Health, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Sex in Education Programs or Activities Receiving Federal Financial Assistance'' (RIN 1901–AA87) received on April 18, 2001; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–1442. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Office of Environment, Safety and Health, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Stabilization, Packing, and Storage of Plutonium-Bearing Materials'' (STD–3013–2000) received on April 18, 2001; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–1443. A communication from the Acting Director of the Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Utah Regulatory Program'' (UT–038–FOR) received on April 19, 2001; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–1444. A communication from the Acting Associate Administrator for Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of an interim rule to change the NASA Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement (48 CFR Parts 1812, 1823, 1852) received on April 6, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1445. A communication from the Acting Associate Administrator for Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule ''Emergency Medical Services and Evacuations'' (48 CFR Parts 1842 and 1852) received on April 6, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1446. A communication from the Attorney/Advisor of the Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a nomination for the position of Deputy Secretary, Department of Transportation; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1447. A communication from the Attorney/Advisor of the Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy in the position of Administrator, Maritime Administration, Department of Transportation; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1448. A communication from the Attorney/Advisor of the Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the discontinuation of service in acting role for the position of Administrator, Maritime Administration, Department of Transportation; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1449. A communication from the Attorney/Advisor of the Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the designation of acting officer as Administrator of the Research and Special Programs Administration, Department of Transportation; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1450. A communication from the Attorney/Advisor of the Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a discontinuation of service in acting

role as Administrator of the Research and Special Programs Administration, Department of Transportation; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1451. A communication from the Attorney/Advisor of the Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy in the position as Administrator of the Research and Special Programs Administration, Department of Transportation; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1452. A communication from the Attorney/Advisor of the Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the discontinuation of service in acting role as Administrator of the Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1453. A communication from the Attorney/Advisor of the Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the designation of acting officer as Administrator of the Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1454. A communication from the Attorney/Advisor of the Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy in the position as Administrator of the Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1455. A communication from the Attorney/Advisor of the Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy in the position of Administrator of the National Highway Traffic Administration, Department of Transportation; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1456. A communication from the Attorney/Advisor of the Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the return of a nomination for Administrator of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1457. A communication from the Attorney/Advisor of the Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the designation of acting officer for the position of Associate Deputy Secretary, Department of Transportation; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1458. A communication from the Attorney/Advisor of the Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy in the position of Associate Deputy Secretary, Department of Transportation; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1459. A communication from the Attorney/Advisor of the Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the discontinuation of service in acting role as Assistant Secretary for Aviation and International Affairs, Department of Transportation; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1460. A communication from the Attorney/Advisor of the Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary for Transportation Policy, Department of Transportation; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1461. A communication from the Attorney/Advisor of the Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary for Governmental Affairs, Department of Transportation; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1462. A communication from the Attorney/Advisor of the Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the return of a nomination for Assistant Secretary for Aviation and International Affairs, Department of Transportation; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1463. A communication from the Attorney/Advisor of the Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the return of a nomination for Deputy Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1464. A communication from the Attorney/Advisor of the Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary for Aviation and International Affairs, Department of Transportation; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1465. A communication from the Attorney/Advisor of the Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the discontinuation of service in acting role as Deputy Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1466. A communication from the Attorney/Advisor of the Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a designation of acting officer as Deputy Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1467. A communication from the Attorney/Advisor of the Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy in the position of Secretary of the Department of Transportation; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1468. A communication from the Attorney/Advisor of the Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy and the designation of acting officer in the position as Chief Financial Officer of the National Aeronautic Space Administration; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1469. A communication from the Attorney/Advisor of the Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a vacancy in the position of Deputy Secretary of the Department of Transportation; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1470. A communication from the Attorney/Advisor of the Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the confirmation of the nomination for Secretary of the Department of Transportation; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1471. A communication from the Attorney/Advisor of the Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a nomination for the position of Secretary of the Department of Transportation; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1472. A communication from the Attorney/Advisor of the Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a discontinuation of service in acting role for Secretary of the Department of Transportation; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1473. A communication from the Attorney/Advisor of the Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the designation of acting officer for the position of Secretary, Department of Transportation; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1474. A communication from the Attorney/Advisor of the Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a nomination for the position of Assistant Secretary for Governmental Affairs, Department of Transportation; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1475. A communication from the General Counsel for the Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a designation of Acting Officer for the position of Administrator, United States Fire Administration, Federal Emergency Management Agency; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1476. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of Class E Airspace; Waynesboro, VA'' ((RIN2120–AA66)(2001–0065)) received on April 5, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1477. A communication from the Acting Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska—Pollock Closure in the West Yakutat District, Gulf of Alaska'' received on April 6, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1478. A communication from the Acting Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, transmitting , pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries Off West Coast and Western Pacific States; West Coast Salmon Fisheries; Inseason Adjustments from Cape Falcon to Humbug Mountain, OR'' received on April 6, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1479. A communication from the Acting Director of the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Zone Off Alaska—Closure of B Season Pollock Within the Shelikof Strait Conservation Area, Gulf of Alaska'' received on April 18, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1480. A communication from the Attorney of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Light Truck Average Fuel Economy Standards, Model Year 2003'' (RIN2127–AI35) received on April 5, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1481. A communication from the General Counsel of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Assistance to Firefighters Grant Program'' (RIN3067–AD12) received on April 6, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1482. A communication from the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Capital Investment Plan for Fiscal Years 2002 through 2006; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1483. A communication from the Chief of the Enforcement Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Industry Guidance on the Commission's Case

Law Interpreting 18 U.S.C. Section 1464 and Enforcement Policies Regarding Broadcast Indecency'' (FCC 01–90) received on April 16, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1484. A communication from the Chief of the General and International Law Division, Maritime Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Audit Appeals; Policy and Procedure'' (RIN2133–AB42) received on April 16, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1485. A communication from the Chief of the Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, United States Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety/Security Zone Regulations; Fore River Bridge Repairs—Weymouth, Massachusetts'' ((RIN2115–AA97)(2001–0007)) received on April 16, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1486. A communication from the Chief of the Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, United States Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety/Security Zone Regulations: Mission Bay, San Diego, CA'' ((RIN2115–AA97)(2001–0006)) received on April 16, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1487. A communication from the Chief of the Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, United States Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Regatta Regulations; Approaches to Annapolis Harbor, Spa Creek, and Severn River, Annapolis, Maryland'' ((RIN2115–AE46)(2001–0006)) received on April 16, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1488. A communication from the Chief of the Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, United States Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Regatta Regulations; Western Branch, Elizabeth River, Portsmouth Va'' ((RIN2115–AE46)(2001–0005)) received on April 16, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1489. A communication from the Chief of the Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, United States Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Drawbridge Regulations: Crescent Beach Bridge (SR 206), Crescent Beach, FL'' ((RIN2115–AE47)(2001–0027)) received on April 16, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1490. A communication from the Chief of the Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, United States Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Drawbridge Regulations: Hackensack River, NJ'' ((RIN2115–AE47)(2001–0026)) received on April 16, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1491. A communication from the Chief of the Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, United States Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Drawbridge Regulations: Shaw Cove, CT'' ((RIN2115–AE47)(2001–0025)) received on April 16, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1492. A communication from the Chief of the Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, United States Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety/Security Zone Regulations; Gulf of Alaska, Southeast of Narrow Cape, Kodiak Island, AK'' ((RIN2115–AA97)(2001–0009)) received on April 16, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1493. A communication from the Chief of the Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, United States Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety/Security Zone Regulations; Fireworks Display, East River, New York, NY'' ((RIN2115–AA97)(2001–0008)) received on April 16, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1494. A communication from the Program Analyst for the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment to Class E Airspace; Phillipsburg, KS'' ((RIN2120–AA66)(2001–0071)) received on April 16, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1495. A communication from the Program Analyst for the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment to Class E Airspace; Omaha, NE; Correction'' ((RIN2120–AA66)(2001–0069)) received on April 16, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1496. A communication from the Program Analyst for the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revocation of Class D Airspace; Fort Worth Carswell AFB, TX'' ((RIN2120–AA66)(2001–0070)) received on April 16, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1497. A communication from the Program Analyst for the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class D Airspace; Valdosta Moody AFB, GA'' ((RIN2120–AA66)(2001–0068)) received on April 16, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1498. A communication from the Program Analyst for the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of Class E Airspace; Rome, NY'' ((RIN2120–AA66)(2001–0067)) received on April 16 , 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1499. A communication from the Program Analyst for the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Airbus Model A 300 B4–601, –603, –620, –605R, –622R, and –605R Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(2001–0178)) received on April 16, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1500. A communication from the Program Analyst for the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Airbus Model A330–301, –321, –322, –341, and –342 Series Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(2001–0177)) received on April 16, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1501. A communication from the Program Analyst for the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: SOCATA Groupe AEROSPATIALE Model TBM 700 Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(2001–0167)) received on April 16, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1502. A communication from the Program Analyst for the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: The New Piper Aircraft, Inc. Models PA 31, –300, –325, –350, –31P, –31T, –31T1, –31T2, –31T3, and –31P–350 Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(2001–0170)) received on April 16, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1503. A communication from the Program Analyst for the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: GE Company CF6 80A3 Series Turbofan Engines'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(2001–0169)) received on April 16, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1504. A communication from the Program Analyst for the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Cessna Aircraft Company Model 172RG Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(2001–0168)) received on April 16, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1505. A communication from the Program Analyst for the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Cessna Aircraft Company Models 172R and 172S Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(2001–0172)) received on April 16, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1506. A communication from the Program Analyst for the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica, SA, Model EMB–120 Series Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(2001–0171)) received on April 16, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1507. A communication from the Program Analyst for the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Dowty Aerospace Propellers Model R381/6–123–F/5 Propellers, Correction'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(2001–0174)) received on April 16, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1508. A communication from the Program Analyst for the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: SAAB Model SF340A and 340B Series Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(2001–0173)) received on April 16, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1509. A communication from the Program Analyst for the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Boeing Model 737–600, –700, –700C, and –800 Series Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(2001–0176)) received on April 16, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1510. A communication from the Program Analyst for the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Boeing Model 767 Series Airplanes Powered by GE Engines'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(2001–0175)) received on April 16, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1511. A communication from the Deputy Chief of the Accounting Policy Division, Common Carrier Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''In

the Matter of Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Services; Children's Internet Protection Act'' (FCC 01–120) received on April 16, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1512. A communication from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Section 730202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Huachuca City, Arizona; Puerto Rico, Arizona; Pine Level Alabama)'' (Doc. No. 00–208, 00–209, 00–211) received on April 18, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1513. A communication from the Special Assistant to the Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Hinton, Whiting, and Underwood, Iowa; and Blair Nebraska)'' (Doc. No. 99–94) received on April 18, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1514. A communication from the Acting Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Funding Availability for Research Projects of the Causes for the Decline of Steller Sea Lions in Waters Off Alaska'' received on April 18, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1515. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Final Rule Implementing Changes in the Mackerel Catch Specifications for the Gulf Migratory Group of King Mackerel Under the Fishery Management Plan for Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources in the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic Region'' (RIN0648–AN85) received on April 18, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1516. A communication from the Chief of the Market Disputes Resolution Division, Enforcement Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Rules Governing Procedures to be Followed When Formal Complaints are Filed Against Common Carriers'' (Doc. 96–238) received on April 18, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1517. A communication from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Section 73.622(b), Table of Allotments, DTV Broadcast Stations (Hastings, NE) received on April 18, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1518. A communication from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Division, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Avalon, Fountain Valley, Adelanto, Ridgecrest and Riverside, California)'' (Doc. No. 99–329) received on April 18, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1519. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments'' ((RIN2120–AA65)(2001–0025)) received on April 23, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1520. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establish Class E Airspace; Salisbury, MD'' ((RIN2120–AA66)(2001–0073)) received on April 23, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1521. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establish Class E Airspace; Seneca Falls, NY'' ((RIN2120–AA66)(2001–0074)) received on April 23, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1522. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (63)'' ((RIN2120–AA65)(2001–0026)) received on April 23, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1523. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments (22)'' ((RIN2120–AA63)(2001–0003)) received on April 23, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1524. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Airbus Model A330–301; –321, –341, and –342 Airplanes; and Model A340–211, –212, –213, –311, –312, and –313 Series Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(2001–0181)) received on April 23, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1525. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: McDonnell Douglas Model DC 9, 33, 42, 55, and 61 Series Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(2001–0182)) received on April 23, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1526. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment of Class D Airspace; Shreveport Downtown Airport, Shreveport, LA'' ((RIN2120–AA66)(2001–0072)) received on April 23, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1527. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: McDonnell Douglas Model DC 10 and MD 11 Series Airplanes, and KC 10A Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(2001–0179)) received on April 23, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1528. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Eurocopter France Model AS 350B, BA, B1, B2, and D; and AS 355E, F, F1, F2, and N Helicopters'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(2001–0180)) received on April 23, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1529. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (24)'' ((RIN2120–AA65)(2001–0024)) received on April 23, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1530. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (41)'' ((RIN2120–AA65)(2001–0022)) received on April 23, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1531. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Boeing Model 737–600, 700, and 800 Series Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(2001–0184)) received on April 23, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1532. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (86)'' ((RIN2120–AA65)(2001–0021)) received on April 23, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1533. A communication from the Program Analyst of the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives: Airbus Model A330–301, 321, 322 Series Airplanes and Model A340 Series Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64)(2001–0183)) received on April 23, 2001; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GRASSLEY, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

S. 763: An original bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow tax-free expenditures from education individual retirement accounts for elementary and secondary school expenses, to increase the maximum annual amount of contributions to such accounts, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 107–12).

## INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. HUTCHINSON (for himself, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. BREAUX, and Mr. DEWINE):

S. 758. A bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 to authorize the annual enrollment of land in the wetlands reserve program, to extend the wetlands reserve program through 2005, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire:

S. 759. A bill to amend title 4 of the United States Code to prohibit a State from imposing a discriminatory tax on income earned within such State by nonresidents of such State; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. KERRY, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. CRAPO, and Mr. SMITH of Oregon):

S. 760. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage and accelerate the nationwide production, retail sale, and consumer use of new motor vehicles that are powered by fuel cell technology, hybrid technology, battery electric technology, alternative fuels, or other advanced motor vehicle technologies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BAUCUS (for himself, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mr. INOUYE):

S. 761. A bill to provide loans for the improvement of telecommunications services on Indian reservations; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CONRAD (for himself, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. REID, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, and Mr. JOHNSON):

S. 762. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for information technology training expenses and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GRASSLEY:

S. 763. An original bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow tax-free expenditures from education individual retirement accounts for elementary and secondary school expenses, to increase the maximum annual amount of contributions to such accounts, and for other purposes; from the Committee on Finance; placed on the calendar.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. CANTWELL, and Mr. LIEBERMAN):

S. 764. A bill to direct the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to impose just and reasonable load-differentiated demand rates or cost-of-service based rates on sales by public utilities of electric energy at wholesale in the western energy market, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BROWNBACK (for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. LUGAR, and Mr. DEWINE):

S. 765. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a carbon sequestration investment tax credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON:

S. 766. A bill to impose notification and reporting requirements in connection with grants of waivers of the limitation on certain procurements of the Department of Defense that is known as the Berry amendment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. CORZINE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. KERRY, Mr. CHAFEE, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. CARPER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. AKAKA, and Mr. HOLLINGS):

S. 767. A bill to extend the Brady background checks to gun shows, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WARNER:

S. 768. A bill to amend section 8339(p) of title 5, United States Code, to clarify the method for computing certain annuities under the Civil Service Retirement System which are based (in whole or in part) on part-time service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. BROWNBACK (for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. LUGAR, and Mr. DEWINE):

S. 769. A bill to establish a carbon sequestration program and an implementing panel within the Department of Commerce to enhance international conservation, to promote the role of carbon sequestration as a means of slowing the buildup of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere, and to reward and encourage voluntary, pro-active environmental efforts on the issue of global climate change; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself and Mr. JEFFORDS):

S. 770. A bill to amend part A of title IV of the Social Security Act to allow up to 24 months of vocational educational training to be counted as a work activity under the temporary assistance to needy families program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. ALLEN):

S. J. Res. 13. A joint resolution conferring honorary citizenship of the United States on Paul Yves Roch Gilbert du Motier, also known as the Marquis de Lafayette; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. CRAPO, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. GREGG, Mr. DODD, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. REID, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. KERRY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. BINGAMAN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Ms. LANDRIEU, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. BAUCUS, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. CORZINE, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. BAYH):

S. Res. 72. A resolution designating the month of April as ''National Sexual Assault Awareness Month''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREGG (for himself and Mr. LIEBERMAN):

S. Con. Res. 33. A concurrent resolution supporting a National Charter Schools Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS—MONDAY, APRIL 23, 2001

S. 21

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 21, a bill to establish an off-budget lockbox to strengthen Social Security and Medicare.

S. 133

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CLELAND) were added as cosponsors of S. 133, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the exclusion for employer-provided educational assistance programs, and for other purposes.

S. 152

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire) was added as a cosponsor of S. 152, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to eliminate the 60-month limit and increase the income limitation on the student loan interest deduction.

S. 170

At the request of Mr. REID, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLARD), and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) were added as cosponsors of S. 170, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit retired members of the Armed Forces who have a service-connected disability to receive both military retired pay by reason of their years of military service and disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs for their disability.

S. 177

At the request of Mr. AKAKA, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. CARNAHAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 177, a bill to amend the provisions of title 39, United States Code, relating to the manner in which pay policies and schedules and fringe benefit programs for postmasters are established.

S. 219

At the request of Mr. DODD, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 219, a bill to suspend for two years the certification procedures under section 490(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 in order to foster greater multilateral cooperation in international counternarcotics programs, and for other purposes.

S. 311

At the request of Mr. DODD, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 311, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide for partnerships in character education.

S. 326

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 326, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to eliminate the 15 percent reduction in payment rates under the prospective payment system for home health services and to permanently increase payments for such services that are furnished in rural areas.

S. 388

At the request of Mr. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLARD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 388, a bill to protect the energy and security of the United States and decrease America's dependency on foreign oil sources to 50 percent by the year 2011 by enhancing the use of renewable energy resources conserving energy resources, improving energy efficiencies, and increasing domestic energy supplies; improve environmental quality by reducing emissions of air pollutants and greenhouse gases; mitigate the effect of increases in energy

prices on the American consumer, including the poor and the elderly; and for other purposes.

S. 389

At the request of Mr. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLARD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 389, a bill to protect the energy and security of the United States and decrease America's dependency on foreign oil sources to 50 percent by the year 2011 by enhancing the use of renewable energy resources conserving energy resources, improving energy efficiencies, and increasing domestic energy supplies; improve environmental quality by reducing emissions of air pollutants and greenhouse gases; mitigate the effect of increases in energy prices on the American consumer, including the poor and the elderly; and for other purposes.

S. 392

At the request of Mr. SARBANES, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BOND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 392, a bill to grant a Federal Charter to Korean War Veterans Association, Incorporated, and for other purposes.

S. 440

At the request of Mr. CAMPBELL, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 440, a bill to establish a matching grant program to help State and local jurisdictions purchase bullet-resistant equipment for use by law enforcement departments.

S. 441

At the request of Mr. CAMPBELL, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 441, a bill to provide Capitol-flown flags to the families of law enforcement officers and firefighters killed in the line of duty.

S. 452

At the request of Mr. MURKOWSKI, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) were added as cosponsors of S. 452, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure that the Secretary of Health and Human Services provides appropriate guidance to physicians, providers of services, and ambulance providers that are attempting to properly submit claims under the medicare program to ensure that the Secretary does not target inadvertent billing errors.

S. 461

At the request of Mr. FRIST, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 461, a bill to support educational partnerships, focusing on mathematics, science, and technology, between institutions of higher education and elementary schools and secondary schools, and for other purposes.

S. 497

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. KOHL), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. CHAFEE), and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. WELLSTONE) were added as cosponsors of S. 497, a bill to express the sense of Congress that the Department of Defense should field currently available weapons, other technologies, tactics and operational concepts that provide suitable alternatives to anti-personnel mines and mixed anti-tank mine systems and that the United States should end its use of such mines and join the Convention on the Prohibition of Anti-Personnel Mines as soon as possible, to expand support for mine action programs including mine victim assistance, and for other purposes.

S. 590

At the request of Mr. JEFFORDS, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. TORRICELLI) were added as cosponsors of S. 590, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a refundable tax credit for health insurance costs, and for other purposes.

S. 655

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 655, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt from income taxation income derived from natural resources-related activity by a member of an Indian tribe directly or through a qualified Indian entity.

S. 656

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) was added as a cosponsor of S. 656, a bill to provide for the adjustment of status of certain nationals of Liberia to that of lawful permanent residence.

S. 660

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 660, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the issuance of tax-exempt bonds by Indian tribal governments, and for other purposes.

S. 707

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAIG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 707, a bill to provide grants for special environmental assistance for the regulation of communities and habitat (''SEARCH grants'') to small communities.

S. 718

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. EDWARDS) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. FITZGERALD) were added as cosponsors of S. 718, a bill to direct the National Institute of Standards and Technology to establish a program to support research and training in methods of detecting the use of performance-enhancing drugs by athletes, and for other purposes.

S. 721

At the request of Mr. HUTCHINSON, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 721, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a Nurse Corps and recruitment and retention strategies to address the nursing shortage, and for other purposes.

S. 742

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VOINOVICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 742, a bill to provide for pension reform, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 66

At the request of Mr. THOMAS, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. ALLEN), and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. NELSON) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 66, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the release of twenty-four United States military personnel currently being detained by the People's Republic of China.

S. CON. RES. 14

At the request of Mr. CAMPBELL, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 14, a concurrent resolution recognizing the social problem of child abuse and neglect, and supporting efforts to enhance public awareness of it.

S. CON. RES. 24

At the request of Mr. LIEBERMAN, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 24, a concurrent resolution expressing support for a National Reflex Sympathetic Dystrophy (RSD) Awareness Month.

S. CON. RES. 28

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 28, a concurrent resolution calling for a United States effort to end restrictions on the freedoms and human rights of the enclaved people in the occupied area of Cyprus.

## ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS— TUESDAY, APRIL 24, 2001

S. 39

At the request of Mr. STEVENS, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 39, a bill to provide a national medal for public safety officers who act with extraordinary valor above and beyond the call of duty, and for other purposes.

S. 41

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 41, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the research credit and to increase the rates of the alternative incremental credit.

S. 88

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the names of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) and the Senator

from Minnesota (Mr. DAYTON) were added as cosponsors of S. 88, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide an incentive to ensure that all Americans gain timely and equitable access to the Internet over current and future generations of broadband capability.

S. 161

At the request of Mr. WELLSTONE, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) were added as cosponsors of S. 161, a bill to establish the Violence Against Women Office within the Department of Justice.

S. 170

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. ENSIGN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 170, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit retired members of the Armed Forces who have a service-connected disability to receive both military retired pay by reason of their years of military service and disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs for their disability.

S. 177

At the request of Mr. AKAKA, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SPECTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 177, a bill to amend the provisions of title 39, United States Code, relating to the manner in which pay policies and schedules and fringe benefit programs for postmasters are established.

S. 206

At the request of Mr. SHELBY, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 206, a bill to repeal the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935, to enact the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 2001, and for other purposes.

S. 281

At the request of Mr. HAGEL, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 281, a bill to authorize the design and construction of a temporary education center at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial.

S. 305

At the request of Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CLELAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 305, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to remove the reduction in the amount of Survivor Benefit Plan annuities at age 62.

S. 311

At the request of Mr. DODD, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. CARNAHAN) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CORZINE) were added as cosponsors of S. 311, a bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide for partnerships in character education.

S. 345

At the request of Mr. ALLARD, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) were added as cosponsors of S. 345, a bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to strike the limitation that permits interstate movement of live birds, for the purpose of fighting, to States in which animal fighting is lawful.

S. 350

At the request of Mr. CHAFEE, the names of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 350, a bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to promote the cleanup and reuse of brownfields, to provide financial assistance for brownfields revitalization, to enhance State response programs, and for other purposes.

S. 403

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) were added as cosponsors of S. 403, a bill to improve the National Writing Project.

S. 413

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 413, a bill to amend part F of title X of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to improve and refocus civic education, and for other purposes.

S. 512

At the request of Mr. DORGAN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 512, a bill to foster innovation and technological advancement in the development of the Internet and electronic commerce, and to assist the States in simplifying their sales and use taxes.

S. 567

At the request of Mr. SESSIONS, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CLELAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 567, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide capital gain treatment under section 631(b) of such Code for outright sales of timber by landowners.

S. 570

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE) and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) were added as cosponsors of S. 570, a bill to establish a permanent Violence Against Women Office at the Department of Justice.

S. 623

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. CLINTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 623, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act and the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to improve access to health insurance and Medicare benefits for individuals ages 55 to 65, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a 50 percent credit against income tax for payment of such premiums and of premiums for certain COBRA continuation coverage, and for other purposes.

S. 640

At the request of Mr. THOMPSON, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KYL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 640, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to include wireless telecommunications equipment in the definition of qualified technological equipment for purposes of determining the depreciation treatment of such equipment.

S. 661

At the request of Mr. THOMPSON, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KYL) were added as cosponsors of S. 661, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the 4.3-cent motor fuel exercise taxes on railroads and inland waterway transportation which remain in the general fund of the Treasury.

S. 673

At the request of Mr. HAGEL, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 673, a bill to establish within the executive branch of the Government an interagency committee to review and coordinate United States nonproliferation efforts in the independent states of the former Soviet Union.

S. 676

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KYL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 676, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend permanently the subpart F exemption for active financing income.

S. 677

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 677, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the required use of certain principal repayments on mortgage subsidy bond financing to redeem bonds, to modify the purchase price limitation under mortgage subsidy bond rules based on median family income, and for other purposes.

S. 686

At the request of Mrs. LINCOLN, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 686, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit against tax for energy efficient appliances.

S. 694

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 694, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that a deduction equal to fair market value shall be allowed for charitable contributions of literary, musical, artistic, or scholarly compositions created by the donor.

S. 697

At the request of Mr. BAUCUS, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 697, a bill to modernize the financing of the railroad retirement system and to provide enhanced benefits to employees and beneficiaries.

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE), and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) were added as cosponsors of S. 697, supra.

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE), and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) were added as cosponsors of S. 697, supra.

S. CON. RES. 11

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. EDWARDS) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 11, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress to fully use the powers of the Federal Government to enhance the science base required to more fully develop the field of health promotion and disease prevention, and to explore how strategies can be developed to integrate lifestyle improvement programs into national policy, our health care system, schools, workplaces, families and communities.

S. CON. RES. 28

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. TORRICELLI) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 28, a concurrent resolution calling for a United States effort to end restrictions on the freedoms and human rights of the enclaved people in the occupied area of Cyprus.

## STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. HUTCHINSON (for himself, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. BREAUX, and Mr. DEWINE):

S. 758. A bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 to authorize the annual enrollment of land in the wetlands reserve program, to extend the wetlands reserve program through 2005, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the legislation that I am introducing today with Senators LINCOLN, BREAUX, and DEWINE be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 758

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

**SECTION 1. WETLANDS RESERVE PROGRAM.**

(a) ANNUAL ENROLLMENT AUTHORITY.—Section 1237(b) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3837(b)) is amended by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

''(1) ANNUAL ENROLLMENT AUTHORITY.—For each of calendar years 2001 through 2005, the Secretary may enroll in the wetlands reserve program not more than 250,000 acres.''.

(b) EXTENSION OF PROGRAM.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1237(c) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3837(c)) is amended by striking ''2002'' and inserting ''2005''.

''(2) FUNDING.—Section 1241(a) of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3841(a)) is amended by striking ''2002'' and inserting ''2005''.

(c) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—Section 1237F of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3837f) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

''(b) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—Notwithstanding chapter 63 of title 31, United States Code, for purposes of carrying out this subchapter, the Secretary may enter into a cooperative agreement with a State, a political subdivision of a State, or any organization or person, for the acquisition of goods or services (including personal services) if the Secretary determines that—

''(1) the purposes of the agreement serve wetland conservation;

''(2) all parties to the agreement contribute resources to the accomplishment of the purposes; and

''(3) the agreement furthers the purposes of this subchapter.''.

By Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire:

S. 759. A bill to amend title 4 of the United States Code to prohibit a State from imposing a discriminatory tax on income earned within such State by nonresident of such State; to the Committee on Finance.

## THE NONRESIDENT INCOME TAX FREEDOM ACT OF 2001

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce a bill called ''The Nonresident Income Tax Freedom Act of 2001.''

My legislation would prohibit a state from imposing income taxes on income earned within such state by nonresidents of such state.

Simply put, my bill bans state income taxes levied on nonresident workers.

I am sure that every American has studied the Boston Tea Party.

In 1776, the 13 American colonies refused to pay unjust taxes and declared their independence from Britain.

The resulting American revolution was a revolution of ideas and together the 13 colonies created a government which derived its just authority from the consent of the governed.

In 1764, Britain imposed the Sugar Act on the American colonies, that tax was followed by the Stamp Act and the Townshend Revenue Act.

The Stamp Act was essentially a paper tax of less than one cent, but this tax inspired the formation of the Sons of Liberty, who burned the stamps in protest of the tax.

A tea tax was imposed on the American colonies of less than one cent, but this tax motivated Bostonians to protest the tax in the Boston Tea Party.

The result of these British taxes were that Americans openly rebelled in order to fight those unjust taxes.

I am not comparing the current situation to the American revolution, but I am proposing legislation consistent with the theme of the American Revolution—No taxation without representation.

When a citizen from New Hampshire goes to work in Massachusetts or Maine or Vermont and pays their income tax, it is not reciprocated. We don't have an income tax. We don't tax them. They don't live in that State, and, therefore, I don't believe they should pay that tax.

My bill will grant Federal protection for nonresident taxpayers and prohibit this taxation without representation.

I hope my colleagues will look carefully at this regardless of the tax situation in their own States. The State of Oklahoma, or the State of New Hampshire, or any other State has a perfect right to tax its citizens in whatever way the citizens allow their elected representatives. But the question is, Should the citizens of Wyoming or some other State tell another State what taxes they should pay on their citizens?

The problem exists today where workers from one State are being taxed by others, and these taxpayers have no vote. They have no say and no recourse into how their income tax money is spent. Approximately 90,000 from New Hampshire go to Massachusetts and work. The taxes are collected from them for Massachusetts income taxes. They have no recourse. They have to pay those taxes.

As a matter of fact, New Hampshire residents pay over $200 million in income taxes to Maine, Massachusetts, and Vermont, all of which have income taxes. New Hampshire doesn't. In 1999, Vermont imposed an income tax on 10,840 New Hampshire residents and raised $10.2 million in revenue off the backs of New Hampshire workers who had nothing to say about it, nor could they do anything about it.

In 1998, Massachusetts levied an income tax on 89,336 New Hampshire residents and raised $184 million, again, off the residents of New Hampshire.

And finally, in Maine, in 1998, 8,219 New Hampshire residents were taxed and $9.3 million was raised in revenue.

This is taxation without representation. I am not trying to start another Revolutionary War here, but it is not fair. I believe that whether you have an income tax or not in your State, the issue is really should you be able to levy an income tax against another citizen who lives in another State.

In New Hampshire, we have always had a keen interest in taxes, as a matter of fact, a keen interest in less taxes. One of the greatest Governors in the history of our State, Gov. Meldrim Thomson, passed away last Thursday at the age of 89. Mel Thomson was a hero to many of us in the antitax movement. His campaign theme, when

he ran for Governor three times, was ''ax the tax.'' And that he did. He fought taxes and cut taxes time and time again in our State. He helped our State to assume that true ''live free or die'' tradition that is so popular and so well known.

It is a strength that New Hampshire politicians have not allowed a State income tax to be levied on the hard-working residents of that State. People still do not understand it. They come to me and say: How can you do this without an income tax? How do you get along? We do it through frugality and responsibility and taking care of the hard-earned dollars of our taxpayers.

As recently as last week, my friends in the New Hampshire State House defeated a sales tax proposal. I congratulate them for it. The Republican-led legislature knocked down a 2.5-percent sales tax which would have helped Maine, Massachusetts, and Vermont to discourage their State citizens from coming across the border to shop because we would have begun to get our States equalized in their taxes.

We have this great tradition in New Hampshire of less taxes, less spending, and fiscal responsibility. That is why I was pleased and proud just today—and I know the Presiding Officer's rating is high up in this rating; and I will check the rating—I was pleased today to be told the National Taxpayers Union ranked me No. 7 in the Senate for fiscal responsibility on cutting spending, cutting taxes, and cutting regulations. It is an award of which I am very proud. But it is not so much me; it is tradition in New Hampshire.

If you advocate those sales taxes, if you advocate those income taxes, if you advocate more taxes, you won't be reelected. There are a lot of people who said, let's have a sales or income tax, and they have been defeated and have not been heard from since, and many of them had to leave town.

I think it is rather unfortunate Governor Thomson passed away at the very time President Bush—a man who Governor Thompson admired, and President Bush admired Governor Thompson as well; it was reciprocal—but at the very time President Bush is proposing a $1.6 trillion tax cut for the American people, the man who led the ''ax the tax'' fight in New Hampshire has passed away. So President Bush has picked up the torch from Governor Thomson, and New Hampshire is proud of that.

I am proud of President Bush's budget proposal to provide the typical family of four paying income taxes $1,600 in tax relief.

John Marshall said: ''The power to tax is the power to destroy.'' Taxes have to be used responsibly. As I said today, when I was asked about the National Taxpayers Union rating, it does not mean we do not spend money. We do spend money. We have a responsibility to spend money for our military, for those in need, or whatever. But we have to spend it responsibly. I think that is the key issue.

The taxers in New Hampshire's neighboring States are very clever. They impose the income tax on New Hampshire residents without any fear whatsoever of any political retaliation. It is really cowardice. The officials there tax citizens from my State of New Hampshire who go into Massachusetts to work, and they cannot vote. They cannot vote. They do not have any say about it. What can they do about it? It is not fair. We ought to change it. I say that with respect to my colleagues no matter what the tax status of your own State is. Tax all you want in your State, but do not tax people from another State. And I think that is fair.

Today's average taxpayer faces a combined Federal, State, and local burden of nearly 50 percent of their income. I think that is a little too much. It is time for a change. This is one small way to help New Hampshire citizens, as I know so many are trying to help all of our citizens with tax cuts at the national level.

So I ask my colleagues to support George W. Bush's tax cut and my tax fairness initiative to give certainly New Hampshire citizens and all Americans a little boost for their pocketbooks, so they can spend some money the way they would like to spend it, to have it in their pockets. That $200 million in the pockets of taxpayers in New Hampshire can be used for a lot of things they would like to use it for, including college education, health care, putting money away for a rainy day, or whatever.

I close by saying, my bill amends chapter 4 of title 4 of the U.S. Code to add a provision that says, ''a State or political subdivision thereof may not impose a tax on income earned within such State or political subdivision by non-residents of such State.'' In other words, if they are not your citizens, then you cannot tax them with an income tax. It explicitly allows a State, however—and this is a very important point—if two States want to enter into a voluntary compact or agreement to tax one another—if the two States agree—they can do that. There is an exception for that if the two States agree.

This is consistent with the theme of ''no taxation without representation'' because residents who become angry at politicians who vote for income tax compacts can vote the offending politician out of office. That is why it is good.

I look forward to pressing hard on this and getting the attention of my colleagues. It is my hope I can be a part of the President's push to restore reason and good sense to the Federal tax law.

I ask my colleagues to support me on the Nonresident Income Tax Freedom Act of 2001 to help thousands of New Hampshire citizens who are treated unfairly by taxation without representation.

By Mr. CONRAD (for himself, Ms. SNOW, Mr. REID, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. ROCKFELLER, and Mr. JOHNSON):

S. 762. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for information technology training expenses and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, during the final months of the 106th Congress, the Senate and House completed action on the American Competitiveness in the 21st Century Act which will respond to the shortage of skilled IT workers and help ensure our nation's continued growth and leadership in the information technology field. Congress increased the cap on the number of H1B visas available for foreign workers with high-tech skills to fill the job vacancies in information technology in the US.

As important as action by Congress to permit companies to hire foreign-born skilled IT workers is, this legislation by itself will not address our long-term IT worker needs. Throughout the recent debate on the IT worker shortage, I have urged that we focus our efforts on IT training and partnerships between the business and education communities. Many excellent partnerships between the IT community, state and local government, high schools, and colleges and universities that provide individuals of all ages with education and training opportunities in information technology are already underway.

Partnerships include ExplorNet, a non-profit organization working with local community and school officials to train educators and students to rebuild computers; e-learning opportunities for IT training through more than 100 community colleges nationwide, including Bismarck State College; Cisco Systems Training Academies in many school districts; AOL/Time Warner Foundation's ''Time to Read'' literacy program; Green Thumb and Microsoft working with seniors to improve their IT skills; Great Plains Software's, Fargo, ND, partnership with Valley City State University; and Texas Instruments sponsored training for educators to improve technology skills in the classroom. These are excellent examples of the IT and education communities working together to meet the growing demand for information technology skills.

Although these partnerships are helping to train individuals to fill many IT job vacancies, these educational opportunities cannot keep pace with the demand for workers with advanced technical skills—a demand that continues for the long term despite our current economic slowdown and recent layoffs in the IT sector. Furthermore, continuing to rely on foreign workers who obtain H1B visas is not the answer to our shortage of skilled IT professionals.

A report of 685 companies released by the Information Technology Association of America ITAA, on April 2, 2001, confirms this continuing demand for skilled IT workers. The ITAA assessment of the current IT job market, although reporting a significant decline in the demand for IT workers because of the economic slowdown, confirms there are thousands of positions that employers are not able to fill because firms are unable to find workers with the necessary technical skills. The study estimates there are currently 425,000 vacancies in the IT field for skilled technical positions. Harris Miller, president, of ITAA, remarked, ''. . . hiring has by no means halted for IT workers, rather, demand still far exceeds supply in this market. Miller continues to encourage individuals to pursue advanced technical education programs. He remarked, ''this is actually the time to prepare yourself.''

Mr. President, in response to this continuing long-term demand for skilled IT workers, I am introducing legislation, the Technology Education and Training Act of 2001, TETA, to provide a tax credit for businesses offering IT training and to enable individuals enrolled in certified IT training to take advantage of the Hope Scholarship and Lifetime Learning Credits. This legislation is similar to a bill that I introduced in the 106th Congress, and I am particularly pleased that Senator SNOWE is joining me again in this bipartisan effort as the principal cosponsor. Also joining me as cosponsors are Senators REID, DEWINE, ROCKEFELLER, and JOHNSON, colleagues who have taken leadership roles in focusing attention on the importance of information technology for our economy and encouraging IT education and partnerships.

I am honored that this legislation is also endorsed by a broad coalition of IT, business and educational organizations, including Computing Technology Industry Association, CompTIA, the Technology Workforce Coalition, the American Society for Training and Development, the Information Technology Association of America, the Information Technology Training Association, the Career College Association, the National Association of Computer Consultant Businesses, Cisco Systems, Novell, Compaq Computer Corporation, Gateway and Microsoft.

Under our legislation, businesses would receive a credit against taxes equal to 100 percent of the first $1,500 of information technology training expenses for non-degree IT skills certification on behalf of a current or prospective employee. The credit would increase to $2,000 if the training program is offered in an empowerment zone, an enterprise community, an area declared a disaster zone, a school district with 50 percent or more of students participating in the school lunch program, a tribal community, a rural enterprise community, involves a small business with 200 or fewer employees or involves an individual with a disability.

Additionally, this legislation would amend current law regarding the Hope Scholarship and Lifetime Learning Credits to permit individuals enrolled in non-degree IT training programs and not attending a Title IV institution to be eligible to apply for the Hope Scholarship or Lifetime Learning Credit. Under current law, individuals are not eligible to take advantage of the Hope Scholarship or the Lifetime Learning Credits unless the programs are offered through a Title IV higher education or proprietary institution.

In order to qualify for the Hope Scholarship or Lifetime Learning Credit, the IT training program must lead to certification in an IT skill similar to programs offered by Cisco, Microsoft, Novell, and CompTIA. Under the proposed changes in the Technology Education and Training Act, the certification offered by the commercial information technology training provider must be approved by the Secretary of Treasury in consultation with an Information Technology Training Certification Board.

The shortage of skilled information technology workers will continue to be a major concern for all sectors of our economy despite the current economic slowdown and the recent layoffs in the IT sector. Our continued growth and leadership in formation technology will depend on a sufficient number of highly trained workers. Additionally, as economies around the world rebound and countries, particularly in Asia, develop their own high-tech corridors, it will be difficult to continue to recruit high-tech workers from these countries to meet the needs of our own economy.

Rather than continue our dependency on the H1B program, I believe that encouraging partnerships between the IT and education communities and authorizing additional incentives for businesses and individuals to take advantage of IT skills training offers a more reasonable approach to meeting our long-term high-tech worker needs. The Technology Education and Training Act authorizes important initiatives to respond to this critical shortage. I welcome additional cosponsors of this legislation and urge my colleagues on the Senate Finance Committee to support the proposed changes in TETA during consideration of tax legislation in the 107th Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this legislation along with statements of endorsement for the Technology Education and Training Act from the Technology Workforce Coalition, the Information Technology Association of America, and the American Society for Training and Development be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 762

*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 ''Technology Education and Training Act of 2001''.

**SEC. 2. CREDIT FOR INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY TRAINING PROGRAM EXPENSES.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart B of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following:

**''SEC. 30B. INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY TRAINING PROGRAM EXPENSES.**

''(a) GENERAL RULE.—In the case of a taxpayer engaged in a trade or business during the taxable year, there shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter for such taxable year an amount equal to 100 percent of information technology training program expenses of the taxpayer and any employee of the taxpayer paid or incurred by the taxpayer during such taxable year.

''(b) LIMITATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The amount of information technology training program expenses with respect to any individual which may be taken into account under subsection (a) for the taxable year shall not exceed $1,500.

''(2) INCREASE IN CREDIT AMOUNT FOR PARTICIPATION IN CERTAIN PROGRAMS AND FOR CERTAIN INDIVIDUALS.—The dollar amount in paragraph (1) shall be increased (but not above $2,000) by the amount of information technology training program expenses paid or incurred by the taxpayer—

''(A) with respect to a program operated—

''(i) in an empowerment zone or enterprise community designated under part I of subchapter U or a renewal community designated under part I of subchapter X,

''(ii) in a school district in which at least 50 percent of the students attending schools in such district are eligible for free or reduced-cost lunches under the school lunch program established under the National School Lunch Act,

''(iii) in an area designated as a disaster area by the Secretary of Agriculture or by the President under the Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act in the taxable year or the 4 preceding taxable years,

''(iv) in a rural enterprise community designated under section 766 of the Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1999,

''(v) in an area designated by the Secretary of Agriculture as a Rural Economic Area Partnership Zone,

''(vi) in an area over which an Indian tribal government (as defined in section 7701(a)(40)) has jurisdiction, or

''(vii) by an employer who has 200 or fewer employees for each business day in each of 20 or more calendar weeks in the current or preceding calendar year, or

''(B) in the case of an individual with a disability.

''(c) INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY TRAINING PROGRAM EXPENSES.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The term 'information technology training program expenses' means expenses paid or incurred by reason of the participation of the taxpayer (or any employee of the taxpayer) in any information technology training program if such expenses lead to an industry-accepted information technology certification for the participant. Such term shall only include includes expenses paid for in connection with course work and certification testing which is essential to assessing skill acquisition.

''(2) INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY TRAINING PROGRAM.—The term 'information technology training program' means a program for an industry-accepted information technology certification—

''(A) by any information technology trade association or corporation, and

''(B) which—

''(i) is provided for the employees of such association or corporation, or

''(ii) involves—

''(I) employers, and

''(II) State training programs, school districts, university systems, higher education institutions (as defined in section 101(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965), or certified commercial information technology training providers.

''(3) CERTIFIED COMMERCIAL INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY TRAINING PROVIDER.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'certified commercial information technology training provider' means a private sector organization providing an information technology training program which leads to an approved information technology industry certification for the participants.

''(B) APPROVED INDUSTRY CERTIFICATION.—For purposes of paragraph (1), an information technology industry certification shall be considered approved if such certification is approved by the Secretary, in consultation with the Information Technology Training Certification Advisory Board.

''(d) DENIAL OF DOUBLE BENEFIT.—No deduction or credit under any other provision of this chapter shall be allowed with respect to information technology training program expenses taken into account for the credit under this section.

''(e) CERTAIN RULES MADE APPLICABLE.—For purposes of this section, rules similar to the rules of section 45A(e)(2) and subsections (c), (d), and (e) of section 52 shall apply.

''(f) APPLICATION WITH OTHER CREDITS.—The credit allowed by subsection (a) for any taxable year shall not exceed the excess (if any) of—

''(1) the regular tax for the taxable year reduced by the sum of the credits allowable under the subpart A and the previous sections of this subpart, over

''(2) the tentative minimum tax for the taxable year.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subpart B of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following:

''Sec. 30B. Information technology training program expenses.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to amounts paid or incurred in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2001.

**SEC. 3. INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY TRAINING CERTIFICATION ADVISORY BOARD.**

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established an Information Technology Training Certification Advisory Board (in this section referred to as the ''Board'').

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—The Board shall be composed of not more than 15 members appointed by the Secretary of the Treasury from among individuals—

(1) associated with information technology certification and training associations and businesses; and

(2) who are not officers or employees of the Federal Government.

(c) MEETINGS.—The Board shall meet not less often than annually.

(d) CHAIRPERSON.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Board shall elect a Chairperson from among its members.

(2) CHAIRPERSON.—The chairperson shall be an individual who is a member of an information technology industry trade association.

(e) DUTIES.—The Board shall develop a list of information technology industry certifications, for approval by the Secretary of the Treasury, that qualify the provider of the certification as a certified commercial information technology training provider under section 30B(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as added by section (2)(a).

(f) SUBMISSION OF LIST.—Not later than October 1, 2001, and each year thereafter, the Board shall submit the list required under subsection (e) to the Secretary of the Treasury.

(g) BOARD PERSONNEL MATTERS.—

(1) COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS.—Each member of the Board shall serve without compensation.

(2) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—Each member of the Board shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, at rates authorized for employees of agencies under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code, while away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Board.

(h) TERMINATION OF THE BOARD.—Section 14(b) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to the Board.

**SEC. 4. HOPE SCHOLARSHIP AND LIFETIME LEARNING CREDITS INCLUDE TECHNOLOGY TRAINING CENTERS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 25A(f)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to eligible educational institution) is amended to read as follows:

''(2) ELIGIBLE EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION.—The term 'eligible educational institution' means—

''(A) an institution—

''(i) which is described in section 101(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, and

''(ii) which is eligible to participate in a program under title IV of such Act, or

''(B) a certified commercial information technology training provider (as defined in section 30B(c)(3)).''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The second sentence of section 221(e)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''section 25A(f)(2)'' and inserting ''section 25A(f)(2)(A)''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2001.

---

TECHNOLOGY WORKFORCE COALITION,
*Arlington, VA.*

For Immediate Release

SENATE INTRODUCES TAX CREDIT TO EASE IT WORKER SHORTAGE

WASHINGTON, APRIL 24, 2001.—Help may soon be available for companies suffering from a shortage of skilled IT workers. On Tuesday, the United States Senate introduced the ''Technology Education and Training Act (TETA) of 2001,'' which gives individuals and employers tax credits of up to $2,000 for IT training expenses. Sponsored by Senators Kent Conrad (D–ND), Olympia Snowe (R–ME), Mike DeWine (R–OH), and Harry Reid (D–NV), TETA works to help individuals get needed IT training, thus easing America's IT worker shortage.

''Headlines may scream out high-tech layoffs, but the plain fact is that IT jobs are going empty because there are not enough skilled people to fill them,'' noted Grant Mydland, Director of the Technology Workforce Coalition. Mydland applauded the bill's introduction and urged Congress' quick consideration and passage of TETA.

Essentially, TETA:

Provides a tax credit of up to $1,500 for IT training expenses paid by employers

Amends the HOPE and Lifetime Learning tax credits so individuals can better access IT training courses at all of the available institutions and training centers

Allows tax credits of up to $2,000 for small businesses, as well as for people residing in and companies operating in empowerment zones and other qualified areas

''Nearly half of all IT jobs that will be created in 2001 will remain vacant,'' Mydland added. ''IT drives our economy. TETA gives individuals and companies the necessary educational tools to meet America's rapidly evolving IT needs. The Senate should be congratulated for its foresight in addressing a significant challenge to U.S. prosperity and growth.''

---

SUMMARY OF THE TECHNOLOGY EDUCATION AND TRAINING ACT (TETA) OF 2001

Introduced by Senators Kent Conrad (D–ND), Olympia Snowe (R–ME), Mike DeWine (R–OH), Harry Reid (D–NV), and Representatives Jerry Weller (R–IL) and Jim Moran (D–VA)

Provides a tax credit for 100% of the first $1,500 of information technology training expenses paid for by an employer.

Amends the HOPE and Lifetime Learning tax credits to make it easier for individuals to use these tax credits for information technology training expenses.

The training program must result in certification.

The allowed credit would be $2,000 for small businesses and all companies or individuals in enterprise zones, empowerment zones, and other qualified areas.

WHY THIS TAX CREDIT IS NECESSARY

According to a 1999 Comp TIA Workforce Study, as a result of unfilled IT positions, the U.S. economy lost $105.5 billion in spending that would have gone to salaries and training, this reduced household income by $37.2 billion.

An estimated 268,740 (10%) of IT service and support positions went unfilled in 1999, resulting in $4.5 billion per year in lost worker productivity.

ITAA study released April 2, 2001, predicts a shortage of 425,000 of the 900,000 new IT workers needed in 2001.

A PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIP

Allows the private sector to determine who, what, where and how to train workers.

Helps individuals seek the training they need to enter or re-enter the IT workforce.

Fills the IT worker pipeline with thousands of new and retrained skilled IT workers.

Helps cities all across America fill thousands of available IT jobs.

---

THE INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

For Immediate Release, April 24, 2001.

ITAA PRAISES IT TRAINING TAX CREDIT BILL

ARLINGTON, VA.—The Information Technology Association of America (ITAA) today hailed the Technology Education and Training Act of 2001 introduced by Senators Kent Conrad, Olympia Snowe, Mike DeWine and Harry Reid as a vital step toward a permanent fix of the current high-tech workers shortage in the U.S.

The bill would allow employers a $1500 credit against income tax for expenses incurred by high technology job training programs for employees, and a $2000 credit for small businesses or all companies in enterprise zones or empowerment zones. ITAA believes the bill would encourage companies to go the extra mile in training U.S. workers for high tech jobs.

''Tax credits for business to train and retrain workers mean more high-paying, high-tech jobs for American workers,'' said ITAA President Harris N. Miller. ''The current high vacancy rate for IT jobs represents thousands of missed opportunities for American workers, and the impact of failing to address this shortage can be felt as we see more

jobs shipped overseas. This bill is sound public policy.''

ITAA is the industry leader in combating the high-tech worker shortage. In its latest study of the demand for IT workers, When Can You Start?, ITAA found that the number of needed IT positions in the U.S. had declined to 900,000 for 2001, with an expected vacancy rate of 425,000. While substantially lower than in 2000, the study shows that demand for approximately skilled high tech workers persists.

The Information Technology Association of America (ITAA) provides global public policy, business networking, and national leadership to promote the continued rapid growth of the IT industry. ITAA consists of over 500 direct corporate members throughout the U.S., and a global network of 41 countries' IT associations. The Association plays the leading role in issues of IT industry concern including information security, taxes and finance policy, digital intellectual property protection, telecommunications competition, workforce and education, immigration, online privacy and consumer protection, government IT procurement, human resources and e-commerce policy. ITAA members range from the smallest IT startups to industry leaders in the Internet, software, IT services, ASP, digital content, systems integration, telecommunications, and enterprise solution fields.

---

THE AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT,
*Alexandria, VA.*

For Immediate Release

ASTD ENDORSES THE TECHNOLOGY EDUCATION AND TRAINING ACT (TETA) OF 2001

ALEXANDRIA, VA, APRIL 24.—The American Society for Training & Development (ASTD) today congratulated Senator Kent Conrad (D–ND) and other leading members of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives for introducing the Technology Education & Training Act (TETA) of 2001.

The legislation would provide a tax credit for 100% of the first $1,500 of IT training expenses paid for by an employer. It also amends the HOPE and Lifetime Learning tax credits to make it easier for individuals to use these tax credits for IT training expenses.

''Given the shortage of skilled IT workers, the Technology Education & Training Act of 2001 will go a long way toward filling the gap and providing access to additional training opportunities offered by higher education institutions and training providers,'' said Tina Sung, President & CEO of ASTD. ''Training is the key to preparing and maintaining a strong workforce.''

ASTA's data shows that organizations that make the investment in training are more financially successful. In a study of 575 U.S.-based publicly traded firms during 1996, 1997, and 1998, ASTD found that companies that invested $680 more in training per employee than the average company in the study improved their Total Shareholder Return (TSR) the next year by six percentage points.

Founded in 1944, ASTD is the world's premiere professional association in the field of workplace learning and performance. ASTD's membership includes more than 70,000 professionals in organizations from every level of the field of workplace learning and performance in more than 100 countries. Its leadership and members work in more than 15,000 multinational corporations, small and medium sized businesses, government agencies, colleges, and universities.

---

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. BINGAMAN, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. CANTWELL, and Mr. LIEBERMAN):

S. 764. A bill to direct the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to impose just and reasonable load-differentiated demand rates or cost-of-service based rates on sales by public utilities of electric energy at wholesale in the western energy market, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, by now we know that there will not be enough electricity supply to meet demand in California this summer and that there will be significant rolling blackouts.

As the peak summer demand for power in the State kicks in over the next few months, the crisis is only going to deepen, and we may see electricity prices in California and the Northwest reach unprecedented levels.

And without intervention by the Federal Government, the price gouging that has occurred over the past 6 months will almost certainly continue.

In fact, it looks like California will spend 10 times more for power in 2001 than it spent in 1999, an increase from $7 billion to $70 billion.

And I predict that if left unchecked, these price spikes will spread to other states as well.

But despite the severity and scope of this crisis, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, FERC, has failed to take necessary steps to address the problem.

Since last August, I have called upon FERC to impose a temporary wholesale price cap or cost of service-based rates on energy prices in the Western market.

But FERC, an agency whose sole mission is to regulate the energy market, has refused to act. Today, we introduce this legislation to force FERC to do its job.

Some have argued that a bill to control energy prices would remove incentives for companies to build additional energy generation, exacerbating the situation.

While I agree that we desperately need new supply, I believe that a price cap would provide temporary price stability and reliability until the market returns to normal.

And quite frankly, I think that with prices for power 10 times more than they were in 1999, there is more than enough incentive for suppliers to sell into the Western market.

With cost of service based rates, energy suppliers would generate significant profits and be guaranteed a reasonable rate of return.

With wholesale price caps, companies would be able to decide for themselves whether it is profitable to produce at a given price.

In fact, the energy crisis we are now experiencing is marked much more by the withholding of energy supply from the market than an unwillingness to build additional generation.

In fact, California expects to have 20,000 additional megawatts on line by 2004, enough power for 20 million additional people.

But because it takes 2–3 years to site new power generation, not enough energy can be brought online in time to help the situation this summer.

Price controls, if done right, could actually bring more power into the market.

Indeed, the temporary cost-based rates and/or the regional price cap that Senator SMITH and I are proposing will eliminate that incentive. Thus, generators would have no reason to withhold power to the market.

With that said, let me talk briefly about what this bill would do: The bill requires FERC to set either a temporary price cap or cost of service based rates (with a reasonable rate of return). And make no mistake this bill is temporary; it is intended to get us through two summers. In order to qualify, a state must allow its utilities to recover costs from ratepayers and a state must pass electricity rates onto ratepayers. Though a state regulatory authority would still determine the manner in which wholesale rates are passed onto consumers. In addition, the bill directs FERC to end the temporary suspension of the natural gas transportation rate cap. Even today the price of natural gas in Southern California is about 3 times the cost in neighboring San Juan, New Mexico, $13 Decatherm vs. $4.50 Decatherm. The bill directs FERC to require that anyone selling natural gas in a bundled transaction into California to disclose the commodity and transportation components of the price. When a company purchases both the transportation and commodity components of natural gas, there is no reporting requirement as to the price of each transaction. The bill also requires that all future orders to sell natural gas or electricity to an affected state must include a reasonable assurance of payment.

I am deeply disappointed that FERC will not do its job and protect consumers and businesses in the West.

It is my hope that FERC will reconsider its opposition to price caps or cost-based rates. Price caps or cost-based rates may be the only way to prevent the further transfer of wealth from the Western region to energy suppliers.

---

By Mr. BROWNBACK (for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. LUGAR, and Mr. DEWINE):

S. 765. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a carbon sequestration investment tax credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 765

*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 ''Carbon Sequestration Investment Tax Credit Act''.

**SEC. 2. CARBON SEQUESTRATION INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart D of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to business-related credits) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

**"SEC. 45E. CARBON SEQUESTRATION INVESTMENT CREDIT.**

''(a) ALLOWANCE OF CREDIT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of section 38, in the case of an eligible taxpayer's investment in a carbon sequestration project approved by the implementing panel under section 2 of the International Carbon Conservation Act, the carbon sequestration investment credit determined under this section for the taxable year is an amount equal to—

''(A) $2.50, multiplied by

''(B) the number of tons of carbon the implementing panel determines was sequestrated in such project during the calendar year ending with or within such taxable year, multiplied by

''(C) the percentage of the total investment in such project which is represented by the investment in such project which is attributable, directly or indirectly, to the eligible taxpayer, as determined by the implementing panel.

''(2) AGGREGATE DOLLAR LIMITATION.—The credit determined under paragraph (1) for any taxable year, when added to any credit allowed to the eligible taxpayer with respect to the such project in any preceding taxable year, shall not exceed 50 percent of the investment attributable to the eligible taxpayer with respect to such project through such taxable year.

''(b) ANNUAL LIMITATION ON AGGREGATE CREDIT ALLOWABLE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The amount of the carbon sequestration investment credit determined under subsection (a) for any taxable year, when added to all such credits allowed to all eligible taxpayers with respect to the such project for such taxable year shall not exceed the credit dollar amount allocated to such project under this subsection by the implementing panel for the calendar year ending with or within such taxable year.

''(2) TIME FOR MAKING ALLOCATION.—An allocation shall be taken into account under paragraph (1) only if it is made not later than the close of the calendar year in which the carbon sequestration project proposal with respect to such project is approved by the implementing panel under section 2 of the International Carbon Conservation Act.

''(3) AGGREGATE CREDIT DOLLAR AMOUNT.—The aggregate credit dollar amount which the implementing panel may allocate for any calendar year is equal to $200,000,000.

''(e) ELIGIBLE TAXPAYER; IMPLEMENTING PANEL.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) ELIGIBLE TAXPAYER.—A taxpayer is eligible for the credit under this section with respect to a carbon sequestration project if such taxpayer has not elected the application of sections 3 and 4 of the International Carbon Conservation Act with respect to such project.

''(2) IMPLEMENTING PANEL.—The term 'implementing panel' means the implementing panel established under section 2 of such Act.

''(f) RECAPTURE OF CREDIT IN CERTAIN CASES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—If, at any time during the 30-year period of a carbon sequestration project, there is a recapture event with respect to such project, then the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year in which such event occurs shall be increased by the credit recapture amount.

''(2) CREDIT RECAPTURE AMOUNT.—For purposes of paragraph (1)—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The credit recapture amount is an amount equal to the recapture percentage of all carbon sequestration investment credits previously allowable to an eligible taxpayer with respect to any investment in such project that is attributable to such taxpayer.

''(B) RECAPTURE PERCENTAGE.—The recapture percentage shall be 100 percent if the recapture event occurs during the first 10 years of the project, 66⅔ percent if the recapture event occurs during the second 10 years of the project, 33⅓ percent if the recapture event occurs during the third 10 years of the project, and 0 percent if the recapture event occurs at any time after the 30th year of the project.

''(3) RECAPTURE EVENT.—For purposes of paragraph (1), there is a recapture event with respect to a carbon sequestration project if—

''(A) the eligible taxpayer violates a term or condition of the approval of the project by the implementing panel at any time,

''(B) the eligible taxpayer adopts a practice which the implementing panel has specified in its approval of the project as a practice which would tend to defeat the purposes of the carbon sequestration program, or

''(C) the eligible taxpayer disposes of any ownership interest arising out of its investment that the implementing panel has determined is attributable to the project, unless the implementing panel determines that such disposition will not have any adverse effect on the carbon sequestration project.

If an event which otherwise would be a recapture event is outside the control of the eligible taxpayer, as determined by the implementing panel, such event shall not be treated as a recapture event with respect to such taxpayer.

''(4) SPECIAL RULES.—

''(A) TAX BENEFIT RULE.—The tax for the taxable year shall be increased under paragraph (1) only with respect to credits allowed by reason of this section which were used to reduce tax liability. In the case of credits not so used to reduce tax liability, the carryforwards and carrybacks under section 39 shall be appropriately adjusted.

''(B) NO CREDITS AGAINST TAX.—Any increase in tax under this subsection shall not be treated as a tax imposed by this chapter for purposes of determining the amount of any credit under this chapter or for purposes of section 55.

''(g) DISALLOWANCE OF DOUBLE BENEFIT.—

''(1) BASIS REDUCTION.—The basis of any investment in a carbon sequestration project shall be reduced by the amount of any credit determined under this section with respect to such investment.

''(2) CHARITABLE DEDUCTION DISALLOWED.—No deduction shall be allowed to an eligible taxpayer under section 170 with respect to any contribution which the implementing panel certifies pursuant to section 2 of the International Carbon Conservation Act to the Secretary constitutes an investment in a carbon sequestration project that is attributable to such taxpayer.

''(h) CERTIFICATION TO SECRETARY.—The implementing panel shall certify to the Secretary before January 31 of each year with respect to each eligible taxpayer which has made an investment in a carbon sequestration project—

''(1) the amount of the carbon sequestration investment credit allowable to such taxpayer for the preceding calendar year,

''(2) whether a recapture event occurred with respect to such taxpayer during the preceding calendar year, and

''(3) the credit recapture amount, if any, with respect to such taxpayer for the preceding calendar year.

''(i) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall prescribe such regulations as may be appropriate to carry out this section, including regulations—

''(1) which limit the credit for investments which are directly or indirectly subsidized by other Federal benefits,

''(2) which prevent the abuse of the provisions of this section through the use of related parties, and

''(3) which impose appropriate reporting requirements.''.

(b) CREDIT MADE PART OF GENERAL BUSINESS CREDIT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (b) of section 38 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''plus'' at the end of paragraph (12), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (13) and inserting '', plus'', and by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(14) the carbon sequestration investment credit determined under section 45E(a).''.

(2) LIMITATION ON CARRYBACK.—Subsection (d) of section 39 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(10) NO CARRYBACK OF CARBON SEQUESTRATION INVESTMENT CREDIT BEFORE JANUARY 1, 2002.—No portion of the unused business credit for any taxable year which is attributable to the credit under section 45E may be carried back to a taxable year ending before January 1, 2002.''.

(c) DEDUCTION FOR UNUSED CREDIT.—Subsection (c) of section 196 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking ''and'' at the end of paragraph (7), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (8) and inserting '', and'', and by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(9) the carbon sequestration investment credit determined under section 45E(a).''.

(d) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subpart D of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''Sec. 45E. Carbon sequestration investment credit.''.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to investments made after December 31, 2001.

---

By Mr. HUTCHINSON:

S. 766. A bill to impose notification and reporting requirements in connection with grants of waivers of the limitation on certain procurements of the Department of Defense that is known as the Berry amendment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill I am introducing today be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 766

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

**SECTION 1. NOTIFICATION AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS REGARDING WAIVER OF THE BERRY AMENDMENT LIMITATION.**

(a) ANNUAL REPORT.—(1) After the end of each fiscal year, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report on the waivers of the limitation on use of funds set forth in section 9005 of Public Law 102–396 (popularly known as the ''Berry amendment'') that were granted under any provision of law during that fiscal year for procurements made by the Defense Logistics Agency for the military departments.

(2) The report for a fiscal year shall include the following:

(A) The number of waivers.

(B) For each waiver—

(i) the reasons for the waiver;

(ii) the date of the notification of the military department concerned under subsection (b); and

(iii) a description of the items procured pursuant to the waiver, together with the amount of the procurement.

(C) The number of instances in which the Secretary of Defense waived the notification requirement under subsection (b).

(b) NOTIFICATION.—(1) Not later than 14 days before granting a waiver of the limitation referred to in subsection (a)(1) for a procurement to be made by the Defense Logistics Agency for a military department, the Secretary of Defense shall transmit to the Secretary of the military department a notification of the determination to waive the limitation.

(2) The Secretary of Defense may waive the applicability of the notification requirement under paragraph (1) in any case in which the Secretary determines that a delay of the procurement to satisfy the requirement is not consistent with a need to expedite the procurement in the national security interests of the United States.

(c) SYSTEM FOR DATA COLLECTION.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish a system for—

(1) monitoring the granting of waivers of the limitation referred to in subsection (a)(1); and

(2) recording the waivers and the reasons for the waivers.

(d) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''waiver'', with respect to the limitation referred to in subsection (a)(1), means a determination authorized under section 9005 of Public Law 102–396 that a particular procurement is covered by an exception provided in that section.

---

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. CORZINE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. KERRY, Mr. CHAFEE, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. CARPER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. AKAKA, and Mr. HOLLINGS):

S. 767. A bill to extend the Brady background checks to gun shows, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise to introduce the Gun Show Background Check Act of 2001. Along with twenty of my colleagues, I am offering this legislation to renew the process of bringing some sense to our nation's gun laws by closing a loophole that has allowed criminals to buy firearms at gun shows for far too long.

The Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms reported to Congress last year that gun shows are a major gun trafficking channel responsible for more than 26,000 illegal firearms sales during an 18-month period. The FBI and ATF tell us again and again that convicted felons, domestic abusers, and other prohibited purchasers are taking advantage of the gun show loophole to acquire firearms.

Two years ago, after Eric Harris and Dylan Klebold killed 13 people at Columbine High School with weapons purchased from a private seller at a gun show, the United States Senate passed the Lautenberg amendment to close the gun show loophole. The legislation I am introducing today is identical to that Senate-passed amendment.

Under federal law, Federal Firearms Licensees are required to maintain careful records of their sales, and under the Brady Act, to check a purchaser's background with the National Instant Criminal Background Check System before transferring any firearm. However, a person does not need a federal firearms license, and the Brady Act does not apply, if the person is not ''engaged in the business'' of selling firearms pursuant to federal law. These nonlicensees make up one quarter or more of the sellers of firearms at thousands of gun shows in America each year. Consequently, felons and other prohibited persons who want to avoid Brady Act checks and records of their purchases buy firearms at gun shows.

My legislation incorporates recommendations made by the Department of Justice and the Department of the Treasury in their 1999 report on gun shows. The legislation would take several steps to make gun show transactions safer for all Americans:

Definition of gun shows: Gun shows are defined to include any event at which 50 or more firearms are offered or exhibited for sale. This definition includes not only those events where firearms are the main commodity sold, but also other events where a significant number of guns are sold, such as flea markets or swap meets.

Gun show promoters: Gun show promoters would be required to register with the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms, maintain a list of vendors at all gun shows, and ensure that all vendors acknowledge receipt of information about their legal obligations.

Background checks for all transactions: The bill requires that all firearms sales at gun shows go through a Federal Firearms Licensee. If a nonlicensed person is selling a weapon, they would use an FFL at the gun show to complete the transaction. The FFL would be responsible for conducting a Brady check on the purchaser and maintaining records of the transactions.

Improved firearm tracing: FFLs would be required to submit information necessary to trace all firearms transferred at gun shows to the ATF's National Tracing Center, including the manufacturer/importer, model, and serial number of the firearms. However, no personal information about either the seller or the purchaser would be given to the government. Instead, as under current law, FFLs would maintain this information in their files. The NTC would request this information from an FFL only in the event that a firearm subsequently becomes the subject of a law enforcement trace request.

Some will say that this legislation is an attempt to end gun shows, but the experience of states that have closed the gun show loophole proves otherwise. California, for example, requires not only background checks at gun shows but a 10-day waiting period for all gun sales, yet gun shows continue to thrive there. No, we're not trying to end gun shows. What we are trying to end is the free pass we're giving to convicted felons when they can walk into a gun show, find a private dealer, buy whatever weapons they want and walk out without a Brady background check.

In overwhelming numbers, the American people believe that background checks should be required for all gun show sales. The people of Colorado and Oregon confirmed this last fall when they approved ballot initiatives to close the gun show loophole. I urge my colleagues to support the Gun Show Background Check Act of 2001 so that we can finally close this loophole in every state and make sure that convicted felons, domestic abusers, and other prohibited persons do not use gun shows to purchase firearms without a Brady background check.

---

By Mr. WARNER:

S. 768. A bill to amend section 8339(p) of title 5, United States Code, to clarify the method for computing certain annuities under the Civil Service Retirement System which are based (in whole or in part) on part-time service, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleague in the House of Representatives, Congressman JIM MORAN, in introducing legislation to correct an error in the retirement benefits calculation for certain part-time federal employees.

In 1986, Congress passed legislation to reform the retirement system for the federal workforce, establishing the Federal Employees Retirement System to replace the Civil Service Retirement System.

Provisions in this legislation also revised the formula used to determine retirement benefits for employees with full time and part time service in the federal government. Congress did not intend this change to impact the existing workers who remained under the Civil Service Retirement System.

Implementation of the provision, however, was misinterpreted by the Office of Personnel Management. Affected employees are losing hundreds, and in some cases thousands, of dollars every year of the retirement benefits they earned.

Many employees only became aware as they were about to retire that they would not receive all of the benefits they were expecting. The impacted federal workers had full-time service before 1986, and changed to part-time service for the end of their civil service career. Often these employees cut back their hours to care for their families,

or even delayed retirement and worked part-time to help an office during a transition period.

The revised retirement formula calculates benefits for a federal part-time worker based on a full-time equivalent basis which is scaled accordingly. Benefits are based on a worker's high-three average salary during his or her career. This could occur during an employee's part-time service.

Civil service employees with pre-1986 full-time work and some part-time work after 1986 do not receive the proper credit for their full-time work, however, because full-time and part-time work are broken into two parts. The full-time equivalent pay for the high-three years should apply to an employees entire career. Instead, for the affected employees, their pre-1986 full-time benefits are based on actual salary. This two-step approach undervalues the worker's full-time service.

The bill I am introducing today will correct this error by allowing an employee's full-time equivalent salary for their high-three years apply to their entire careers, including pre-1986 service.

I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation and these federal employees for their dedicated service by ensuring they receive the retirement benefits they have earned.

I ask consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 768

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

**SECTION 1. COMPUTATION OF CERTAIN ANNUITIES BASED ON PART-TIME SERVICE.**

Section 8339(p) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(3) In the administration of paragraph (1)—

''(A) subparagraph (A) of such paragraph shall apply with respect to any service performed on a part-time basis before, on, or after April 7, 1986;

''(B) subparagraph (B) of such paragraph shall apply with respect to all service performed on or after April 7, 1986 (whether on a part-time basis or otherwise); and

''(C) any service performed on a part-time basis before April 7, 1986, shall be credited as service performed on a full-time basis.''.

**SEC. 2. APPLICABILITY.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), the amendment made by this Act shall apply only with respect to an annuity entitlement that is based on a separation occurring on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) RECOMPUTATION OF CERTAIN ANNUITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any individual who—

(A) before April 7, 1986, performed any service creditable under subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, and

(B) was separated from the service on or after April 7, 1986, and before the date of enactment of this Act,

any annuity under subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code (or under chapter 84 of that title, to the extent of any portion of such annuity which is computed under subchapter III of such chapter 83) based on the service of such individual shall be recomputed to take into account the amendment made by this Act, if application therefor is made within 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) AMOUNTS TO WHICH APPLICABLE.—Any change in an annuity resulting from a recomputation under paragraph (1) shall be effective with respect to amounts accruing for months beginning after the date on which application for such recomputation is made.

(c) NOTICE REQUIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Office of Personnel Management shall take such action as may be necessary and appropriate to inform individuals entitled to have any annuity recomputed under subsection (b) of their entitlement to such recomputation.

(2) ASSISTANCE.—The Office shall, on request, assist any individual referred to in paragraph (1) in obtaining from any department, agency, or other instrumentality of the United States such information in the possession of such instrumentality as may be necessary—

(A) to verify the entitlement of such individual to have an annuity recomputed under subsection (b); or

(B) to carry out any such recomputation.

(3) INFORMATION.—Any department, agency, or other instrumentality of the United States which possesses any information with respect to part-time service performed by an individual shall, at the request of the Office, furnish such information to the Office.

---

By Mr. BROWNBACK (for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. LUGAR, and Mr. DEWINE):

S. 769. A bill to establish a carbon sequestration program and an implementing panel within the Department of Commerce to enhance international conservation, to promote the role of carbon sequestration as a means of slowing the buildup of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere, and to reward and encourage voluntary, pro-active environmental efforts on the issue of global climate change; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 769

*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 ''International Carbon Conservation Act''.

**SEC. 2. CARBON SEQUESTRATION PROGRAM.**

(a) CARBON SEQUESTRATION PROGRAM.—Within 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the implementing panel shall establish a carbon sequestration program to permit project sponsors to make carbon sequestration project proposals to the implementing panel.

(b) IMPLEMENTING PANEL.—There is established within the National Institute of Standards and Technology of the Department of Commerce an implementing panel consisting of—

(1) the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology,

(2) the Secretary of Agriculture,

(3) the Secretary of State,

(4) the Secretary of Energy,

(5) the Chief of the Forest Service, and

(6) representatives of nongovernmental organizations who have an expertise and experience in carbon sequestration practices, appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The Chief of the Forest Service shall act as chairperson of the implementing panel.

(c) CARBON SEQUESTRATION PROJECT.—For purposes of this section—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The term ''carbon sequestration project'' means a project—

(A) which is located outside the United States,

(B) the duration of which is not less than 30 years,

(C) which is designed to increase the sequestration of carbon, and

(D) which is accepted by the implementing panel under the carbon sequestration program.

(2) ACCEPTANCE OF PROJECT PROPOSALS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Under the carbon sequestration program, the implementing panel shall accept a proposal for a carbon sequestration project from a project sponsor only if—

(i) the proposal includes a needs assessment described in subparagraph (B),

(ii) the proposal identifies the benefits of carbon sequestration practices of the sponsored project under criteria developed to evaluate such benefits under subsection (d) and under guidelines instituted to quantify such benefits under subsection (e) and includes an agreement by the sponsor to carry out such practices as described in subparagraph (C), and

(iii) the proposal includes an agreement to provide verification of compliance with an approved project as described in subparagraph (D) under standards established under subsection (f).

(B) NEEDS ASSESSMENT.—A needs assessment described in this subparagraph is an assessment of the need for the carbon sequestration project described in a proposal and the ability of the project sponsor to carry out the carbon sequestration practices related to such project. The assessment shall be developed by the project sponsor, in cooperation with the Agency for International Development, nongovernmental organizations, and independent third-party verifiers.

(C) CARBON SEQUESTRATION PRACTICES.—Under a carbon sequestration project proposal, the project sponsor shall agree to contract with other entities, including organizations based in the country in which the sponsored carbon sequestration project is located, to carry out carbon sequestration practices proposed by the project sponsor which (as determined by the implementing panel)—

(i) provide for additional carbon sequestration beyond that which would be provided in the absence of such project, and

(ii) contribute to a positive reduction of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere through carbon sequestration over at least a 30-year period.

(D) VERIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE WITH APPROVED CARBON SEQUESTRATION PROJECT.—Under a carbon sequestration project proposal, the project sponsor shall agree to provide the implementing panel with verification through a third party that such project is sequestering carbon in accordance with the proposal approved by the implementing panel, including an annual audit of the project, an actual verification of the practices at the project site every 5 years, and such random inspections as are necessary.

(d) CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING BENEFITS OF CARBON SEQUESTRATION PRACTICES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Under the carbon sequestration program the Chief of the Forest Service, in consultation with other members of the implementing panel, shall develop criteria for prioritizing, determining the acceptability of, and evaluating, the benefits of the carbon sequestration practices proposed in projects for the purpose of determining the acceptability of project proposals.

(2) CONTENT.—The criteria shall ensure that carbon sequestration investment credits under section 45E of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 are not allocated to projects the primary purpose of which is to grow timber for commercial harvest or to projects which replace native ecological systems with commercial timber plantations. Projects should be prioritized according to—

(A) native forest preservation, especially with respect to land which would otherwise cease to be native forest land,

(B) reforestation of former forest land where such land has not been forested for at least 10 years,

(C) biodiversity enhancement,

(D) the prevention of greenhouse gas emissions through the preservation of carbon storing plants and trees,

(E) soil erosion management,

(F) soil fertility restoration, and

(G) the duration of the project, including any project under which other entities are engaged to extend the duration of the project beyond the minimum carbon sequestration project term.

(e) GUIDELINES FOR QUANTIFYING BENEFITS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Under the carbon sequestration program, the Chief of the Forest Service, in consultation with other members of the implementing panel, shall institute guidelines for the development of methodologies for quantifying the amount of carbon sequestered by particular projects for the purposes of determining the acceptability of project proposals. These guidelines should set standards for project sponsors with regard to—

(A) methodologies for measuring the carbon sequestered,

(B) measures to assure the duration of projects sponsored,

(C) criteria that verifies that the carbon sequestered is additional to the sequestration which would have occurred without the sponsored project,

(D) reasonable criteria to evaluate the extent to which the project displaces activity that causes deforestation in another location, and

(E) the extent to which the project promotes sustainable development in a project area, particularly with regard to protecting the traditional land tenure of indigenous people.

(2) BASIS.—In developing the guidelines, the Chief of the Forest Service shall—

(A) consult with land grant universities and entities which specialize in carbon storage verification and measurement, and

(B) use information reported to the Secretary of Energy from projects carried out under the voluntary reporting program of the Energy Information Administration under section 1605 of the Energy Policy Act of 1992 (42 U.S.C. 13385).

(f) VERIFICATION STANDARDS.—Under the carbon sequestration program, the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, in consultation with other members of the implementing panel and the National Science Foundation, shall establish verification standards for purposes of subsection (c)(2)(D).

(g) PROGRAM REPORTING.—The Administrator of the Energy Information Administration, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, shall develop forms to monitor carbon sequestration improvements made as a result of the program established under this section and the implementing panel shall use such forms to report to the Administrator on—

(1) carbon sequestration improvements made as a result of the program,

(2) carbon sequestration practices of project sponsors enrolled in the program, and

(3) compliance with the terms of the implementing panel's approval of projects.

(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the program established under subsection (a).

**SEC. 3. EXPORT-IMPORT BANK FINANCING.**

An owner or operator of property that is located outside of the United States and that is used in a carbon sequestration project approved by the implementing panel under section 2 may enter into a contract for an extension of credit from the Export-Import Bank of the United States of up to 75 percent of the cost of carrying out the carbon sequestration practices specified in the carbon sequestration project proposal to the extent that the Export-Import Bank determines that the cost sharing is appropriate, in the public interest, and otherwise meets the requirements of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945.

**SEC. 4. EQUITY INVESTMENT INSURANCE.**

An owner or operator of property that is located outside of the United States and that is used in a carbon sequestration project approved by the implementing panel under section 2 may enter into a contract for investment insurance issued by the Overseas Private Investment Corporation pursuant to section 234 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2194) if the Corporation determines that issuance of the insurance is consistent with the provisions of such section 234.

---

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself and Mr. JEFFORDS):

S. 770. A bill to amend part A of title IV of the Social security Act to allow up to 24 months of vocational educational training to be counted as a work activity under the temporary assistance to needy families program; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I am pleased to be joined by Senator JEFFORDS, Chairman of the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee in introducing legislation that seeks to add an important measure of flexibility to a provision of the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program, TANF, under the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996. The legislation we are introducing increases from 12 to 24 months the limit on the amount of vocational education training that a state can count towards meeting its work participation rate.

Under the pre-1996 Aid to Families with Dependent Children program, recipients could participate in post-secondary vocational training or community college programs for up to 24 months. While I support the new law's emphasis on moving welfare recipients more quickly into jobs, I am troubled by the law's restriction on post-secondary education training, limiting it to 12 months. One year of vocational education is an approved work activity, the second year of post-secondary education study is not.

The limitation on post-secondary education training raises a number of concerns, not the least of which is whether individuals may be forced into low-paying, short-term employment that will lead them back onto public assistance because they are unable to support themselves or their families. According to recent studies, this is exactly what has happened in far too many cases. According to a March 13, 2001 report of the Congressional Research Service, which is based on research published in the 2000 Edition of the House Committee on Ways and Means Green Book, although the majority of recipients who have left the welfare rolls left because they became employed, most remained poor. The research also revealed that the average hourly wage for these former welfare recipients ranged from $5.50 to $8.80 per hour.

Study after study indicates that short-term training programs raise the income of workers only marginally, while completion of at least a two-year associate degree has the potential of breaking the cycle of poverty for welfare recipients. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, the median earnings of adults with an associate degree are 30 percent higher than adults who have not achieved such a degree.

A majority of the members of the Senate has previously cast their vote in favor of making 24 months of post-secondary education a permissible work activity under TANF The Levin-Jeffords amendment to the 1997 Reconciliation bill, permitting up to 24 months of post-secondary education, received 55 votes—falling five votes short of the required procedural vote of 60. The amendment had the support of the National Governors Association, NGA, and NGA's support continues with the legislation Senator JEFFORDS and I are introducing today. I would also like to make note of Senator WELLSTONE's efforts on this issue. He subsequently proposed several modifications to TANF, including raising the 12 month limit to 24 months, in an amendment to the 1998 Higher Education reauthorization bill. The amendment passed the Senate but was deleted during conference negotiations.

It is my hope that the Senate will again act favorably and expeditiously on this legislation and that the House will support this much-needed State flexibility. We must do what is necessary to achieve TANF's intended goal of getting families permanently off of welfare and onto self-sufficiency.

In closing, I would like to present to my colleagues some examples of the earnings that can be made upon completion of two years of training in a structured vocational or community college program. The following are jobs that an individual could prepare for in a two-year community college program, including the average starting salary for each nationwide.

*Average Starting Salary Nationwide*

| | |
|---|---|
| Dental Hygiene | $31,750 |
| Physical Therapy Assistant | 28,782 |
| Computer Programing | 28,000 |
| Occupational Therapy Assistant | 27,624 |
| Respiratory Therapy | 26,877 |
| Computer Assisted Design | 26,890 |
| Drafting and Design | 24,800 |
| Electronic Technology | 24,255 |
| Culinary Arts | 22,500 |
| Early Childhood Development Assistant | 18,000 |

Again, I urge my colleagues to act with haste. The modification embodied in this legislation can give the states the flexibility they need to help improve the economic status of families across America.

---

By Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. ALLEN):

S.J. Res. 13. A joint resolution conferring honorary citizenship of the United States on Paul Yves Roch Gilbert du Motier, also known as the Marquis de Lafayette; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce a bill that will make General Lafayette an honorary United States Citizen. This honor has been bestowed on four other individuals including Winston Churchill and Mother Teresa.

Marie Joseph Paul Yves Roch Gilbert du Motier, Marquis de La Fayette (1757–1834) was born in France and was a wealthy French youth blessed with every advantage offered by Europe's aristocracy. Although he was wealthy and among France's aristocracy, he risked his wealth and status to aid the Americans in their revolution against Great Britain.

At the age of 19, determined to dedicate himself to the cause of our liberty, he bought a ship and sailed to the American colonies to volunteer his services. In early summer of 1777, soon after his arrival, Congress voted him the rank and commission of Major General. Just two months later, Lafayette was wounded at the battle of Brandywine, forever endearing himself to the American soldiers.

Throughout the American Revolution, Lafayette acted as a liaison between France and the American colonies. He urged influential policy makers to have France make the decisive military, naval and financial commitment to the colonists. His tireless efforts, both as a liaison and a general, aided America in her time of need.

As a general, his military tactics lured British General Cornwallis and his army to Yorktown, Virginia. The American Army, led by General Washington, along with French forces led by Rochambeau, came south and trapped Cornwallis and his troops at Yorktown. As a result, the British were forced to surrender.

Lafayette's services to America extended beyond the battlefront. He worked diligently as an advisor, helping win concessions from Britain during the Treaty negotiations. At Versailles, when negotiating with the French government, our representatives Franklin and Jefferson found him invaluable. Moreover, his impartial friendship was extended to the first eight U.S. presidents.

Despite his commitment to our Country, America did not recognize his United States' citizenship in his time of need. While crossing the French border into the Netherlands to escape arrest from the Revolutionary French Government, the Austrians captured and arrested General Lafayette. Despite his claim that he was an American citizen being illegally detained, the Austrians disagreed. General Lafayette appealed to American ministers for help, but his calls for intervention were not answered. Lafayette clearly felt that he was an America citizen, and technically he may have been under the blanket naturalization granted all citizens of each state when the Constitution was ratified. The U.S. government, however, failed to acknowledge his claim, and he spent the next five years in prison.

Although General Lafayette was made an honorary citizen by Virginia and Maryland before the United States Constitution was ratified, the United States failed to recognize his citizenship while he was imprisoned. I feel that we must set the record straight and honor General Lafayette for his commitment to the United States by making him an honorary United States citizen. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. J. RES. 13

Whereas the United States has conferred honorary citizenship on four other occasions in more than 200 years of its independence, and honorary citizenship is and should remain an extraordinary honor not lightly conferred nor frequently granted;

Whereas Paul Yves Roch Gilbert du Motier, also known as the Marquis de Lafayette or General Lafayette, voluntarily put forth his own money and risked his life for the freedom of Americans;

Whereas the Marquis de Lafayette, by an Act of Congress, was voted to the rank of Major General;

Whereas, during the Revolutionary War, General Lafayette was wounded at the Battle of Brandywine, demonstrating bravery that forever endeared him to the American soldiers;

Whereas the Marquis de Lafayette secured the help of France to aid the United States' colonists against Great Britain;

Whereas the Marquis de Lafayette was conferred the honor of honorary citizenship by the Commonwealth of Virginia and the State of Maryland;

Whereas the Marquis de Lafayette was the first foreign dignitary to address Congress, which honor was accorded him upon his return to the United States in 1824;

Whereas, upon his death, both the House of Representatives and the Senate draped their chambers in black as a demonstration of respect and gratitude for his contribution to the independence of the United States;

Whereas an American flag has flown over his grave in France since his death and has not been removed, even while France occupied by Nazi Germany during World War II; and

Whereas the Marquis de Lafayette gave aid to the United States in time need and is forever a symbol of freedom: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That Paul Yves Roch Gilbert du Motier, also known as the Marquis de Lafayette, is proclaimed to be an honorary citizen of the United States of America.

---

## SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

---

### SENATE RESOLUTION 72—DESIGNATING THE MONTH OF APRIL AS "NATIONAL SEXUAL ASSAULT AWARENESS MONTH"

Mr. SPECTER (for himself, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. CRAPO, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. GREGG, Mr. DODD, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. BIDEN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. REID, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mr. KERRY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. BINGAMAN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Ms. LANDRIEU, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. BAUCUS, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. CORZINE, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. BAYH) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. RES. 72

Whereas non-stranger and stranger rape and sexual assault affects women, children, and men of all racial, cultural, and economic backgrounds;

Whereas women, children, and men suffer multiple types of sexual violence;

Whereas the Department of Justice reports that a sexual assault occurs every 90 seconds;

Whereas it is estimated by the Bureau of Justice Statistics that over 70 percent of rapes are never reported to the police;

Whereas in addition to the immediate physical and emotional costs, sexual assault may also have associated consequences of post-traumatic stress disorder, substance abuse, major depression, homelessness, eating disorders, and suicide;

Whereas it is important to recognize the compassion and dedication of the individuals who provide services to survivors and work to increase the public understanding of this significant problem;

Whereas State coalitions and local rape crisis centers across the Nation are committed to increasing public awareness of sexual violence and its prevalence and to eliminating it through education;

Whereas important partnerships have been formed among criminal and juvenile justice agencies, allied professionals, and victim services;

Whereas the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention have identified sexual assault as a significant, costly, and preventable health issue; and

Whereas the United States Government has expressed a commitment to eliminating sexual violence in society with various legislative actions and appropriations, including the Violence Against Women Act, Grants to Combat Violence Against Women on Campus, and through projects of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) designates the month of April 2001, as ''National Sexual Assault Awareness Month'';

(2) encourages individual and collective efforts that reflect the vision of a Nation where no sexual assault victim goes unserved or ever feels there is no path to justice and where citizens work toward eliminating all forms of sexual violence; and

(3) requests that the President of the United States issue a proclamation calling on the people of the United States and interested groups to observe ''National Sexual Assault Awareness Month'' with appropriate ceremonies, activities, and programs to reflect the commitment to eliminating sexual violence from society and to acknowledge the work of organizations and individuals against sexual violence.

## SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 33—SUPPORTING A NATIONAL CHARTER SCHOOLS WEEK

Mr. GREGG (for himself and Mr. LIEBERMAN) submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. CON. RES. 33

Whereas charter schools are public schools authorized by a designated public body and operating on the principles of accountability, parent flexibility, choice, and autonomy;

Whereas in exchange for the flexibility and autonomy given to charter schools, they are held accountable by their sponsors for improving student achievement and for their financial and other operations;

Whereas 36 States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico have passed laws authorizing charter schools;

Whereas 35 States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico will have received more than $500,000,000 in grants from the Federal Government by the end of the current fiscal year for planning, startup, and implementation of charter schools since their authorization in 1994 under part C of title X of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8061 et seq.);

Whereas 34 States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico are serving approximately 550,000 students in more than 2,150 charter schools during the 2000 to 2001 school year;

Whereas charter schools can be vehicles both for improving student achievement for students who attend them and for stimulating change and improvement in all public schools and benefiting all public school students;

Whereas charter schools in many States serve significant numbers of low income, minority, and disabled students;

Whereas the Charter Schools Expansion Act of 1998 (Public Law 105–278) amended the Federal grant program for charter schools authorized by part C of title X of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8061 et seq.) to strengthen accountability provisions at the Federal, State, and local levels to ensure that charter public schools are of high quality and are truly accountable to the public;

Whereas 7 of 10 charter schools report having a waiting list;

Whereas students in charter schools nationwide have similar demographic characteristics as students in all public schools;

Whereas charter schools have enjoyed broad bipartisan support from the Administration, Congress, State governors and legislatures, educators, and parents across the Nation; and

Whereas charter schools are centers of reform and serve as models of how to educate children as effectively as possible: Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) acknowledges and commends the charter school movement for its contribution to improving student achievement and our Nation's public school system;

(2) designates the period beginning on April 30, 2001, and ending on May 4, 2001, as ''National Charter Schools Week''; and

(3) requests that the President issue a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe the week by conducting appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities to demonstrate support for charter schools in communities throughout the Nation.

## NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The hearing will take place on Thursday, April 26, 2001 at 9:30 a.m. in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, D.C.

The purpose of this hearing is to consider national energy policy with respect to fuel specifications and infrastructure constraints and their impacts on energy supply and price.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record should send two copies of their testimony to the Committee on Energy and Natural resources, United States Senate, SH–212 Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510–6150.

For further information, please call Trici Heninger or Bryan Hannegan at (202) 224–4971.

## AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, April 24, 2001, at 2:20 p.m., in executive session to consider certain pending nominations.

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

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, April 24, 2001, at 3:30 p.m., in open session to consider the nominations of Dr. Dov S. Zakheim to be Under Secretary of Defense, comptroller; Mr. Charles S. Abell to be Assistant Secretary of Defense for force management policy; and Ms. Victoria Clarke to be Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs.

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

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, April 24, 2001, to conduct a hearing on the nomination of Mr. Grant D. Aldonas, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for International Trade; Mr. Kenneth I. Juster, of the District of Columbia, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Export Administration; Ms. Maria Cino, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Director General of the United States and Foreign Commercial Service; and Mr. Robert Glenn Hubbard, of New York, to be a member of the Council of Economic Advisors.

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

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, April 24, 2001, to conduct a mark-up of S. 206, ''The Public Utility Holding Company Act.''

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

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday. April 24, 2001 to hear testimony on the Tax Code Complexity, New Hope for Fresh Solutions.

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

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Small Business be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate for a hearing entitled ''Protecting Small Business Rights: SBREFA on Its 5th Anniversary'' on Tuesday, April 24, 2001, beginning at 9:30 a.m. in room 428A of the Russell Senate Office Building.

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

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSUMER AFFAIRS, FOREIGN COMMITTEE AND TOURISM

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs, Foreign Committee and Tourism of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet on Tuesday, April 24, 2001, at 10 a.m. on Booster Seats and the Forgotten Child: Closing a Safety Gap.

The presiding officer. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY, AND SPACE

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Science, Technology, and Space of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet on Tuesday, April 24, 2001, at 2:30 p.m. on NASA's Aeronautics Program.

The presiding officer. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PERSONNEL

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee on Personnel of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, April 24, 2001, at 9:30 a.m., in open session to receive testimony on the recruiting initiatives of the Department of Defense and the Military Services and to receive an update on the status of recruiting and retention goals.

The presiding officer. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Nicky Yuen and Jay Barth, both fellows in my office, be granted privileges of the floor.–

The presiding officer. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## REPRINTING OF ''WOMEN IN CONGRESS, 1917–1990''

Mr. VOINOVICH. I ask unanimous consent the Rules Committee be discharged from further consideration of H. Con. Res. 66, and the Senate then proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 66) authorizing the printing of a revised and updated version of the House document entitled ''Women in Congress, 1917–1990.''

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the House concurrent resolution.

Mr. VOINOVICH. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

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

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 66) was agreed to.

## ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, APRIL 25, 2001

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until the hour of 9:30 a.m. on Wednesday, April 25. I further ask consent that on Wednesday, immediately following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate begin a period of morning business until 11 a.m. with Senators speaking for up to 10 minutes each, with the following exceptions: Senator DURBIN or his designee from 9:30 to 10:15 a.m.; and Senator THOMAS or his designee from 10:15 to 11 a.m.

## PROGRAM

Mr. VOINOVICH. For the information of all Senators, it is hoped that the Senate can begin consideration of S. 1, the education bill, during tomorrow's session. An agreement on the bill is being negotiated, and we are hoping to begin consideration shortly after an agreement is reached. All Senators are encouraged to come to the floor tomorrow to participate in that debate. Votes are therefore possible during tomorrow's session.

## ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. VOINOVICH. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:05 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, April 25, 2001, at 9:30 a.m.

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## HONORING DR. DAVID K. WINTER

**HON. LOIS CAPPS**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to Dr. David K. Winter, President of Westmont College in Santa Barbara, who will soon retire. Though his impending departure is a great loss, I would like to congratulate David and thank him for 25 years of service and dedication to Westmont College and its surrounding community.

David has a 25-year history of service to higher education. The list of organizations within American higher education that have benefited is a prestigious one. As president of Westmont, he has served on the boards of the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities, the Council of Independent Colleges, and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation, where he directed the board for three years.

During his presidency, David has also provided leadership in connecting Westmont College to the local community. He is very active in local organizations, serving as the director of the Montecito Association, the Montecito Rotary Club, the Channel City Club, the Santa Barbara Chamber of Commerce, and St. Vincent's school. He has also chaired the board of the Salvation Army Hospitality House, the Santa Barbara Industry Education Council, and the Santa Barbara County United Way Campaign, and served as vice chair of the Cottage Hospital board of directors.

His honors are too long to list, but David has been named in a survey of higher education officials and scholars who study the college presidency, as one of the 100 most effective college leaders in the United States. In addition, David has received the Santa Barbara News-Press 1998 Lifetime Achievement Award, and in 1999 he was selected by the John Templeton Foundation as one of the 50 college presidents who have exercised leadership in character development. Most recently, David was honored with the ''Distinguished Community Service Award'' by the Anti-Defamation League and Santa Barbara B'nai B'rith Lodge.

Clearly, David is a man of distinction. But his faithful dedication to education is perhaps his most important contribution. He aimed for excellence in all things, and the college has reached beyond its grasp to accomplish his vision. His plan was anchored in the premise that learning should be a lifelong pursuit. Accordingly, David has led the college under the theory that, in order to best serve its students, a college should arm its students with the skills, knowledge, and enthusiasm to continue learning long after they leave.

On a personal note, David has been a good friend and someone with whom it has been a fine pleasure to work closely with over my years both as a Member of Congress and resident of the community. I look forward to continuing our friendship in the years ahead.

Mr. Speaker, for his lifetime of service to education and commitment to community involvement, I recognize and salute Dr. David K. Winter and thank him for all his efforts on behalf of the entire Central Coast community. I am confident that David will remain a prominent figure in the community as he begins to enter a new phase in his life. We all owe him a tremendous debt of gratitude, and I wish him the best of luck in all of his future endeavors.

## RECOGNIZING THE WEEK OF APRIL 15–21 AS LIONS CLUB WEEK

**HON. TOM DAVIS**

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the Fairfax, Virginia Host Lions Club, is observing its 50th anniversary this month. The Fairfax chapter boasts a long list of distinguished members, including former Congressman William L. Scott, now a State Senator. The Mayor of the City of Fairfax has issued a proclamation proclaiming the week April 15 through 21 as Lions Club Week in the City. I ask unanimous consent that this proclamation be printed in the RECORD.

PROCLAMATION

Whereas, on April 21, 2001 the Fairfax Host Lions Club will celebrate fifty years of community service to citizens and organizations of Fairfax, Virginia; and

Whereas, the Fairfax Host Lions Club have given unselfishly of their time and skills to answer requests affecting the welfare of our community; and

Whereas, these Lions have helped mankind in Fairfax through assisting the needy with food baskets at Thanksgiving, Christmas, and Easter; furnishing eyeglasses, hearing aids and exams; providing support to Little League, Scouting, Drug Awareness and other youth programs; supporting the Lions Eye Clinic at Fairfax Hospital; providing support to the Eye Glass Recycling Program; providing support to selected International Programs to include Leader Dogs for the sight impaired and Hearing Dogs for the hearing impaired; and supporting Diabetes and Amyotrophic Lateral Sclerosis Disease (Lou Gehrig's Disease) Awareness Programs in this area.

Now, therefore, I, John Mason, Mayor of the City of Fairfax, Virginia, do hereby proclaim the week of April 15–21, 2001 as Lions Club Week in the City of Fairfax and encourage all residents of the City to join in paying honor to and supporting the Lions for their many activities benefitting humanity in our City.

Signed,

JOHN MASON,
*Mayor.*

Mr. Speaker, throughout our Country the Lions attempt to improve their communities in numerous ways although special emphasis is placed upon sight conservation. We in Virginia are proud of the Old Dominion Eye Bank, which, with the assistance of dedicated physicians, enables blind people to see once again. They also participate with other Northern Virginia Lions in an Eye Glass Recycling Program, providing glasses to numerous needy people overseas.

I certainly hope that the Fairfax Host Lions Club can continue serving the Fairfax area in so many worthwhile ways, and would like to add my congratulations to the club for the fine work they have done over the years. I call upon all of my colleagues to congratulate them on their fine achievements.

## TRIBUTE TO JEWISH FAMILY SERVICE OF LOS ANGELES, SANFORD WEINER AND ZEV YAROSLAVSKY

**HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN**

OF CALIFORNIA

**HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, we are honored to pay tribute to Jewish Family Service of Los Angeles and the ''FAMMY 2001'' honorees, Sanford Weiner and Los Angeles County Supervisor Zev Yaroslavsky. Sandy Weiner and Zev Yaroslavsky will be given the ''FAMMY 2001'' Award at this year's JFS Dinner Gala on June 24, 2001.

JFS is one of Los Angeles' largest and oldest social service agencies. It is an organization dedicated to preserving and strengthening the lives of individuals and families. The staff helps rehabilitate the homeless and provides care for senior citizens, individuals with disabilities and people with AIDS. They also counsel troubled families, help recent immigrants navigate complicated INS procedures, and offer counseling and advocacy to battered women and their children. JFS is an extremely important organization that makes a real difference in the lives of many people.

We are very pleased that JFS has chosen to honor the past president and former chair of the JFS Immigration and Resettlement, Save-A-Family and Fiscal committees, Sandy Weiner, with the ''FAMMY 2001'' Award. His extraordinary record of community service and his unyielding and successful work to expand JFS have earned him this award. His work within the Jewish community is legendary. He has been an active member and support of many organizations including the Jewish Federation, the American Jewish Congress, Americans for Peace Now and the Progressive Jewish Alliance. We have known Sandy for more than 40 years, since we were students, and are proud to call him a friend. His selflessness, dedication, and accomplishments are inspirational.

Like Sandy Weiner, Supervisor Zev Yaroslavsky is also both an old friend and a worthy recipient of a ''FAMMY 2001'' Award. Zev helped the JFS gain recognition as the agency with expertise in helping older people,

and he worked to get the agency critical funding to expand these services. When Zev was a City Councilman, he helped JFS obtain the funding that started Home Secure, a program to provide free safety modification for renters and homeowners with limited incomes—a program that now serves over 2000 households in the Los Angeles area. Zev's energy and passion are legendary. He is well respected by the citizens of Los Angeles for his remarkable leadership and his responsiveness to the needs of his constituents. We are proud to have him represent us on the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors and we are privileged to call him a friend.

Mr. Speaker, it is our distinct pleasure to ask our colleagues to join with us in saluting Jewish Family Service of Los Angeles, Sanford Weiner, and Los Angeles County Supervisor, Zev Yaroslavsky, for their commitment to improving the lives of many in our community.

## A TRIBUTE TO CAROLINE PAGE

### HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life of a woman who helped change the face of the Monterey Peninsula in California. Caroline Page died last month at the age of 72, but the legacy she created will carry her memory for a long time to come.

Caroline was the daughter of a consul and the wife of a member of the military, so she was used to traveling and moving. When she moved to Monterey in 1958, however, she knew she had found a place where she could work wonders, and lived there until she died.

She joined the Monterey Peninsula chapter of the League of Women Voters, and remained active in it until her death. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, she chaired several committees and projects, and even served as the chapter's president from 1978 to 1980. She was the driving force behind the establishment of the League's housing committee, and helped complete their two-year study on affordable housing on the Peninsula.

Her political interests did not end there. Caroline was active on many political campaigns, beginning with George McGovern's presidential campaign. She was also active on the campaigns for former Monterey County Supervisor Karin Strasser Kauffman, Leon Panetta's first run for this body, and my father, Fred Farr's California State Assembly campaigns.

Caroline Page was also a tireless advocate and worker for education. She did everything from volunteering in classrooms to serving on local school boards and community college boards. Perhaps her greatest inflence in education came when she was elected to the Monterey Peninsula College (MPC) Board of Trustees in 1987, and subsequently re-elected for two more terms. In this role she helped form the MPC Foundation, the essential fundraising arm of the college. With donations from her and her husband and the rest of the community, the Foundation helped build a language lab and complete renovation projects throughout the campus, among other things.

Caroline was an inspiring woman who was universally adored. She was honored by many throughout her life, including a special recognition by the Monterey Peninsula Chamber of Commerce as their 1999 Public Official of the Year. She was a devoted, dedicated and knowledgeable public servant, and she will be sorely missed by her husband of almost 50 years, Charles; sons Stephen of Sonoma, California, David and Chris of San Jose, California, and Jeff of Silver Spring, Maryland; her brother, John Randolf of Burlington, Iowa; and six grandchildren.

## IN RECOGNITION OF LET'S CELEBRATE, INC.

### HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Let's Celebrate, Inc., and to commend its mission, 'helping people move from hunger to wholeness.' Let's Celebrate, Let's Swing, the organization's annual fundraiser, will be held on April 19, 2001. The event will provide an opportunity for Let's Celebrate to express gratitude to its supporters, while also paying tribute to community leaders.

Let's Celebrate, Inc., provides the type of assistance that allows struggling community members to get through the hard times. Let's Celebrate has developed a variety of programs to meet the needs of the poor. These programs offer food assistance, career and money management counseling, and job training:

The Emergency Food Network consists of 14 food pantries and 7 soup kitchens;

The Housingplus Program provides budget/money management counseling and career counseling;

The Senior Service Program provides home-delivered meals to seniors and the disabled; and

The Jobpower Culinary Arts Training School is a twenty-week training program that targets homeless, at-risk youth, and low-income individuals to help them develop into well-rounded people who can gain stable housing and permanent employment in the food service/hospitality industry.

Every community across America depends on the generosity, compassion, and hard work of dedicated men and women who spend their lives helping others. The impact these individuals have on their communities is not only beneficial to those who receive assistance, but is also beneficial to every citizen of this great country.

Today, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Let's Celebrate's important contributions to America.

## IN HONOR OF THE CITY OF PARMA'S 175TH ANNIVERSARY

### HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the City of Parma, Ohio, on its 175th birthday. For almost two hundred years, this city has served as a model of social consciousness and diversity.

Becoming a home to many in the 1820s, the City of Parma quickly evolved into an important pioneer territory. Originally having to ward off such dangerous beasts as wolves and bears, the people came together and formed a vibrant community of settlers. It was this sense of community which helped to attract notable figures such as Dr. Rockefeller, father of the famed John D. Rockefeller, to move to the area. The City grew quickly as more people moved into the bustling city. By 1940, 16,000 people were living in the City of Parma.

During World War II, the City of Parma sent its sons and daughters off to defend our nation. When they came home, the City of Parma witnessed rapid expansions as many young people chose to build houses and start their families in this attractive city. This period of growth attracted a diverse group of people to live together. In Parma, people of all races, beliefs and religions live together in a respectful and honorable environment. By 1970, over 100,000 people were living in this wonderful city.

Today, the City of Parma stands as a testament to good will and peace. My fellow colleagues, please stand with me in honoring the City of Parma on its 175th birthday.

## HONORING GENERAL JAMES C HALL

### HON. THOMAS G. TANCREDO

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I come before the House today to honor the remarkable achievements of Brigadier General James C Hall. He was born on April 14, 1926, in a time when the day after his birthday, Tax Day, was just another day of the month. This weekend, General Hall was the guest of honor at the home of Governor Bill Owens celebrating his 75th birthday and 30th anniversary with his gracious wife, Georgann.

Many of us have read adventure novels, or vicariously experienced adventure in the movies or on television, but General Hall is a real life hero. He enlisted in the Army Air Corps in 1943 during World War II and served as a B–17 Gunner at only 17 years of age. He lost one brother at the ''Battle of the Bulge'' and another brother lost a leg. He served on Tinian Island in the Marianas where the Enola Gay was launched to bomb Hiroshima ultimately leading to the end of the war. Yet, his service to his country did not end there.

For a time he attempted to exercise his adventurous acumen on a gold mine in Mexico and after, loosing a plane and risking his life protecting the claim, walked away in search of other ventures. He worked in Hollywood as a consultant for the military movie classic ''Twelve O'clock High.'' Around that same time, General Hall was awarded a direct commission in the USAF in 1948 and distinguished himself as an expert in jumping out of perfectly good airplanes. He was the key developer of the parachuting program at the USAF Academy and has participated in over 1,200 jumps.

There is an Internet web site in his honor where Kevin Coyne, the publisher of the Ejection site writes: ''In late 1965, Jim Hall a professional parachute safety instructor and Major

in the Air Force Reserve volunteered to act as the human guinea pig for the 0-0 seat package.'' He is still the only human being ever to participate in such a test. His comment after being launched by a rocket 400 feet into the air into a small lake, ''I've been kicked in the ass harder than that.'' Jim Hall is the epitome of the ''right stuff.''

Jim was a close friend of Steve Ritchie, the Air Force's first aerial Ace of Viet Nam and is an active proponent of continued use of Buckley field, General Hall was added, in 1985, to the Colorado Aviation Hall of Fame. He has been active in Colorado politics helping to create the Colorado Leadership Program. He worked to elect Jack Swigert to the 6th Congressional district in 1982 and ultimately worked with the Colorado State Legislature to place the very popular statue of Swigert, right here in our nation's Capitol.

General Jim Hall is the Arapahoe County District II Captain to the county Grand Old Party, he is the namesake of the Aurora Republican Forum's ''General Jim Hall Award.'' He is the Military Advisor to Gov. Owens and the Governor's Community Relations Advisor for the Asian Community and I am honored to include him on my District Military Academy Selection Board and District Military Veterans' Committee.

It is my honor, and pleasure to recognize this outstanding constituent and distinguished American Service Man, here in the Nation's Capitol.

## HONORING JD BUTLER

### HON. LOIS CAPPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, nearly half a century ago, after bravely serving his nation in the United States Navy, JD Butler became a carpenter and joined the Carpenters Union. Today, I rise to announce to my colleagues that JD has announced his retirement from the Carpenters Union, and to commend him for his outstanding services to his fellow carpenters and to our nation.

I have known JD for several years in his capacity as Executive Secretary Treasurer of the Gold Coast District Council. In this capacity, JD was a passionate and effective spokesman, not only for the members of his union, but for working families across California and our country. Since coming to Congress, I have been guided by JD's wisdom and experience on a range of issues, from pension reform, to school construction, to workplace safety, to preserving the protections of Davis-Bacon. On these and other issues, JD is a tireless advocate for the rights of American workers.

JD's success as a carpenter and labor leader is impressive. But more significant to me is the man's character. JD is a warm and compassionate man, a loving husband, father, and grandfather, and someone who has given so much of himself to better his community.

Mr. Speaker, on May 5, people from across Central and Southern California, Nevada, and Arizona will gather in Palm Springs to pay tribute to JD's decades of service to the Carpenters Union. This is certain to be an extraordinary affair honoring an extraordinary man. I know my colleagues will join me in congratulating JD on his retirement and applauding him for a career of achievement and accomplishments.

## RECOGNIZING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MASSACHUSETTS MUTUAL LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY

### HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, May 15, 2001, the Massachusetts Life Insurance Company will celebrate its 150th anniversary—a milestone achieved by only twenty other Fortune 500 companies.

The Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Company was founded by George Rice in Springfield, Massachusetts, in 1851. Today, the MassMutual Financial Group continues to have its headquarters in Springfield, and has grown into a global diversified financial services organization with more than $213 billion in total assets under management.

The family of companies include Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Company, plus its subsidiaries Oppenheimer Funds, David L. Babson, Cornerstone Real Estate Advisers, MML Investors Services, MassMutual International, MassMutual Asia, The MassMutual Trust Company, Antares Capital Corporation, Persumma Financial, MML Bay State Life Insurance Company and C.M. Life Insurance Company.

The Mass Mutual Financial Group serves more than 8 million clients and offers a broad portfolio of financial products and services with offices located across the United States, and international operations in Hong Kong, Argentina, Bermuda, Chile, and Luxembourg.

Celebrating a 150th anniversary is an extraordinary accomplishment so I ask my fellow Members of Congress to join me in recognizing the MassMutual Financial Group's anniversary and congratulating them for a successful 150 years and anticipating another 150 years of continued success.

## HONORING MEMBERS OF THE AMERICAN LEGION POST 364 AND AUXILIARY POST 364

### HON. TOM DAVIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mr. TOM DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to honor two outstanding groups in Northern Virgina, the American Legion Post 364 and Auxiliary Post 364. Recently, four of their most outstanding members were recognized, as well as the entire Auxiliary Unit.

Jerry Howard, a member of Post 364, received the National Award for Children and Youth Chairman of the Year for Region 2. Tirelessly devoted to youth education initiatives, Jerry is most often recognized for aiding children of veterans, even providing financial assistance to those who are in need.

Marie Rhyne, also a member of Post 364, was recently appointed as a member of the National Security Committee. This Committee not only lends support to foreign relations, it also endorses ROTC, blood donations, crime prevention, and junior law cadets.

Barbara Stevenson, a member of Auxiliary Unit 364 and Legislative Chairman of the Unit, received the National Award for Outstanding Unit Legislative Program, Southern Division. Members of the Legislative Division make appearances at Congressional hearings and attend meetings with Congressmen and women's groups to explain their interests.

Marcia Wheatley, also a member of Auxiliary Unit 364 and Junior Activities Chairman, Department of Virginia, received the National Award for Outstanding Department Junior Activities Program, Southern Division. Marcia recognizes that helping our youth is key to the success of the Unit and the community.

Finally, Auxiliary Unit 364 was recognized with the Dr. Kate Barrett trophy for the most outstanding Unit in the Department of Virginia. This prestigious award is well deserved and proves that this Unit gives a great deal back to its community.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I wish the very best to the above individuals and the entire American Legion Post 364 and Auxiliary Post 364. All of the above recognized people have certainly earned this recognition, and I call upon all of my colleagues to join me in applauding their remarkable achievements. Northern Virginia is better off because of their efforts.

## A TRIBUTE TO WINI HURLBERT

### HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of a pillar of the community, Mrs. Jean Winifred Hurlbert. Wini Hurlbert was an active member of many groups, organizations and movements in Pacific Grove and the Monterey Peninsula community in my district. Mrs. Hurlbert passed away recently, surrounded by friends and family, at the age of 94.

Mrs. Hurlbert and her husband, Elgin ''Oxy'' Hurlbert, a retired Navy captain, were lively members of the town of Pacific Grove for almost their entire lives. Wini began her life on the peninsula when she was 17, working at a summer retreat center, and quickly became a fixture to those who knew her. She moved to the area full time in the 1920's, and began a teaching career at Pacific Grove Grammar School, and it was there that she met her future husband. She was a dedicated teacher and educator who was instrumental in starting the preschool program in Pacific Grove, as well as being active in both the Girl Scouts and Boy Scouts.

Along with her devotion to teaching, Wini was an inspiring conservationist. She was an active member of the Monterey Peninsula Audubon Society, the Sierra Club, the Pacific Grove Museum of Natural History Association, and was also a member of The Nature Conservancy, American Birding Association, Hawk Mountain Society, the California Native Plant Society, and the Wilderness Society. Her community interests did not end there, as she was also active in the Friends of the Pacific Grove Library, the Order of the Eastern Star, the Battle of the Coral Sea Association, the Monterey

Peninsula Community Concert Association and the Monterey Peninsula Choral Society.

Mrs. Hurlbert was a warm and gracious person who touched so many lives throughout the 20th Century. Her presence will not soon be forgotten, and she is missed by everyone who knew her, especially her son, Jerry Hurlbert of Weaverville, California; her daughter, Jean Jorgensen of Jackson, Wyoming; eight grandchildren; ten great-grandchildren; and one great-great-grandson.

## TRIBUTE TO SYBIL AND MANNON KAPLAN

### HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to my fellow Adat Ari El congregant's Sybil and Mannon Kaplan. On Sunday evening, June 3, 2001, Adat Ari El—the first Conservative synagogue in the San Fernando Valley—will celebrate the Kaplan's longstanding dedication and service to our temple and community.

The Kaplans have been members of Adat Ari El for more than 35 years and their contributions are legion. They have selflessly involved themselves in a variety of causes. Sybil is a devoted former L.A. Unified School District teacher and community activist. She has served on both the Temple and Sisterhood Board of Directors and is a founding member and past President of the Associates of the Jewish Home for the Aging. She also helped establish the San Fernando Valley Region of the Jewish National Fund and served as President and Chairman of the Board.

Manny, while acting as the managing partner for the last 24 years of the accounting firm of Miller, Kaplan, Arase & Co. LLP, has also found time to devote himself to community service. He currently serves as the Chairman of the Adat Ari El Endowment Fund and he has previously served in many other capacities within Adat Ari El, including the Presidency. He is also the current Chairman of the San Fernando Valley Region of the Jewish National Fund and President of the Valley College Patron Association. He has held many other positions and has served on the Board of Directors of such important organizations as the United Jewish Fund and the University of Judaism. Manny also was the President of Camp Ramah.

I am honored to know the Kaplans personally. I have great respect and admiration for their accomplishments, their integrity, and their civic spirit. It is with great pleasure that I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting Sybil and Mannon Kaplan for everything they've done and continue to do.

## IN HONOR OF THE 20TH YEAR CELEBRATION OF THE FIRST HISPANIC COUNCIL MEMBER ELECTED IN HUDSON COUNTY

### HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 20th Year Celebration of the First Hispanic Council Member Elected in Hudson County, New Jersey. The Hispanic Pioneers Civic Association, Inc., will host the celebration on Friday, April 20, 2001.

The Hispanic Pioneers Civic Association, Inc., (HPCA) was formed to promote and honor Hispanic leaders and non-Hispanics who have made significant contributions to the progress of the Hispanic community during the past twenty years. Whether in the field of education, politics, or community development, HPCA acknowledges those who have made a real difference.

And during the past twenty years, in New Jersey and elsewhere, many Hispanics have won elective office. However, the number of Hispanics in elective office does not proportionally reflect the number of Hispanics in America. Nevertheless, we are making great progress, and Hispanic representation will soon reflect our community's growth and our years of hard work.

In my home district, Hispanics have achieved great success in many fields, and politics is certainly no exception. I am an example of that success; and I could not have done it without the support of the Hispanic community. There have been other success stories that demonstrate how far we have come as a community. The following individuals deserve credit for helping to lay the foundation for Hispanic political and civic involvement in America, which they accomplished through hard work and dedication: Benjamin Lopez; Nydia Dávila-Cólon; Efrain Rosario; George O. Aviles; Jaime Vazquez; Mariano Vega, Jr.; Fernando Colon, Jr.; Jose O. Arango; and Edwin Duroy.

The 20th Year Celebration presents a wonderful opportunity for the Hispanic community to reflect on the important contributions that Hispanics have made to American society.

Today, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the 20th Year Celebration of the First Hispanic Council Member Elected In Hudson County.

## IN HONOR OF SAINT ELIAS MELKITE CATHOLIC CHURCH

### HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Saint Elias Melkite Catholic Church. This year, Saint Elias celebrates its centennial anniversary.

For the past one hundred years, Saint Elias has served as an important part of the Northeast Ohio community. A place where people of all faiths can come together to pray for peace in the Middle East, Saint Elias has effectively ministered to a diverse neighborhood. In 1997, the Catholic Church formally presented Saint Elias with the award for the Promotion of Catholic Unity and Inter-Religious Dialogue. The award recognized Saint Elias's years of dedication to ecumenicalism.

The good nature of Saint Elias has not been limited to the neighborhood which houses the parish. Starting last year, the parish has sponsored children in Lebanon by helping to provide needed medical supplies and clothing. The goodwill and love of the people of Saint Elias has been demonstrated by these acts of sharing and concern.

Saint Elias Church has always stayed true to its Melkite roots. Always stressing fellowship and service, Saint Elias has assumed important roles in its neighborhood. Most recently, Saint Elias created its first Mens Club, which has shown a deep dedication to the promotion of spiritual and material projects. They have organized countless benefits, and have raised funds for scholarships, provided relief to the poor and sponsored religious activities. The Men's Club has become a fixture in the neighborhood, bring people together to help one another.

My fellow colleagues, please join me in honoring Saint Elias Melkite Catholic Church as they celebrate their one hundredth birthday.

## THE HEART OF COLUMBINE DAY

### HON. THOMAS G. TANCREDO

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to give honor to efforts by Governor Bill Owens and the Jefferson County Board of Education in declaring April 20th ''The Heart of Columbine Day,'' in support of the Heart of Columbine organization.

Last week, the Littleton community and everyone across our state of Colorado came together to quietly mark the second anniversary of the shootings at Columbine High School.

In January, in remembrance of this terrible tragedy, the Heart of Columbine organization was created by Gerda Weissman Klein and students and staff members of Columbine to encourage community involvement. The organization is actively recruiting other schools across the country to follow their lead and, already, schools in Illinois and Arizona have started their own programs.

This year, Columbine chose to focus its efforts on hunger prevention, has worked in soup kitckens, sponsored a child in the Philippines and collected more than 7,200 cans of food. Heart of Columbine also hosted a community day in the school's parking lot to involve the community in their project.

I hope that my colleagues will join me in honoring this extremely outstanding organization, which has done such a tremendous job of turning tragedy into triumph.

## RECOGNIZING THE OUTSTANDING CAREER OF ROGER E. FARRELL, TEACHER, THOMAS W. BURGESS SCHOOL, HAMPDEN, MASSACHUSETTS

### HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to hereby recognize the outstanding career of one of Hampden, Massachusetts' finest educators, Roger E. Farrell. Mr. Farrell has taught social studies at the Thomas W. Burgess in Hampden for thirty-four years. During that span he has instilled in Hampden's young people an appreciation of our government and of the many facets of our world. Also, he has done exceptional work in organizing award programs, student videos, and

educational trips to New York and to our nation's capital. Mr. Farrell and his classes have always been welcome visitors to my office.

Even more important than this Mr. Speaker, is the fact that Mr. Farrell has significantly contributed to the molding of fine character of those he has taught over the years. The upstanding character displayed by his students on their yearly visits to Washington serves as testament of this.

Mr. Speaker, the Thomas W. Burgess School, the entire Hampden community, and myself are extremely grateful of the dedicated service that Mr. Farrell has provided his students. I congratulate him on his retirement and wish he and his wife Barbara the best of luck in all their endeavors.

## HONORING WILLIAM L. GRAY

### HON. LOIS CAPPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay special tribute to a good friend, close advisor, and leader of the Santa Barbara community, Mr. William L. Gray. After twenty-eight years of service, Bill recently retired from Pacific Bell.

Bill started his career at Pacific Bell in 1972 as a customer service representative. His commitment to serving the customers of his company and the members of his community has been Bill's trademark ever since.

I have come to know Bill professionally over the past several years in his capacity as Director of Pacific Bell's External Affairs for Ventura and Santa Barbara Counties. Of course, Bill was an effective advocate for the positions of his company on legislation pending in Congress. But more important, Bill was a tireless proponent of the limitless potential that communications technology has to benefit our society. I learned a tremendous amount from Bill about the range of technology choices consumers can and should expect in the years ahead. His counsel was particularly helpful to me in my role as a member of the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. Speaker, there are few institutions in Santa Barbara County that have not benefited from Bill Gray's substantial and generous community activism. He served on the Board of Directors of the Goleta Valley and Santa Barbara Region Chambers of Commerce, the Kiwanis club, the Santa Barbara Chamber Orchestra, Santa Barbara Partners in Education, Santa Barbara Family YMCA, the Red Cross, and the United Way. He has also contributed significantly to business and civic groups in Santa Maria, Lompoc, Carpinteria, and Solvang.

Although Bill may have retired from his job, I know that he and his wife Cindy will not retire from their commitment to improving the quality of life in our community. I will miss working directly with Bill on issues involving Pacific Bell, but I know that I will continue to witness the wonderful contributions he makes to Santa Barbara County. I hope all of my colleagues will join me in congratulating Bill Gray on his lifetime of accomplishments and achievement.

## HONORING ELIZABETH HARTWELL EARTH DAY

### HON. TOM DAVIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to honor a friend of Northern Virginia, Mrs. Elizabeth Hartwell, who dedicated her life to protecting the environment. I want to recognize her life and all of her contributions to the Eleventh District of Virginia.

Mrs. Hartwell began her quest to protect the environment in 1966, when she learned of plans to rezone part of Northern Virginia, Mason Neck, a wildlife habitat. She made modest films of the wildlife that thrived there and showed it to civic organizations around the region. She even gave tours by boat along Mason Neck's waterways. She formed a committee and, with the backing of local officials, saved 5,000 acres of Mason Neck for use as park land.

She served on many boards to help care for the environment. She was a member and vice chairman of the Northern Virginia Regional Park Authority. Mrs. Hartwell also served as secretary and vice president of the Conservation Council of Virginia and chairman of the Citizen's Council for a Clean Potomac. Some of her time was spent with the Audubon Naturalist Society.

Mrs. Hartwell was the organizer of ''Friends of Mason Neck.'' Due to her efforts, the 2,277-acre Mason Neck National Wildlife Refuge was formed, making it the first area established for the protection of bald eagles. Also created were the 1,804-acre Mason Neck State Park and the 1,003-acre Pohick Regional Park.

During his term, former Governor Linwood Holton appointed her to the Virginia Board of Agriculture. Later she was appointed to the board of Fairfax County Wetlands for seven years. Former Governors Charles Robb and Gerald Baliles both appointed Mrs. Hartwell to the Northern Virginia Potomac River Basin Committee.

Her efforts to protect the environment were rewarded with dozens of honors and awards. In 1976, Mrs. Hartwell was named the Virginia Wildlife Federation Conservationist of the Year. In 1990, she won the Fairfax County Park Authority's Elly Doyle Park Service Award.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I wish the very best to Mason Neck State Park as they honor Mrs. Elizabeth Hartwell on April 21, 2001 in Fairfax, Virginia. She dedicated her life to nature and helping the environment and I call upon all of my colleagues to join me in celebrating her remarkable life. Because of her efforts, Northern Virginia today is an even better place to live, work, and raise a family.

## SMALL BUSINESS INTEREST CHECKING ACT OF 2001

SPEECH OF

### HON. JUDY BIGGERT

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 3, 2001*

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 974, ''the Small Business Interest Checking Act of 2001.'' This bill will repeal the prohibition against banks paying interest on checking accounts.

When this bill was considered in the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions, I expressed my concern that this legislation could be interpreted in a way that would effectively eliminate the financial benefits and checking services that large depositors now receive from banks in lieu of interest. These services are now provided in accordance with substantial interpretive guidance that has been issued by the Federal Reserve under Regulation Q. Current law states that the provision or the receipt of such services and benefits does not constitute interest.

I am pleased that Chairman OXLEY agreed to modify the bill by including a new section and accompanying report language. These provisions clarify that the current provision of services by banks in accordance with Regulation Q will be continued. This legislation will not alter the legal definition of interest for real estate closing escrow transactions and provides that current Regulation Q Federal regulatory interpretations regarding the definition of interest on deposits will continue to stand.

Title companies and agents currently receive bank services that defray the overall cost of maintaining real estate settlement escrows. These services subsidize settlement service operations, ultimately lowering the cost of closing and settlement services to the public. As a highly developed financial system, Federal banking law and regulations have consistently operated to facilitate the smooth and efficient flow of real estate transactions and promoted American homeownership.

I am grateful that the Committee included a clear statement of congressional intent with respect to this issue in relationship to the proposed changes in the bill and I fully support H.R. 974.

## HONORING THE EIGHTH GRADE CLASS OF GATES–CHILI MIDDLE SCHOOL

### HON. THOMAS M. REYNOLDS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to welcome the eighth grade class of Gates-Chili Middle School, who arrived in Washington today.

These outstanding students have come to our nation's Capitol not only to experience first-hand our government and history, but to show their respect and gratitude to America's World War II veterans. While here, they will be presenting a donation to the American Legion to help build the World War II Memorial.

More than two generations removed from the Second World War, these young men and women dedicated their time and their energy to raise $1,000 for the memorial fund. Through a mass production project, the Team 8C Coolaids (as they called themselves), produced CD racks that were sold in school and throughout the community, with the help of the Parent-Teachers Organization.

Mr. Speaker, I am extremely proud of these students for their hard work, and for their commitment to ensuring that the sacrifices endured, and the triumph ensured by our nation's World War II veterans will forever be remembered. I ask that this entire Congress join

me in saluting the hard work, service and devoting of the eighth grade class at Gates-Chili Middle School.

## SUMMARY OF LOFGREN-CONYERS AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE TO H.R. 503

### HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, the Lofgren-Conyers Amendment, the ''Motherhood Protection Act of 2001,'' is an overall substitute to the committee bill, the ''Unborn Victims of Violence Act of 2001,'' H.R. 503, and creates a crime for any violent or assaultive conduct against a pregnant woman that interrupts or terminates her pregnancy and makes any interruption punishable by a fine and imprisonment up to twenty years but, if the pregnancy is terminated, punishable by a fine and imprisonment up to life.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 503, AS REPORTED
OFFERED BY MS. LOFGREN OF CALIFORNIA

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the ''Motherhood Protection Act of 2001''.

**SEC. 2. CRIMES AGAINST A WOMAN—TERMINATING HER PREGNANCY.**

(a) Whoever engages in any violent or assaultive conduct against a pregnant woman resulting in the conviction of the person so engaging for a violation of any of the provisions of law set forth in subsection (c), and thereby causes an interruption to the normal course of the pregnancy resulting in prenatal injury (including termination of the pregnancy), shall, in addition to any penalty imposed for the violation, be punished as provided in subsection (b).

(b) The punishment for a violation of subsection (a) is—

(1) if the relevant provision of law set forth in subsection (c) is set forth in paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of that subsection, a fine under title 18, United States Code, or imprisonment for not more than 20 years, or both, but if the interruption terminates the pregnancy, a fine under title 18, United States Code, or imprisonment for any term of years or for life, or both; and

(2) if the relevant provision of law is set forth in subsection (c)(4), the punishment shall be such punishment (other than the death penalty) as the court martial may direct.

(c) The provisions of law referred to in subsection (a) are the following:

(1) Sections 36, 37, 43, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 229, 242, 245, 247, 248, 351, 831, 844(d), (f), (h)(1), and (i), 924(j), 930, 1111, 1112, 1114, 1116, 1118, 1119, 1120, 1121, 1153(a), 1201(a), 1203(a), 1365(a), 1501, 1503, 1505, 1512, 1513, 1751, 1864, 1951, 1952(a)(1)(B), (a)(2)(B), and (a)(3)(B), 1958, 1959, 1992, 2113, 2114, 2116, 2118, 2119, 2191, 2231, 2241(a), 2245, 2261, 2261A, 2280, 2281, 2332, 2332a, 2332b, 2340A, and 2441 of title 18, United States Code.

(2) Section 408(e) of the Controlled Substances Act of 1970 (21 U.S.C. 848).

(3) Section 202 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2283).

(4) Sections 918, 919(a), 919(b)(2), 920(a), 922, 924, 926, and 928 of title 10, United States Code (articles 118, 119(a), 119(b)(2), 120(a), 122, 124, 126, and 128).

## TRIBUTE TO CAPE HENLOPEN HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS PARTICIPATING IN THE WE THE PEOPLE NATIONAL FINALS

### HON. MICHAEL N. CASTLE

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, on April 21–23, 2001 more than 1200 students from across the United States will be in Washington, D.C. to compete in the national finals of the We the People . . . The Citizen and the Constitution program. I am proud to announce that the class from Cape Henlopen High School from Lewes will represent the state of Delaware in this national event. These young scholars have worked diligently to reach the national finals and through their experience have gained a deep knowledge and understanding of the fundamental principles and values of our constitutional democracy.

I would like to recognize the participating students from Cape Henlopen High School: Matt Beebe, Caroline Boving, Kristin Cannatelli, Cassandra Class, Khara Conlon, Lauren Cooper, Laura Dillon, Megan Kee, Hillary Lord, Alieda Lynch, Chrissy Mulligan, Andrew Olenderski, Neeru Peri, Joe Pritchett, Heather Sweard, Sarah Sprague, Megan Sterling, Charli Tabler, and Erin Williams.

I would also like to recognize their teacher, Jerry Peden, who deserves much of the credit for the success of the class.

The class from Cape Henlopen High School is currently conducting research and preparing for the upcoming national competition in Washington, D.C. I wish them, and Mr. Peden, the very best of luck; they are all fine representatives of the First State.

## THE FREEDOM FROM UNFAIR ENERGY LEVY ACT (FUEL)

### HON. F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR.

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, today I am re-introducing legislation, the Freedom from Unfair Energy Levy Act or ''FUEL Act,'' to alleviate the impact of current high fuel prices. My legislation would place a six-month moratorium on federal motor fuel excise taxes, including the 18.3 cent per gallon tax consumers pay for gasoline and the 24.3 cent per gallon tax on diesel fuel, and eliminate permanently the 4.3 cent per gallon tax increase approved in 1993.

Last year, when I first introduced the FUEL Act, I warned of the threat that high energy prices posed to our economy. As was illustrated clearly in the 1970s and early 1990s, fuel price hikes can cause widespread damage to economic well being. Unfortunately, high energy costs have continued to plague the U.S. since that warning and our economy is beginning to suffer the consequences. Some have argued that money from fuel taxes is more useful in Washington than in Americans' pockets, helping motorists afford the high price of gasoline. In reality, the economic damage caused by high fuel prices far outweighs any impact on federal spending that a six-month moratorium could cause. Congress should act now to mitigate the economic damage caused by steep energy costs.

The current high gasoline prices across the country are a continuation of the energy problems that began during the Clinton administration. In recent years, domestic energy production has fallen to its lowest level since before World War II. The failure to increase domestic production has made the U.S. increasingly vulnerable to the whims of OPEC nations, who recently slashed their oil production in order to increase their profitability. Compounding the problem is the increase in the gasoline tax that was enacted in 1993. That year, when fuel prices were low, Democrats in Congress, President Clinton, and a tie-breaking vote by Vice President Gore combined to increase federal fuel taxes. The FUEL Act would reverse that increase and represents a sound first step in the development of a comprehensive, long-term policy to lower energy costs.

Besides addressing long-term concerns, my legislation provides immediate assistance to the problem of high fuel costs. By halting the collection of federal fuel taxes for six months, consumers will see an immediate dip of nearly 20 cents in the cost of gasoline at the pump. This six month moratorium will help to keep prices down over the summer months which often see steep fuel cost increases. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation to fight rising energy prices.

## TRIBUTE TO LT. COLONEL HUGH PENTLAND DUNN

### HON. LYNN C. WOOLSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Lt. Colonel Hugh Pentland Dunn's 100th Birthday. Mr. Dunn was born in New York City on April 24, 1901. He is a veteran of three wars: World War I, World War II, and the Korean War.

Hugh Dunn lives in Santa Rosa, CA, with his wife Patricia. He has a humor and brightness that shines with every story he tells. People who visit Hugh Dunn find him refreshing and entering to be around. We are all enriched by his first-hand memories of the early 1900's.

At age 17, he lied about his age to join the Canadian Army's Expeditionary Force and entered World War I. After the war, he attended college at Columbia University in New York City and joined the ROTC as an officer. Eventually he transferred to City College because of protests at Columbia against the ROTC. Mr. Dunn served in World War II in the Korean conflict, ending his career in Germany in the Army of Occupation.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to represent such a dedicated and knowledgeable veteran. Please join me in celebrating his 100th birthday.

## SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTERS

### HON. ASA HUTCHINSON

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the great contributions which Small Business Development Centers (SBDCs) make to our communities. SBDCs have provided counseling and training programs to small businesses and potential entrepreneurs for over 20 years. SBDCs have a large return on investment as they create jobs, increase business revenue and generated tax revenue.

In my home State of Arkansas, an economic impact study conducted in 2000 revealed that more than $44 million in increased sales and more than $3.5 million in tax revenues were generated as a result of services provided by the Arkansas Small Business Development Center (ASBDC). Last year, clients served by the ASBDC created 541 new jobs! Those are staggering numbers which show that this is a program which deserves full funding.

Small businesses account for 87 percent of all businesses in Arkansas. There are over 45,000 businesses with 20 employees or fewer. These numbers demonstrate the great need for the support services provided by the SBDCs. Businesses turn to the SBDCs for counseling, training, assistance with loan applications, and more. Simply put, SBDCs are vital to the health of the small business community.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support funding of Small Business Development Centers at the highest level possible. In addition, I would like to insert an excerpt from an article ''Successful Business Strategies'' written by USA Today columnist Rhonda Abrams as she speaks to the merits of this program.

SUCCESSFUL BUSINESS STRATEGIES

(By Rhonda M. Abrams)

One of the best, least-known services the government helps fund—and I emphasize the word ''help,'' since the federal government only provides matching funds—is a national network of Small Business Development Centers (SBDCs). There are over 1,000 SBDCs, located primarily at community colleges or in Main Street storefronts across the country.

They've provided one-on-one counseling and training programs—free or at very low cost—to small businesses and start-up entrepreneurs for over 20 years. If you haven't heard of them, it's because they don't spend money advertising. They just do their job.

SBDCs serve over 600,000 small businesses a year in face-to-face counseling sessions, and another 750,000 businesses turn to them for information, resources, and call-in assistance. They provide business plan guidance, computer training, and help small companies regroup rather than fold up when an industry is phased out in a region.

The result is a remarkable track record. SBDC clients generated 67,800 new jobs in 1998. Small businesses helped by SBDCs have a higher survival rate than other small companies. And while the entire SBDC network received a paltry $83 million in 2000, SBDC clients generated additional tax revenues of over $468 million. This is one federal program that actually makes money for the government!

## CELEBRATION OF THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AIR FORCE SERGEANTS ASSOCIATION

### HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the enlisted men and women of the United States Air Force, to whom ''Service Before Self'' is more than a slogan, it is an ingrained value that has become the standard by which they live. As I have worked with the Air Force Sergeants Association, I have recognized that same value in their enduring contributions and dedicated efforts to representing their members. Over the past forty years, the Air Force Sergeants Association has become known as ''the voice of the Air Force enlisted corps'' by tenaciously representing those whom they serve. The Air Force Sergeants Association plays a key role in keeping Members of Congress informed of the issues affecting Air Force enlisted members and their families, whether those members are active duty, Air Force component or retiree personnel. These issues range from pay and benefits, to education, to housing, to military health care. Not only does AFSA keep the Members of Congress informed, it keeps its members up-to-date regarding where Congress stands on the critical quality of life issues that so drastically impact upon their welfare.

The efforts of the enlisted men and women contribute immeasurably to the success of our United States Air Force. AFSA's dedicated efforts to those men and women have made this association a great success. The Air Force Sergeants Association's 40th Anniversary will occur on May 3rd.

I am proud to recognize their efforts and contributions to the Air Force enlisted corps and to the defense of our great nation. I congratulate them on reaching this important milestone.

## MINNESOTA PUBLIC RADIO'S AMERICAN RADIOWORKS WINS TOP NATIONAL JOURNALISM AWARD

### HON. BILL LUTHER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mr. LUTHER. Mr. Speaker, Minnesota Public Radio's American RadioWorks has won the 2001 Alfred I. duPont-Columbia University Gold Baton Award for its hour-long documentary entitled ''Massacre at Cuska: Anatomy of a War Crime.'' The award is considered to be the nation's most prestigious in broadcast journalism.

''Massacre at Cuska'' investigated the events surrounding the May 14, 1999 attack by Serbian death squads on an ethnic Albanian village called Cuska (pronounced CHOOSH-kuh) that, within a matter of hours, left forty-one unarmed civilians dead. The program presented, for the first time, detailed testimony from Serbian police, army and militia members alleging that Slobodan Milosevic's senior generals masterminded a campaign of murder and deportations against Kosovar Albanians. Six of the Serbs interviewed by American RadioWorks took part in the Cuska attack, including one man who admitted to executing a dozen unarmed Albanian men.

The Alfred I. duPont-Columbia awards have spotlighted the nation's best in broadcast journalism since 1942. Past Gold Baton winners have included Bill Moyers and Public Affairs Television in 2000 for ''Facing the Truth'' on PBS, and 1999 winner NOVA, produced at WGBH-TV, Boston, for five programs (''Everest: The Death Zone,'' ''The Brain Eater,'' ''Supersonic Spies,'' ''China's Mysterious Mummies,'' and ''Coma'') and for consistently outstanding science reporting. Batons are inscribed with the late Edward R. Murrow's famous observation on television: ''This instrument can teach, it can illuminate; yes, it can even inspire. But it can do so only to the extent that humans are determined to use it to those ends. Otherwise it is merely wires and lights in a box.''

In presenting the 2001 Gold Baton to American RadioWorks Producers, Stephen Smith and Michael Montgomery, Columbia University's President George Rupp said, ''It is a measure of the times we live through that each year, at least one of these winning programs is about man's inhumanity to man. The duPont jury applauds this radio documentary for telling us about ghastly events in a now forgotten part of the world.'' Jurors, who reviewed over 600 submissions to choose just one Gold Baton recipient, commented, ''This program reaffirms the effectiveness of radio in presenting complicated issues in a compelling way.''

''Massacre at Cuska'' had already received well-deserved national recognition when, in December 2000, it was named as a finalist for the 2000 International Consortium of Investigative Journalists (ICIJ) Award for Outstanding International Investigative Reporting and as a finalist in the category Enterprise Journalism: In Collaboration for the Online Journalism Awards (OJAs) presented by the Online News Association and Columbia University. That said, an award of the stature of the Alfred I. duPont-Columbia University Gold Baton bestowed upon such a small, public radio broadcasting entity like American RadioWorks is unprecedented.

''Massacre at Cuska'' originally aired in this country in February 2000 on public radio stations nationwide, and later that year, a Serbian language version was broadcast in Yugoslavia on the independent B92 radio network. According to co-producer, Michael Montgomery, ''Serbs had never heard a program so detailed and so blunt about the ethnic killings in Kosovo. As part of Serbia's new commitment to democracy, it's important that Serbs have access to independent accounts of the Kosovo violence. We hope the program will foster a public discussion in Serbia about war, accountability and reconciliation.''

American RadioWorks is public radio's largest documentary production unit. It represents a collaboration that involves Minnesota Public Radio, National Public Radio and public radio stations across the country. Through investigative journalism, American RadioWorks is based in Minnesota, but its work, like mine, touches more than just Minnesotans. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate American RadioWorks on their notable achievement as the 2001 recipient of the Alfred I. duPont-Columbia Gold

Baton Award for overall excellence in broadcast journalism.

## ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

### HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, Oliver Wendell Holmes once said ''Pretty much all the honest truth telling in the world is done by children.'' I believe we here in Congress could certainly learn something about energy, the environment, and the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge from a young girl named Sophie Brown of Anchorage, Alaska, the subject of the following thoughtful and thought-provoking ''Letter to the Editor'' from her mother, published in the Anchorage Daily News on April 5, 2001:

CHILDREN PUT EARTH BEFORE PARENTS' SUVS

(By Barbara Brown)

I pulled the car into the driveway, walked toward the door of the house, and Sophie threw open the storm door and shouted, ''How do you feel about drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge?''

''Hold on,'' I said, ''let me pull the car into the garage.''

''But this is important,'' she insisted. ''Yes or no?''

Just another pleasant ''welcome home'' in the Wiepking-Brown household.

One evening, Tim was talking about something over the dinner table, and I must have become distracted because next thing I knew, he was discussing scientists and cannibalism in Papua New Guinea.

''Cannibalism?'' I said, really confused. ''What are you talking about?''

Sophie piped up: ''It's the slow, deadly spread of mad cow disease.''

By this point, I was really feeling disconnected. ''What slow, deadly spread of mad cow disease?'' I asked. And Sophie pointed to Newsweek magazine. ''The Slow, Deadly Spread of Mad Cow Disease'' was right there, on the cover.

''You read the article?'' Tim asked, incredulous.

''Yes,'' Sophie said. ''We're discussing mad cow disease in school.''

Tim loves this about Sophie. He loves discussing current events. In school, he'd had a lot of trouble with reading until they introduced newspapers in his classroom. He went from nonreader to the boy everyone wanted on the current-events team.

But back to ANWR. In Sophie's class, all the kids were opposed to drilling except one boy who thought the money might help education in the affected communities. I wondered if they'd seen pictures of cute little caribou. I asked, ''Was it because of the caribou?''

''Some,'' Sophie said, ''but we know about the differences of opinion between the groups of people there; we know about how much oil they might find there. Mostly, it's because of the Earth, the wilderness.''

One friend of mine said her daughter's class is ready to die on its swords to defend the refuge. Ask the children, and they want to keep it safe from drilling. Is it because they're so young, so naive, so limited in understanding? Is it because they're not paying the bills? Talk to them—they're well-versed in the facts. It's just the way they assign priorities: Kids put the Earth into the equation.

Tim went looking for a car recently and was considering a sport utility. In horror, Sophie shouted, ''No, not an SUV! They are terribly wasteful of the Earth's resources!''

Don't ask me where she read that—probably the same places you have. It's just that kids don't let it slide by, don't let it fall away under considerations of image, size, power and, oh yes, by the way, it isn't very fuel-efficient.

So she sees SUVs on the road and she asks, ''Are those people selfish, or do they just not know better?'' She used to ask the same thing about people she saw littering.

I hear on the radio that 75 percent of Americans are worried about global warming, but the United States won't agree to a treaty to try to control it. Our president says it would be too hazardous for our economy.

Every day, everyone evaluates, decides what priority to assign things and then makes up his or her mind. But for older people, the Earth wasn't and isn't a thing to worry about. It's just ''there,'' like adding zero to both sides of an equation. Other things—costs, duration, employment statistics, capitalization, demographics—those are all factors to be considered. The Earth? It just keeps rotating around the sun. You've seen one tree, you've seen them all. Or, you see no trees, there's nothing there.

Find me a kid who doesn't know about recycling. Find me a kid who doesn't know why he or she recycles, why it's important. OK, maybe they are just little do-gooders, but they're little do-gooders entirely different from the way little kids used to be. While my mom told people to turn their lights off for the war effort, these kids turn lights off ''for the Earth.''

Once, many years ago, a summer roommate said to me, ''If the U.S. uses most of the Earth's resources, then if conditions are going to improve for the rest of the world, we would have to end up using less, right?''

I thought so.

''Well,'' he decided, ''I don't want to use less of anything. So I guess the rest of the world can't improve.''

I am eager to see the world these children make. Oh, I know that some may grow up to think that recycling aluminum cans is a pain in the neck or that they want as big a gas guzzler as the next guy. All those ''other'' factors may outweigh their desire for wilderness, for conservation, for clean air and water.

But right now—bet on it—children are putting the Earth first. Even if that changes—even if they put the Earth second or third or fourth—we can be sure they'll never forget about putting the Earth in the equation. How will they feel if we don't leave them much Earth to worry about?

Barbara Brown lives and writes in Anchorage.

## TRIBUTE TO BEVERLY K. ABBOTT

### HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a distinguished Californian, Beverly K. Abbott, on the occasion of her retirement from the San Mateo County Mental Health Services Agency.

In January 1968 Beverly Abbott entered into public service as a social worker. A dedicated champion of the mentally ill, she devoted twelve years to Marin County's Division of Community Health, eight of which were spent as Director. Beverly Abbott revolutionized the Department during her tenure, increasing the budget from $5,000,000 to $12,000,000.

In 1985, Beverly Abbott took the helm at the San Mateo County Mental Health Services Agency. Under her stewardship, the Mental Health Division has been transformed from a traditional, clinic-based mental health facility to a dynamic organization with a broad array of residential and rehabilitation options. Today the Agency offers a wide selection of contact services, designed to involve families and clients in the administration and evaluation of the service delivery system.

In 1994, the San Mateo Mental Health Division led the State of California by implementing the first fully integrated mental health service system for persons funded by Medi-Cal (MEDICAID).

Beverly Abbott has taken a leadership role in a number of prestigious organizations, including the American College of Mental Health Administration where she served as President-Elect and President from 1995 to 1999.

She has worked tirelessly to provide uncompromising assistance to all residents of San Mateo County. Beverly Abbott's life of leadership is instructive to us all. Her dedication to the ideals of democracy and community service stand tall. It is fitting that she is being honored upon the occasion of her retirement from the San Mateo County Mental Health Services Agency, and I ask my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to join me in honoring this great and good woman whom I am proud to call my friend. We are a better county, a better country and a better people because of her.

## NATIONAL DEPRESSIVE AND MANIC-DEPRESSIVE ASSOCIATION

### HON. PATRICK J. KENNEDY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, I submit the attached testimony that was given by Lydia Lewis of the National Depressive and Manic Depressive Association to the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health, and Human Services and Education for the RECORD.

NATIONAL DEPRESSIVE AND MANIC-DEPRESSIVE ASSOCIATION, CHICAGO

(Statement on Fiscal Year 2002 Budget, National Institutes of Health and National Institute of Mental Health—Submitted to the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, March 21, 2001)

Good afternoon. Chairman Regula, Ranking Member Obey, and distinguished members of the Subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to testify today. My name is Lydia Lewis, and I am the Executive Director of the National Depressive and Manic-Depressive Association (National DMDA). We are pleased to have this opportunity to testify on fiscal year 2002 funding for mental health research supported by the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH).

National DMDA has been gratified to see the overall NIH budget increase over the past three years, including last year's nearly $2.5 billion increase, and we urge the continued full funding of these research priorities in order to maintain an active, progressive research agenda. We fully support President Bush's 2002 budget request of a $2.8 billion increase above the 2001 funding level for NIH,

to a total of $23.1 billion, and we applaud the President's stated initiative to double NIH's 1998 $13.6 billion funding level by 2003.

With nearly 400 patient-run support groups in every major metropolitan area, National DMDA is the nation's largest patient-directed, illness-specific organization. We are committed to advocating for research toward the elimination of mood disorders; educating patients, professionals and the public about the nature of depression and manic-depression as treatable medical diseases; fostering self-help; eliminating discrimination and stigma; and improving access to care. We have a distinguished Scientific Advisory Board of nearly 65 leading researchers and clinicians in the field of mood disorders which reviews all of our materials for medical and scientific accuracy and provides critical and timely advice on important research opportunities and treatment breakthroughs. While I am here today to testify on behalf of National DMDA, I know personally what it is like to battle depression every day, to fight the urge to end my life. I myself suffer from the disease. It's a dreadful way to live.

COMBATING THE STIGMA OF MENTAL ILLNESS

The facts are staggering. More than 20 million American adults—10% of the U.S. population—suffer from unipolar or major depression every year. An additional 2.3 million people suffer from bipolar disorder, also known as manic-depression. According to a study done in 2000 by the World Health Organization, the World Bank, and the Harvard School of Public Health, unipolar major depression is the leading cause of disability in the world today. It also found that mental health has long been misunderstood. In fact, mental illness accounts for more than 15% of the burden of disease in established market economies such as the United States. This is more than the disease burden caused by all cancers combined.

Women are more than twice as likely as men to experience depression, and one out of every four American women will experience a major depressive episode in her lifetime. Ten to fifteen percent of women develop postpartum depression the first year after birth—the most underdiagnosed obstetrical complication in America. Among the many consequences of this illness is the depressed new mother's inability to bond with and nurture her child. Experts say these babies are at increased risk of depression throughout life.

Coping with these devastating illnesses is a tragic, exhausting and difficult way to live. Despite these facts, stigmatizing mental illness is a common occurrence in the United States. Labeling people with mental illness has been a part of the national consciousness for far too long, and continues to send the message that devaluing mental illness is acceptable. An estimated 50 million Americans experience a mental disorder in any given year, and only one-fourth of them actually receive mental health and other services. Two out of three people with mood disorders do not get proper treatment because their symptoms are not recognized, and misdiagnosed or, due to the stigma associated with mental illness, are blamed on personal weakness. Far too often, the fear of being judged or abandoned wins out over the need to seek medical attention, and the person remains untreated.

Equally devastating is the stigma associated with the research of mood disorders and other mental illnesses. Research in behavioral science is as critical as that undertaken for any other illness. Our understanding of the brain is extremely limited and will remain so for decades unless much greater financial support is provided. Neuroscience research is also critically important to understand the mechanisms in the brain that lead to these illnesses. When we begin to understand these, we will be able to develop more effective and rational ways to treat, and hopefully cure, mental illness.

Increased public awareness and understanding of mood disorders will contribute significantly to improved diagnosis and treatment rates for these illnesses. Progress is slowly being made, and we encourage the Subcommittee to continue to fully fund programs that address the stigma and isolation associated with mental illness. We must, as NIMH Director Dr. Steven Hyman has said, sound the alarm that we are in the midst of a public health crisis—that our glaring misperceptions about and undertreatment of mental illness, especially for children and minority populations, represents nothing less than a national health emergency.

PROGRESS IN RESEARCH AND DIAGNOSIS

Mood disorders and other mental illnesses kill people every day. Depression is the leading cause of suicide in the United States. One in every five bipolar sufferers takes his or her own life, and the Centers for Disease Control report that suicide is the third-leading cause of death among 15 to 24 year old Americans. For every two homicides committed in the United States, there are three suicides.

We know that science destigmatizes, and as more people come to understand that mood disorders are treatable medical illnesses, we can make significant reductions in both their human and economic costs. The Surgeon General released a groundbreaking report on mental illness, an important first step in this process. The study concluded that these diseases are real, treatable, and affect the most vital organ in the body—the brain. Research supported by NIMH has lead to new and more effective medications for both depression and manic depression. We have a much better understanding of these illnesses, and are learning more about their impact on cardiovascular disease and stroke.

The Surgeon General's 1999 report was the first ever, from that office, on mental illness. While this is a shameful statistic—by comparison, there have been 23 Surgeon General's reports on tobacco since 1964—National DMDA is nevertheless encouraged by this development, and we hope to take advantage of this turning tide. Finally, there is hope that these disorders will start to be seen by Americans for what they are—real diseases. But we urgently need to increase funding for NIMH and other research institutions to ensure that any forward momentum is not lost.

CLINICAL RESEARCH

National DMDA plays an important role in several large NIMH-sponsored clinical trials. Our consumer representatives are members of oversight committees for trials studying the effectiveness of treatments for bipolar disorder, the study of treatment of adolescents with depression, and the study of treatment of individuals with depression who do not benefit from standard initial treatments. National DMDA participates in the oversight of these trials to ensure that the first priority of all clinical trials is the safety of the patient. One of our primary objectives is to limit the number of people exposed to placebo and limit the duration of their exposure without compromising scientific validity.

MOOD DISORDERS IN CHILDREN AND ADOLESCENTS

The issue of mood disorders in children and adolescents is of particular concern to National DMDA, and we support the aggressive research being done by NIMH in this area. Nearly 2.5 percent of children and 8.3 percent of adolescents suffer from clinical depression. There has, however, been virtually no research to date on bipolar disorders in children, despite evidence that families wait an average of 10 years before receiving the proper diagnosis after seeking help. We know that up to 90 percent of bipolar disorders start before age 20, meaning more high school dropouts, more illegal drug and alcohol use, higher teen pregnancy rates, more teen violence and more adolescent suicides. The costs of waiting for proper treatment do not just affect the individual sufferer, but society as a whole.

We fully support NIMH plans to further expand clinical trials of treatments for mental illnesses, including the exploration of depression in young children. We urge a significant increase in funding for research of mood disorders in children and adolescents with special emphasis on the efficacy and safety of current treatments, the epidemiology of these illnesses and improved diagnostic tools.

We are pleased that NIMH played a lead role in the Surgeon General's report on youth violence. With further research into the relationship between mental disorders and violence, we are hopeful that tragedies like the recent school shootings in California and across the country can be prevented in the future. Many of the perpetrators of these shootings exhibited symptoms of mental illness, and further research into the connection between behavior problems and anxiety disorders, depression, and suicidal ideation is critical. National DMDA is also pleased with the coordination between NIMH and other federal agencies, such as the Centers for Disease Control and the departments of education and justice, and continued information sharing about the relationship between mental illnesses and violence.

BIPOLAR (MANIC-DEPRESSION) DISORDER

The World Health Organization has identified bipolar disorder as the seventh-ranked cause of disability in the world today. Nearly one in 100 Americans suffers from manic-depression, yet research in this area has been continually under funded.

That is slowly changing. NIMH's current Systemic Treatment Enhancement Program for Bipolar Disorder (STEP-BD) is a landmark study of 5,000 people with bipolar disorder, the largest psychiatric trial ever held. While this is a critically important study, it also underscores the unfortunate circumstance that mental illnesses remain woefully under funded. The STEP-BD trial has a budget of just $20 million. A brief check of, for example, the National Cancer Institute programs will reveal that this is an unjustly small allocation for researching this pervasive and fatal disease. In fact, in FY 1999, NIMH spent only $46 million on bipolar research. Congress must continue to increase its investment in this important area of mental health research.

THE IMPACT OF DEPRESSION ON OTHER ILLNESSES

National DMDA is pleased to be participating next week in an important NIMH forum on improving health outcomes for major diseases such as cancer, diabetes, heart disease, stroke, AIDS, and Parkinson's through the effective treatment of co-occurring depression. The forum will highlight scientific advances linking depression and other illnesses, and the role that treating depression plays in improving the course of the co-occurring disease. Participants will also focus on ideas for shaping the Institute's research agenda, and further educational and communication plans for improving health care. National DMDA applauds NIMH for its efforts to include the public in its agenda setting.

Important new research has shown that treatment of co-occurring depression often improves health outcomes for patients with a wide variety of diseases. Researchers are tracing various aspects of depression, that may affect illnesses as varied as neurological diseases such as Parkinson's disease, diseases of the cardiovascular system, and diseases involving suppression of the immune system, such as cancer and AIDS. It appears that depression is an important risk factor for heart disease. In a recent study, it was found that heart patients who had depression were four times as likely to die in the next six months as those who were not depressed. There are also studies linking depression and obesity and diabetes, as well as findings showing common genetic patterns in diabetes and depression.

OTHER RESEARCH NEEDS

More research is needed on the medications for mental illness. There has not been a drug developed specifically for bipolar disorder since the discovery of lithium more than 50 years ago. In addition, it is not fully understood how psychiatric drugs work in the brain. A person often must choose between lessening suicidal thoughts or getting life threatening rashes, seizures, or lithium poisoning. So many of us have to choose a life without libido or a life of fatigue, exacerbated by insomnia. Although these medications are effective for many people, no one should have to make choices like these. Every day technology and science bring us further in understanding the brain, and these kinds of successes build upon each other.

National DMDA is therefore particularly pleased to see the NIMH's renewed commitment to research of more viable treatment options for depression and bipolar disorder and we hope that the Congress will continue to fund important studies in this area. Great strides are being made, but it is critical that even more research is done on how different medicines affect both the body and the mind.

CONCLUSION

We urge the National Institutes of Health and the National Institute of Mental Health to continue to expand and enhance behavioral science, neuroscience and genetics research of mental illnesses. We commend the Subcommittee's past support of NIH and NIMH, and look forward to continuing to work with you in the next year to ensure renewed commitment to full funding of mental health research. We are confident that together, our efforts will mean real treatment options, an end to the stigma associated with mental illness, lives saved and a far more productive America. Thank you again for the opportunity to testify on issues critical to the health and well being of all Americans.

## CELEBRATING THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF ISTHMUS

### HON. TAMMY BALDWIN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 25th anniversary of the founding of a unique institution in Madison, Wisconsin, our weekly newspaper, Isthmus. Conceived as an alternative source of news and information, nurtured by the hard work and big dreams of its founders, Vince O'Hern and Fred Milverstedt, Isthmus' growth and success over 25 years have mirrored Madison's.

Those of us who live in, and work in, and love Madison consider our weekly copy of Isthmus as much a part of our city's life and character as our renowned farmers' market or the statue atop our State Capitol's dome.

Isthmus has been described as a hybrid that, like the community it serves, defies easy labeling or simple description. It provides a weekly accounting of our lives with astute analyses, groundbreaking investigative reporting, and commentary of all stripes on who we are and who we want to be.

Isthmus' influence has spread beyond the pages of the paper. The Isthmus Annual Manual has become our guidebook to all that is good and helpful in our community; while the yearly Isthmus Jazz Festival has become a treasured weekend of good music and great moments.

On this 25th anniversary of Isthmus' founding, I applaud its talented and industrious staff, faithful advertisers, and devoted readers who have nurtured and supported this indispensable chronicle of our lives the past 25 years and we look forward to the next 25!

## TRIBUTE TO ALACHUA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL'S 2001 QUIZ BOWL TEAM

### HON. KAREN L. THURMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute to six remarkable elementary school students, Sam Hart, Ryan McCoy, Ashley Nelson, Paloma Paredes, Megan Raulerson, and Justin Sturm; their equally remarkable teacher, Shirley Tanner, and their school for triumphing in the 2001 National Thinking Cap Quiz Bowl.

Located in Alachua, a tiny city of approximately five thousand people, Alachua Elementary School serves less than 600 students. Principal Jim Brandenburg described the one-hundred and six- year-old school as a ''community school'' and credited community involvement for the school's quality, explaining that: ''Alachua is a very stable community. Many of our students' parents and grandparents also attended Alachua Elementary School. We don't have a lot of money but the parental involvement and community support help make up for that.''

Alachua Elementary School is often referred to as ''the little school that could.'' It has been honored as a Blue Ribbon School and recently received for student achievement from the Alachua County School Board. Furthermore, this is the second consecutive year that Alachua Elementary School has come in first in the state in the National Thinking Cap Quiz Bowl.

Shirley Tanner has coached both of Alachua Elementary School's champion National Thinking Cap Quiz Bowl teams. She also makes time to teach enrichment classes and instructs students and teachers about technology resources. She is certainly a beloved and devoted teacher who prefers to keep the focus on her students' accomplishments rather than her own.

Mrs. Tanner initiated the school's involvement in the challenging competition several years ago. The test consists of 100 computer-generated multiple-choice questions covering a wide range of school subjects, current events and trivia. Each of the fifth-grade students on the quiz bowl team worked incredibly hard to win this competition. Students who qualified for the team already had a wide range of general knowledge, but still had to prepare for the competition. They divided up topics in various academic disciplines and each student became an expert in one or more fields. They studied for a minimum of an extra hour every day, as well as practicing team-work, test-taking strategies and speed. Mrs. Tanner says this approach is the best strategy to take when preparing students for a competition in which they have no idea which questions will be asked of them. They simply need to be quick minded, calm under pressure and knowledgeable about many subjects. She said the six students on this year's team were all of these things and even worked hard enough on their regular school work to make the Honor Roll. We are very proud of them.

Now let me tell you a little bit more about these wonderful kids.

Sam Hart, who also won the spelling bee at Alachua Elementary School this year, focused on spelling. He also concentrated on sports and children's literature. Sam is a quiet, intelligent student who Mrs. Tanner described as ''highly respected and popular with both teachers and peers.''

Ryan McCoy is the second member of his family to participate in the quiz bowl. His older brother Evan McCoy was also on the school's quiz bowl team. Ryan concentrated on sports for the competition as well as measurements and Roman numerals.

Ashley Nelson, a straight-A student who took sixth grade math this year, specialized in math and measurement. On test day, Ashley was the team member chosen to enter the team's answers using the computer keyboard or mouse pointer. Ashley performed this stressful task ''flawlessly'' according to Mrs. Tanner. She input the team answers quickly and accurately. She also demonstrated her fine grasp of math concepts and computation by correctly answering all the math questions without even using a pencil or paper.

Paloma Paredes, another straight-A student, learned time zones and geometry for the competition. Mrs. Tanner described Paloma as an incredibly conscientious and hard-working student. Paloma studies every chance she gets.

Megan Raulerson, also a straight-A student, was the team's language arts expert. In addition to her schoolwork and Quiz Bowl participation, Megan routinely appears on the school's closed circuit live video news broadcasts. Both Megan and fellow Quiz Bowl teammate, Justin Sturm, frequently fill in when a scheduled anchorperson fails to show up. This means they don't even have the opportunity to read the script until a few minutes before broadcast time. A tough job, but they do it wonderfully.

Mrs. Tanner says that Justin Sturm ''wants to know everything about everything.'' She says Justin excels in science and is an avid reader and an enthusiastic learner.

I would also like to recognize last year's quiz bowl winners: Keely Duff, Tyler Mikell, Elizabeth Keller, Katey Sands and Sara Wooding for their achievements. Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring all of these exceptional students.

## IN HONOR OF THE SNOHOMISH COUNTY PROSECUTOR'S OFFICE

### HON. JAY INSLEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, as Members of Congress, we spend countless hours in this chamber discussing issues related to juvenile crime, and we all agree that we must do more than merely punish juvenile criminals—we must develop programs in our communities to keep our youth from becoming criminals in the first place. I rise today to pay special tribute to some wonderful individuals from the Snohomish County Prosecutor's office that are helping our young people to become healthy, productive, law-abiding citizens. These volunteers, in collaboration with local schoolteachers, conduct the Courtrooms to Classrooms program.

This innovative program, funded through a federal grant, provides young students an opportunity to learn nonviolent problem solving techniques and avoid self-destructive behaviors. Initiated by Prosecuting Attorney James Krider and adapted by Lynn Mattson-Eul, the Courtrooms to Classrooms's curriculum allows students to: bound with positive role models, appreciate how laws influence their daily lives, learn about our justice system, and explore new career options from local prosecuting attorneys. The Courtrooms to Classroom program assists students in understanding the individual responsibilities one has as a member of society, and developing analytical skills when making routine and serious decisions. One of the highlights of the program is the mock trial of the storybook character ''Goldilocks.'' It is obvious that the important lessons these young people take away from the Courtrooms to Classrooms program will stay with them the rest of their lives.

I encourage my fellow colleagues to join me in thanking the following individuals for taking the time to improve this country by participating in the lives of our children.

Those individuals are: Kathy Jo Kristof, Scott Lord, Becky Quirk, Walt Sowa, Charlie Blackman, Julie Twito, Jim Townsend, Paul Stern, Mara Rozzano,

Aaron Shields, Jason Cummings, Tom Curtis, Chris Dickinson, Colleen St. Clair, Dave Kurtz, Randy Yates, Dave Thiele, Patricia Lyon, Seth Fine, Steven Bladek, Michael Held, John Swanson, Serena Hart, Kerri Oseguera, Sandra Walters, Marie Turk, Ted Mueser, Mark Roe, Craig Matheson, Lisa Paul, Remy Leonard, Barbara Finnie, Matt Hunter, John Stansell, Kathy Patterson, Craig Bray, Cindy Larsen, Erica Temple, Hal Hupp, Ed Stemier, George Appel, Karen Jorgensen-Peters, Lisa Hanna, Linda Scoccia, Tim Geraghty, Sherry King, Karen Moore, Dave Wold, Diane Kremenich, Susan Lewis, Debbie Cicardini, Karen Kahmann, Diana Kinnebrew, Patricia Bear, Tricia Bryant, Anna Clark, Chery Park, Amy Matthiesen, and Cheri Wantola.

## FORCED CHILD LABOR IN CHINA

### HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my sincerest condolences to the families of the 42 individuals—including 37 young school children—who died in a horrible explosion in China on March 6 of this year. This tragedy resulted from a situation of forced child labor in which the deceased third- and fourth-graders were required to spend long hours during the school day making firecrackers. Along with 16 cosponsors, today I am introducing a bipartisan resolution that expresses condolences to the families of the deceased and expresses support for international trade agreements that will enforce the International Labor Organization's core labor standards, which include prohibition of child labor and forced labor.

For years, the parents of children in the Fanglin elementary school, which is in a small village 40 miles southwest of Shanghai, had complained that their children were being forced by school officials to manufacture large firecrackers at school. Every day, the young children were required to spend hours mounting fuses and detonators into the firecrackers that were then sold by local officials. To ensure that their monetary intake remained high, the officials set a sliding production quota that started at 1,000 firecrackers per day for the youngest children and reached 10,000 firecrackers per day for the fifth-graders.

It was only a matter of time before this disturbing example of forced and dangerous child labor would end in tragedy. On a Tuesday afternoon, the firecrackers exploded in the elementary school and took the lives of the 37 young children.

Chinese Prime Minister Zhu immediately denied the use of forced child labor, and Communist Party officials invented a story about a ''mad man'' who entered the school and set off the explosion as part of his suicide attempt. However, thanks to the courageous and persistent reporting of both Chinese and international journalists, Prime Minister Zhu was eventually forced to acknowledge the true events of March 6.

The forced labor and child labor in China violates several conventions of the International Labor Organization (ILO), but unfortunately the ILO has no enforcement powers. I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting a bipartisan House Resolution that expresses our condolences to the families of the deceased and urges strong international action to enforce the ILO core labor standards.

## THE 47TH ANNUAL NATIONAL PRAYER BREAKFAST

### HON. STEVE LARGENT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the House and Senate Prayer Groups, it was an honor to chair the 47th Annual National Prayer Breakfast held on February 4th, 1999.

This annual breakfast is an opportunity for leaders and guests from around the world to join in love and unity as we celebrate our faith in God and the religious freedom that our country protects. We put our differences aside and come together as children of God of pray for peace and reconciliation.

No other event during my years as a member of Congress has been such a blessing as the National Prayer Breakfast. The thoughts and prayers shared at this year's breakfast were beneficial to those who attended, and I believe they will be so many more. I am therefore including the program and transcript to be printed in the RECORD. The program and transcript follow:

1999 NATIONAL PRAYER BREAKFAST, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1999, HILTON WASHINGTON AND TOWERS HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C.,

Chairman: Representative Steve Largent

Representative LARGENT. My name is Steve Largent, and I want to welcome you to the National Prayer Breakfast. I am a member of the House of Representatives from the state of Oklahoma, and I am this year's chairman and will be acting as the Master of Ceremonies for at the prayer breakfast this year.

It is my pleasure at this time to introduce Mr. Jim Kimsey, who will begin with our pre-breakfast prayer.

Mr. KIMSEY. Basil was a fourth-century saint from Asia Minor. He said, ''We pray in the morning to give us the first stirrings our mind to God. Before anything else, let the thought of God gladden you.'' Would you begin this day with me in prayer?

Dear God, may the efforts of all those gathered here today reach far and wide—our thoughts, our work, our lives. Make them blessings for your kingdom. Let them go beyond today. Our lives today have consequences unseen. Each life has a purpose. Please, God, grant us the wisdom to recognize that purpose.

Today is new and unlike any other day, for God makes each day different. To live each day wisely, we need wisdom—wisdom in our hearts and in our thoughts. We need wisdom in the choices we make. Psalm 90 implores us, ''Lord, teach us to number our days aright, that we may gain wisdom in our heart.''

Each day, like today, we pray to God to help us to do the things that matter, not to waste the time we have. We know the moments we have are precious. We pray that God helps us count them dear and teach us to number our days aright; that he fills this day and every day with kindness so that we may be glad and rejoice all the days of our life.

Numbering our days aright is crucial for our own happiness, but it is even more important for the rest of the world. Each day we are presented with opportunities to make a difference; small differences, like a hello to a lonely neighbor, to extra change dropped in a homeless person's cup. And we can make big differences feeding the hungry, teaching children to read, bridging understanding and peace between nations. Every difference you make matters, just as every day matters. Edmund Burke wisely noted long ago, ''The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing.''

We are especially blessed today. We have a unique opportunity in our frantic lives to begin with prayer and listen to the wisdom of the incredible group assembled here today. I would like to leave you with one thought. Yesterday is history, and tomorrow is a mystery. But today is a gift. Thank you.

(Opening Song by the United States Army Chorus.)

Representative LARGENT. Thank you to the United States Army Chorus. We appreciate

that. That is inspiring, and a good way to start the breakfast.

At this time I would like to call to the podium General Dennis Reimer, who is the Chief of Staff of the Army, for our opening prayer.

General REIMER. Let us pray.

Almighty and eternal God, creator of all things, we ask Your presence with us at this gathering this morning as we raise our minds and hearts to You. May the words we share be an echo of Your voice. We are grateful for our nation's long and abiding legacy of freedom. We thank You for Your gifts, which become richer as we share them, and more secure as we guard them for one another.

Gracious Lord, we praise You for the spirit of liberty You have established through our nation's founders. Lord, we remember this morning the words of Peter Marshall, who gave thanks for the rich heritage of this good land, for the evidences of Thy favor in the past and for the hand that hath made and preserved this nation. We thank You for the men and women who, by blood and sweat, by toil and tears, forged on the anvil of their own sacrifice all that we hold dear. May we never lightly esteem what they obtained at a great price. Grateful for rights and privileges, may we be conscious of duties and obligations. May his words continue to be timeless.

Lord, we ask that You will strengthen us to stand firmly against cruel and heartless discrimination or prejudice of any kind. In Your holy presence we ask that the things which make for peace may not be hidden from our eyes. Help us to catch Your vision of a greater destiny and the call of holy responsibility. May the moral fibers of duty, honor and country be seen in all we do.

Lord our God, in profound gratitude we ask Your blessing on the United States of America. Bless now this food to our use and us to Your service. In Your holy name we pray. Amen.

Representative LARGENT. Thank you, General Reimer, a great Oklahoman.

Please enjoy your meal. We will continue with the program in about 15 minutes. Thank you.

(Breakfast)

Representative LARGENT. In addition to the President and First Lady, and the Vice President, this morning we have a number of special guests. We have members of the Senate and the House, and members of the President's Cabinet. We have members of the Joint Chiefs, prime ministers, heads of corporations, student leaders and numerous other dignitaries. We have people from all 50 states and over 150 countries represented here this morning. (Applause.)

In addition, we have with us several heads of state which I would like to recognize at this time. We have His Excellency Ljubco Georgievski, Prime Minister of the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. (Applause.) Also joining us is His Excellency Mathieu Kerekou, President of the Republic of Benin. (Applause.) His Excellency Jamil Mahuad, President of Ecuador. (Applause.) And His Excellency Pandeli Majko, Prime Minister of the Republic of Albania. (Applause.) I get extra credit for all of that. (Laughter.)

At this time, I would like to introduce the head table. Beginning on my left and your right is Mr. Jim Kimsey. He is the founder of America On Line and is a gentleman who has a deep love for the District of Columbia. With Mr. Kimsey is Ms. Holidae Hayes. We are glad to have you here. (Applause.)

Next to them is Mr. Michael W. Smith. He is a Grammy-winning recording artist who will perform for us later, and his wife Debbie. (Applause.)

Next we have Dr. Laura Schlessinger, also known as Dr. Laura. (Applause.) I don't even need to say who she is, right? (Laughter.) No, she is one of America's most listened-to radio talk show hosts. She is the co-author of the current bestseller, ''The Ten Commandments: The Significance of God's Law in Everyday Life.'' She is also a licensed marriage, family and children's counselor and is frequently referred to as America's mommy. (Applause.)

Next to Dr. Schlessinger is Senator Kay Bailey Hutchison, an outstanding senator from the state of Texas, who will share with you later about the Senate and House breakfast groups. Senator, thank you. (Applause.)

Next is Annie Glenn, wife of Senator John Glenn. Annie is a great friend and a great example for us all. (Applause.) And then we have Senator Glenn, who is one of our national heroes, whose return to space last year had me considering out of retirement, briefly. (Applause.)

Next is our Vice President, Al Gore. Every year Congress hosts a National Student Leadership Forum on Faith and Values, and this year the Vice President and his wife Tipper were kind enough to open up their home to about 200 student leaders from across the country and actually spent a lot of time with them individually, talking with them. Mr. Vice President, please tell Tipper we said thank you very much. (Applause.)

Next are President Clinton and the First Lady. (Applause.) I want to tell you an interesting story that I think also is a bit of a glimpse behind the scenes of President Clinton. After the prayer breakfast two years ago, I sent him a note thanking him for his remarks, which were wonderful, as they will be this morning. He actually was in the process of writing me a note and said, ''No, I thought I would just call.''

So he called our home, and my daughter Casie, who at that time was about 15 years old, answered the phone and said, ''The President of the United States is calling for Congressman Steve Largent.'' My daughter put the phone on hold and came and got me and she said, ''Dad, somebody said that the President is on the line. Would you please get him off the line because I've got Brad Pitt holding on the other line.'' (Applause.)

Next to the First Lady is my first lady, Terry Largent. (Applause.)

Next we have our speaker this morning, Max Lucado and his wife Denalyn. I will tell you more about Max just a little bit later. (Applause.)

Next to the Lucados is Senator Joseph Lieberman, a great senator and a man who is known for his integrity and for his love of God. (Applause.)

Next is one of my good friends and colleagues in the House of Representatives, Harold Ford, Jr. He is the first African-American in history to succeed his father in the U.S. House of Representatives. (Applause.)

And next to Congressman Ford are General Dennis Reimer, who I introduced earlier, one of our great military leaders, and his wife, Mrs. Mary Jo Reimer. (Applause.)

As we gather this morning, this is the National Prayer Breakfast, and there are many around the world who need our prayers here this morning. I want to take a moment to mention just a few of the people that are in dire need of our prayers this morning, including King Hussein, Billy Graham, Pope John Paul II, and the victims of the recent earthquake in Colombia. In fact, it is my understanding that King Hussein is undergoing therapy for cancer treatment as we are speaking and is watching the prayer breakfast this morning.

Many in the Senate and the House breakfast group have had the opportunity over the years to become friends in this fellowship with his majesty, King Hussein of Jordan. As friends, we have prayed with his majesty in times of triumph and times of trial. And as he undergoes treatment this week for the trial of a lifetime, we join all our prayers to uplift his spirit and strengthen his family, his loved ones and his medical care team in a special way.

Also, many of you may be here this morning asking, ''What is the prayer breakfast and why am I here?'' I want to tell you just a little bit about the prayer breakfast and its genesis. It is not very complicated, actually. There was a small group that began meeting in the Senate back in the early 1950s. They were joined later by a small group that began in the House. At some time they decided, wouldn't it be a good idea if the House group and the Senate group met together to pray for the President of the United States. And that is how the prayer breakfast began 47 years ago. You are going to hear a little bit more about the Senate and House groups from Senator Hutchison and what we are doing in both chambers as we speak.

The members concluded that whether our country is experiencing peace or war, bounty or struggle, there is a tremendous need for people of faith to lift the President up in prayer. This is not now, nor has it ever been, a political event. When we come to the prayer breakfast, we take our political hats off and come together to talk and pray about the principles of Jesus.

One individual who embodies these principles and who generally graces our presence here at the prayer breakfast is Dr. Billy Graham. Unfortunately, because of his health considerations, Dr. Graham is unable to attend this year. However, by way of a letter, he sends his greetings. I would like to share a portion of his letter with you, because I believe it captures the spirit of the occasion.

Dr. Graham writes, ''After so many years, the most difficult thing for me to do is to inform you that I will not be able to come to the prayer breakfast as I had planned. I hope you will give my greetings and the promise of prayer for this important gathering this morning. Our country is in need of a unity that only God can bring. We must as a people repent of our sins and turn to God in faith. He alone can heal our divisions, forgive our sins and bring the spiritual renewal the nation needs if we are to survive. I deeply regret that I cannot be with you today, but I will be in prayer that God will give the greatest spirit of spiritual renewal that we have ever had. Please assure the President and Mrs. Clinton, Vice President and Mrs. Gore, and the other leaders gathered at the breakfast, that they are in my constant prayers. God bless you all. Billy Graham.'' (Applause.)

Mr. President, I would just add that our prayer is that while you are here with us, you will have a sense of peace and rest and will understand that as you leave here that there are people all over the world that are praying for you.

Now, Senator Kay Bailey Hutchison will share with you about the House and Senate prayer groups.

Senator HUTCHISON. Thank you, Congressman Largent. And thank you for all the work you have done to make this a wonderful event. (Applause.) Mr. President and Mrs. Clinton, Mr. Vice President, we are so honored to have all of our guests today.

It is gratifying to see such a large and distinguished crowd for this great Washington tradition. We come for our own reasons, some more inspired than others. For some, it is the prayer. Perhaps for some it is the breakfast. (Scattered laughter.) But as I look around this morning, in this city, I am reminded about the small-town Texas preacher

who phoned the local newspaper editor on Monday to thank him for making a mistake in the paper. And the editor said, ''Well, why are you thanking me for the mistake?'' And the preacher said, ''Well, the topic I sent you was, 'What Jesus Saw in the Publicans and Plutocrats.' What you printed was, 'What Jesus Saw in Republicans and Democrats.' The curiosity brought me the greatest crowd of the year.'' (Laughter.)

Obviously, we do not come here today as Republicans or Democrats, or even as Americans. We come as God's human creation, seeking guidance in our daily lives. I am pleased to report for the United States Senate and the House of Representatives this morning. Each of us has a regular weekly meeting at breakfast, and our regulars rarely miss it. It is the priority time on our schedules. It is a time for fellowship and reflection, two commodities that are often in short supply in the course of our daily lives.

It is also a time to renew old acquaintances. One of the regulars who grace the Senate meeting is former Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield. Every Wednesday morning he comes in and orders bacon and eggs and biscuits, and all of my younger colleagues are eating granola and fruit. (Laughter.) We tell him we love to see a guy that still eats like a guy. (Laugher.) We figure that the breakfast and the prayer is working for him, because he is 96 years old. (Applause.)

We are blessed with occasional drop-ins. Both the Vice President and the President have dropped in on our prayer breakfasts, and we enjoy it very much. but mostly it is just us, our members and our former members, who are always welcome. We spend our sessions discussing different things. Sometimes it is the events of the day and what bearing they may have on our spiritual growth and renewal. At other times, we hear the testimony of a colleague or we help him or her respond to a personal crisis. There is only one informal rule: we never discuss Senate or House business.

The Senate and the House are institutions, that, by their very nature and genius, are diverse. They represent varied sections and interests that define the great nation that is ours. They come together to find common ground. But in our prayer breakfast, we start on common ground and we grow together from there. We start from the acceptance that each of us is flawed, that we all need guidance, and that none of us alone has the answers. We grow from the relationship that bonds us. We gain the strength to fulfill our collective duty to develop and nurture one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all. That is what all of us hope that this annual meeting does, to inspire us to do better in the next year for our respective nations.

Thank you. Thank you, Steve. (Applause.)

Representative LARGENT. Thank you, Senator. And now, for a reading from the Holy Scriptures, Dr. Laura Schlessinger.

Dr. SCHLESSINGER. First, I would just like to say I cannot tell you how touched and honored I am to be here doing this. You have no idea what it means to me. This is Deuteronomy 8.

''You shall faithfully observe all the instruction that I enjoin upon you today, that you may thrive and increase and be able to possess the land that the Lord promised on oath to your fathers. Remember the long way that the Lord your God has made you travel in the wilderness these past 40 years, that he might test you by hardship to learn what is in your hearts, whether you would keep his commandments or not.

''He subjected you to the hardship of hunger and then gave you manna to eat, which neither you not your fathers had ever known, in order to teach you that man does not live by bread alone, but that man may live on anything that the Lord decrees. The clothes upon you did not wear out, nor did your feet swell these 40 years.

''Bear in mind that Lord your God disciplines you just as a man disciplines his son. Therefore, keep the commandments of the Lord your God. Walk in his ways and revere him. For the Lord your God is bringing you into a good land, a land with streams and springs and fountains issuing from plain and hill, a land of wheat and barley, of vines, figs and pomegranates, a land of olive trees and honey, a land where you may eat food without scarcity, where you will lack nothing, a land whose rocks are iron and from whose hills you can mine copper.

''When you have eaten your fill, give thanks to the Lord your God for the good land which he has given you. Take care, lest you forget the Lord your God and fail to keep his commandments, his rules and his laws, which I enjoin upon you today. When you have eaten your fill and have built fine houses to live in and your herds and flocks have multiplied and your silver and gold have increased and everything you own has prospered, beware lest your hearts grow haughty and you forget the Lord your God, who freed you from the land of Egypt, the house of bondage, who led you through the great and terrible wilderness with its serpents and scorpions, a parched land with no water on it, who brought forth water for you from the flinty rock, who fed you in the wilderness with manna, which your fathers had never known, in order to test you by hardship, only to benefit you in the end.

''You say to yourselves, 'My own power and the might of my own had have won this wealth for me.' Remember that it is the Lord your God who gives you the power to get wealth in fulfillment of the covenant that he made on oath with your fathers, as is still the case. If you do forget the Lord your God and follow other gods to serve them or bow down to them. I warn you this day that you shall certainly perish. Like the nations that the Lord will cause to perish before you, so shall you perish, because you did not heed the Lord your God.''

Shalom. (Applause.)

Representative LARGENT. Thank you, Dr. Laura. Now Michael W. Smith.

(Michael W. Smith sings ''Salvation Belongs to God.'')

Representative LARGENT. Thank you, Michael.

As you are aware, Senator Glenn made history recently by returning to space 36 years after he became the first American to orbit the earth. During Senator Glenn's space flight last year, he kept in contact with the President via E-mail. At one point, the President E-mailed Senator Glenn to let him know he had spoken to an 83-year-old woman from Queens and asked her what she thought of the mission. She replied that it seemed like a perfectly fine thing for a young man like Senator Glenn to do. (Laughter.) So please welcome the young Senator Glenn to the podium (Applause.)

Senator GLENN. Thank you. (Continued applause.) Thank you all very much. Thank you all very, very much. Steve, I thank you for that introduction very much also.

Let me add a couple of Old Testament thoughts to what Dr. Laura just read for you a moment ago. These readings have been favorites of mine for a long time, and I wanted to add those before I get over into a couple of quotes from the New Testament.

I am sure you all are very familiar with that part in Ecclesiastes that start out, ''To everything there is a season, and a time for every purpose under heaven.'' I won't take time to read all of it exactly, but you remember that. ''A time to be born and die, plant, pluck up that which is planted, a time to kill, heal, break down, build up, weep, laugh, mourn, dance, cast away stones, gather stones, embrace, time to refrain, time to get, time to lose, time to keep, cast away, rend and sow, silence, speak, love and hate, time of war, time of peace.''

That about covers the whole gamut of the human existence. There is not much we could add to that. That has always been one that I thought leads us to believe that there is a time for everything intended for us, that God wants us to live a full life. There is a time for everything. There is a time to live and a time to do—for all of these things.

There is another passage I also like. This came to me and has been a favorite, because when I was training way back in World War II days, which does show my age, I guess, my mother sent a passage to me that I have always thought was very apropos, not only for that time and what I was looking forward to then, but also no matter what happens to us any time in life. And that is out of Psalm 139.

''Whither shall I go from thy spirit, or whither shall I flee from they presence? If I ascend up into heaven, thou art there. If I make my bed in hell, behold, thou are there.'' And this part in particular: ''If I take the wings of the morning and dwell in the uttermost parts of the sea, even there shall thy hand lead me and they right hand shall hold me.'' To me, that dwelling in the uttermost parts of the sea also means going into space, I can tell you that. Those two passages together I have always thought were about my favorite parts of the Scripture.

Now to our New Testament reading, which I understand is also the favorite of some of the other people here this morning. Romans 8: ''Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation or distress or persecution or famine or nakedness or peril or sword? As it is written, 'For thy sake, we are killed all day long. We are counted as sheep for the slaughter.' Nay, in all these things, we are more than conquerors through him that loved us. For I am persuaded that neither death nor life nor angels nor principalities nor powers nor things present nor things to come nor height nor depth nor any other creature shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.''

The second passage is out of Phillippians: ''Rejoice in the Lord always. And again I say, rejoice. Let you moderation be known unto all men. The Lord is at hand. Be careful for nothing, but in everything, by prayer and supplication, with thanksgiving, let your requests be made known unto God. And the peace of God, which passeth all understanding, shall keep your hearts and minds through Christ Jesus. Finally, brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report, if there be any virtue, if there be any praise, think on these things. Those things which ye have both learned and received and heard and seen in me, do. And the God of peace shall be with you.''

Thank you. (Applause.)

Representative LARGENT. Thank you, Senator Glenn. Please welcome to the podium, ladies and gentleman, the Vice President of the United States, Albert Gore, Jr. (Applause.)

Vice President GORE. Thank you, Steve. Thank you very much. Thank you, Congressman Largent; Mr. President, Mrs. Clinton; Mr. Speaker; distinguished guests.

To all of those who have worked so hard to make this breakfast what it is, including a lot of men and women in the Overflow Room,

who did more work than anybody else, I want to thank them. When I went over to speak with them during the breakfast briefly, by sheer coincidence, I read exactly the same passage from Romans that John just picked here.

And to all of you, I want to thank you joining us at this annual gathering, which reaffirms America as a pilgrim people and a nation of faith.

Every one of us, I believe, has a task appointed for us by the Lord. We are reminded, ''Whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with thy might.'' A teacher should teach with all his heart, a parent should care for her child as if all heaven were watching, a machinist should take the utmost pride in a job well done, because all of us are asked by God to devote our daily work to others and to his glory. All of us have a chance to be made great, not by our achievements measured in the world's eyes, but through our commitment to a path of righteousness and to one another.

I also believe our nation has a task appointed for it by the Lord. As the Gospel says, ''Let your light so shine before men that they may see your good works and glorify your Father, which is in heaven.'' Though our founders separated Church and State, they never forgot that this eternal spiritual light illuminated the principles of democracy, and especially the idea of the preciousness and equality of every human being. The truth that underlies the Constitution is that every human being, no matter how rich or how poor, how powerful or how rail, is made in God's holy image and must be treated accordingly.

We have seen, especially in this century, how dangerous and destructive the world becomes when individuals, nations, and leaders forget this eternal truth. Without it, the door to evil is wrenched open, wreaking untold misery on the human race; demagoguery and cruelty, racial hatred and totalitarianism may enter unchecked.

When we understand our real nature and responsibility as true sons and daughters of the living God, it does not mean we retreat from the world, even though all of us know how hard the world can be on our ideals. Rather, God asks us to move forward into human institutions and, instead of conforming ourselves to them, change them for the better, doing our best to listen to the small, still voice that should guide us.

A little farther in that part of Romans, in a different translation, is a passage that has always meant a lot to me: ''Do not be conformed to this world, but be transformed by the renewing of your mind, so that you may discern what is the will of God, what is good and acceptable and perfect. Let love be genuine. Hate what is evil. Hold fast to what is good. Live in harmony with one another. Do not be haughty, but associate with the lowly. Do not claim to be wiser than you are. Do not repay anyone evil for evil, but take thought for what is noble in the sight of all.''

An old folk tale says there are two ways to warm yourself when it is very cold. One is by putting on a luxurious coat; the other is by lighting a fire. The difference is that the fur coat warms only yourself, while the fire lights anyone who comes near.

We have a comparable choice every day. Indeed, we are at a moment of great spiritual opportunity to choose right. The end of the millennium is drawing near, so let us carry no spiritual debts into a new time, but recommit to a future where we elevate mankind's faith and fill the world with justice. (Applause.)

Representative LARGENT. Thank you, Mr. Vice President.

I was joking with the Vice President earlier that the prayer breakfast is on Thursday, but his prayers were answered earlier in the week when Mr. Gephardt pulled out of the presidential primary. (Laughter.)

It gives me great honor to introduce our speaker this morning, Mr. Max Lucado. Max is probably best know as a best-selling author, having 11 million books in print. Although I have read many of his books, the one that truly touched me the most has been one of his children's books called ''You are Special.'' I have given this book to several friends and have read it aloud on various occasions, especially when I speak with young people. When I was asked to choose a speaker this morning, I immediately thought of Max, because I am convinced that someone who writes the way he writes knows a great deal about the unconditional love of God. So, Max, please come and share with us what is on your heart this morning. (Applause.)

Mr. LUCADO. Mr. President and Mrs. Clinton, Mr. Vice President. I cannot thank you enough for this wonderful privilege that you have given me and my wife, Denalyn, to be with you this morning. Thank you, Congressman Largent, for those kind words.

I never quite know how people respond to those of us who write. Not long ago I was speaking at a conference and a man came up to me afterwards and said, ''I've never had dinner with an author before.'' And I said, ''Well, you buy, I'll eat.'' (Laughter.) So off we went and had a delightful chat. Some days later I received a note from him in which he said, ''I thoroughly enjoyed our visit, but you were not as intelligent as I thought you would be.'' (Laughter.) You can't please everyone.

I will do my best to keep my remarks brief. Not long ago I was speaking and a man got up in the middle of my presentation and began walking out. I stopped everything and I said, ''Sir, can you tell me where you're going?'' He said, ''I's going to get a haircut.'' I said, ''Why didn't you get one before you came in?'' He said, ''I didn't need one before I came in.'' (Laughter.)

I have asked several people associated with the breakfast why the invitation came my way. The answer that really made the most sense was the briefest one, and that is, ''We thought you might share a few words about Jesus,'' a request I am privileged to attempt to fulfill.

The final paragraph on the invitation that we received defines the National Prayer Breakfast as ''a fellowship in the spirit of Jesus.'' How remarkable that such an event even exists. It speaks so highly of you, our leaders, that you would convene such a gathering and clear times out of your very busy schedule to attend such a gathering, not under any religious or political auspices, but in the spirit of Jesus. Thank you that during these dramatic hours you have made prayer a priority.

This breakfast speaks highly of you, our guests. You weave a tapestry this morning of 160 different nations, traditions and cultures, representing a variety of backgrounds but united by a common desire to do what is right for your people. And you are welcome here. Each and every one of you are welcome.

The breakfast is a testimony to you, our leaders, to you, our guests, but most of all, wouldn't you agree?, the breakfast is a testimony to Jesus of Nazareth. Regardless of our perception and understanding and opinion of him, how remarkable that 2,000 years after his birth, we are gathered to consider this life, a man of humble origins, a brother to the poor, a friend of sinners and the great reconciler of people.

It is the last attribute of Jesus I thought we could consider for just a few moments, his ability to reconcile the divided, his ability to deal with contentious people. After all, don't we all deal with people and don't we all know how contentious they can be? How does that verse go? ''To live above with those we love, O, how that will be glory. But to live below with those we know, now, that's another story.'' (Laughter.)

I found this out in college when I found a girl whom I really liked and I took her home to meet my mom, but my mom didn't like her, so I took her back. (Laughter.) I found another girl I really liked, and so I took her home to meet my mom, but mom didn't like her either. So I took her back. I found another girl, took her home. Mom didn't like her. I went through a dormitory full of girls—(laughter)—until finally I found one that I knew my mom would like because she looked just like my mom. She walked like my mom. She talked like my mom. So I took her home, and my dad could not stand her. (Laughter.)

People are tough to deal with. But tucked away in the pages of the Bible is the story of Jesus guiding a contentious group through a crisis. If you will turn your attention to the inside of your program that you received, you will read the words written by a dear friend of Jesus, the apostle John. And he tells us this story:

''Jesus knew that the Father had put all things under his power and that he had come from God and was returning to God. So he got up from the meal, he took off his outer clothing, he wrapped a towel around his waist. After that he poured water into a basin and began to wash his disciples' feet, drying them with the towel that was wrapped around him. He came to Simon Peter, who said to him, 'Lord, are you going to wash my feet?' And Jesus replied, 'You do not realize what I am doing, but later you will understand.' 'No,' said Peter. 'You shall never wash my feet.' And Jesus answered, 'Unless I wash you, you have no part with me.' 'Then, Lord,' Simon Peter replied, 'not just my feet, but my hands and my head as well.' ''

It is the final night of Jesus' life, the night before his death, and Jesus and his disciples have gathered for what will be their final meal together. You would think his followers would be sensitive to the demands of the hour, but they are not. They are divided. Another follower by the name of Luke in his gospel writes these words: ''The disciples began to argue about which of them was the important.'' Can you imagine? The leader is about to be killed and the followers are posturing for power. This is a contentious group.

Not only are they contentious; they are cowardly. Before the night is over, the soldiers will come and the followers will scatter, and those who sit with him at the table will abandon him in the garden. Can you imagine a more stressful evening—death threats on one side and contentious and quarrelsome followers on the other? I suppose some of you can. That may sound like a typical day at the office. But we know that the response of Jesus was not at all typical.

But I wonder what our response would be. Perhaps we would preach a sermon on team work, maybe point a few fingers or pound a few tables. That is probably what we would do. But what does Jesus do? How does he guide a divided team through a crisis? He stands and he removes his coat and he wraps a servant's towel around his waist. He takes up the wash basin and he kneels before one of his disciples. Unlacing a sandal, he gently lifts the disciple's foot and places it in the wash basin, covers it with water and begins to clean it. One by one, Jesus works his way down the row, one grimy foot after another. He washes the feet of his followers.

By the way, I looked for the verse in the Bible that says Jesus washed all of the disciples' feet except the feet of Judas, but I

could not find it. The feet of Judas were washed as well. No one was excluded.

You may be aware that the washing of feet was a task reserved not just for the servants but for the lowest of servants. Every group has its pecking order, and a group of household servants was no exception. And whoever was at the bottom of that pecking order was the one given the towel and the one given the basin. But in this case, the one with the towel and the one with the basin is the one whom many of us esteem as the creator and king of the universe. What a thought. Hands which shaped the stars, rubbing dirt; fingers which formed mountains, massaging toes. And the one before whom all nations will one day bow, kneeling before his friends, before his divided and disloyal band of friends.

It is important to note that Jesus is not applauding their behavior. He is not applauding their actions. He simply chooses to love them and respect them, in spite of their actions. he literally and symbolically cups the grimiest part of their lives in his hands and cleanses it with forgiveness. Isn't this what this gesture means? To wash someone's feet is to touch the mistakes of their lives and cleanse them with kindness. Sometimes there is no other option. Sometimes everything that can be said has been said. Sometimes the most earnest defense is inadequate. There are some conflicts, whether in nations or in homes, which can only be resolved with a towel and a basin of water.

''But Max,'' you might be saying, ''I'm not the one to wash feet. I've done nothing wrong.'' Perhaps you have done nothing wrong. But neither did Jesus. You see, the genius of Jesus' example is that the burden of bridge-building falls on the strong one, not on the weak one. It is the one in the right who takes the initiative.

And you know what happens? When the one in the right volunteers to wash the feet of the one in the wrong, both parties end up on their knees. For don't we always think we are right? We kneel to wash feet only to look up and see our adversary, who is kneeling to wash ours. What better posture from which to resolve our differences?

By the way, this story offers a clear picture of what it means to be a follower of Jesus. We have allowed the definition to get so confusing. Some think it has something to do with attending a certain church or embracing a particular political view. Really it is much simpler. A follower of Jesus is one who has placed his or her life where the disciples placed their feet—in the hands of Jesus. And just as he cleansed their feet with water, so he cleanses our mistakes with forgiveness.

That is why followers of Jesus must be the very first to wash the feet of others. Jesus goes on to say, ''If I, your Lord and master, have washed your feet, you should wash one another's feet. I did this as an example so that you should do as I have done for you.''

I wonder what would happen if we accepted this challenge, if we followed Jesus's example. What if we all determined to resolve conflict by the washing of feet? If we did, here is what might occur. We would listen, really listen, when people speak. We would be kind to those who curse us and quick to forgive those who ask our forgiveness. We would be more concerned about being fair than being noticed. We would not lower our God-given standards, nor would we soften our hearts. We would keep our minds open, our hearts tender and our thoughts humble. And we would search for and find the goodness that God has placed within each person, and love it.

Would our problems be solved overnight? No. Jesus's were not. Judas still sold out and the disciples still ran away. But in time—in fact, in short time—they all came back and they formed a nucleus of followers who changed the course of history. And no doubt they must have learned what I pray we learn this morning: that some problems can only be solved with a towel and a basin of water.

Let's pray together. Our Father, you have taught us that the line between good and evil does not run down geographical or political boundaries but runs through each of our hearts. Please expand that part of us which is good and diminish that part of us which is evil. Let your great blessings be upon our President and his family, our Vice President and his family, and all of these leaders and dignitaries gathered. But we look to you as the ultimate creator, director and author of the universe. Lead us to someone today whose mistakes we might touch with kindness. By your power we pray. Amen. (Applause.)

Representative LARGENT. Thank you, Max. At this time I want to make one other brief introduction, and that is the new Speaker of the House of Representatives, my friend from Illinois, Denny Hastert.

I want to say it is my privilege and high honor to at this time introduce the President of the United States, Mr. William Jefferson Clinton. (Applause.)

President Clinton. Thank you very much.

Steve, distinguished head table guests, to the leaders from around the world who are here, the members of Congress, Mr. Speaker and others, ladies and gentlemen.

I feel exactly the way I did the first time I ever gave a speech as a public official, to the Pine Bluff Rotary Club Officers Installation Banquet in January of 1977. The dinner started at 6:30. There were 500 people there. All but three were introduced; they went home mad. (Laughter.) We had been there since 6:30. I was introduced at a quarter to 10. The guy that introduced me was so nervous he did not know what to do, and, so help me, the first words out of his mouth were, ''You know, we could stop here and have had a very nice evening.'' (Laughter.) He did not mean it the way it sounded, but I do mean it. We could stop here and have had a very wonderful breakfast. You were magnificent, Max. Thank you very much (Applause.)

I did want to assure you that one of the things that has been said here today repeatedly is absolutely true. Senator Hutchison was talking about how when we come here, we set party aside, and there is absolutely no politics in this. I can tell you that is absolutely so. I have had a terrific relationship with Steve Largent, and he has yet to vote with me the first time. (Laughter.) So I know there is no politics in this prayer breakfast. (Laughs.)

We come here every year. Hillary and I were staying up kind of late last night talking about what we should say today and who would be here. I would like to ask you to think about what Max Lucado said in terms of the world we live in, for it is easier to talk about than to do, this idea of making peace with those who are different from us.

We have certain signs of hope, of course. last Good Friday in Northern Ireland, the Irish Protestants and the Irish Catholics set aside literally centuries of distrust and chose peace for their children.

Last October, at the Wye Plantation in Maryland, Chairman Arafat, Abu Mazin and the Palestinian delegation, and Prime Minister Netanyahu and the Israeli delegation went through literally sleepless nights to try to save the peace process in the Middle East and put it back on track.

Throughout this year, we have worked with our allies to deepen the peace in Bosnia, and we are delighted to have the leader of the Republika Srpska here today. We are working today to avoid a new catastrophe in Kosovo, with some hopeful signs.

We also have worked to guarantee religious freedom to those who disagree with all of us in this room, recognizing that so much of the trouble in the world is rooted in what we believe are the instructions we get from God to do things to people who are different from us. And we think the only answer is to promote religious freedom at home and around the world.

I want to thank all of you who helped us to pass the Religious Freedom Act of 1998. I would like say a special word of appreciation to Dr. Robert Seiple, the former head of World Vision, who is here with us today. He is not America's Ambassador at Large for International Religious Freedom. Later this month, I will appoint three members to the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom. The Congress has already nominated its' members.

We know that is a part of it. But, respectfully, I would suggest it is not enough. As we pray for peace, as well listen to what Max said, we say, well, of course it is God's will. But the truth is, throughout history, people have prayed to God to aid them in war. People have claimed repeatedly that it was God's will that they prevail in conflict. Christians have done it at least since the time of the crusades. Jews have done it since the times of the Old Testament. Muslims have done it from the time of the Essenes down to the present day. No faith is blameless in saying that they have taken up arms against other faiths, other races, because it was God's will that they do so. Nearly everybody would agree that from time to time, that happens over the long course of history. I do believe that, even though Adolf Hitler preached a perverted form of Christianity, God did not want him to prevail. But I also know that when we take up arms or words against one another, we must be very careful in invoking the name of our Lord.

Abraham Lincoln once said that in the great Civil War neither side wanted war and both sides prayed to the same God; but one side would make war rather than stay in the union, and the other side would accept war rather than let it be rent asunder, so the war came. In other words, our great president understood that the Almighty has his own designs and all we can do is pray to know God's will.

What does that have to do with us? Martin Luther King once said we had to be careful taking vengeance in the name of God, because the old law of ''an eye for an eye leaves everybody blind.''

And so today, in the spirit in which we have been truly ministered to today, I ask you to pray for peace in the Middle East, in Bosnia and Kosovo; in Northern Ireland, where there are new difficulties. I ask you to pray that the young leaders of Ethiopia and Eritrea will find a way to avoid war. I ask you to pray for a resolution of the conflicts between India and Pakistan. I ask you to pray for the success of the peace process in Colombia, for the agreement made by the leaders of Ecuador and Peru, for the ongoing struggles to make the peace process work in Guatemala.

I ask you to pray for peace. I ask you to pray for the peacemakers; for the Prime Minister of Albania; for the Prime Minister of Macedonia; who are here. Their region is deeply troubled. I ask you to pray for Chairman Arafat and the Palestinians; for the government of Israel; for Mrs. Leah Rabin and her children, who are here, for the awful price they have paid in the loss of Prime Minister Rabin for the cause of peace. I ask you to pray for King Hussein, a wonderful human being, the champion of peace who, I promise you today, is fighting for his life mostly so he can continue to fight for peace.

Finally, I ask you to pray for all of us, including yourself; to pray that our purpose

truly will reflect God's will; to pray that we can all be purged of the temptation to pretend that our willfulness is somehow equal to God's will; to remember that all the great peacemakers in the world in the end have to let go and walk away, like Christ, not from apparent but from genuine grievances. If Nelson Mandela can walk away from 28 years of oppression in a little prison cell, we can walk away from whatever is bothering us. If Leah Rabin and her family can continue their struggle for peace after the Prime Minister's assassination, then we can continue to believe in our better selves.

I remember on September the 19th, 1993, when the leaders of Israel and the Palestinian Authority gather in Washington to sign the peace accord, the great question arose about whether, in front of a billion people on international television, for the very first time, Chairman Arafat and Prime Minister Rabin would shake hands.

Now this may seem like a little thing to you. But Yitzhak Rabin and I were sitting in my office talking, and he said: ''You know, Mr. President, I have been fighting this man for 30 years. I have buried a lot of people. This is difficult.'' And I started to make an argument, and before I could say anything, he said, ''But you do not make peace with your friends.'' And so the handshake occurred that was seen around the world.

A little while afterward, after some time passed, they came back to Washington. And they were going to sign these agreements about what the details were of handing over Gaza and parts of the West Bank. On this second signing, the two of them had to sign three copies of these huge maps, books of maps. There were 27 maps. There were literally thousands of markings on these maps, on each page: ''What would happen at every little cross road? Who would be in charge? Who would do this, who would do that, who would do the other thing?'' Right before the ceremony there was a hitch, and some jurisdictional issue was not resolved. Everybody was going around in a tizzy. I opened the door to the little back room, where the Vice President and I have lunch once a week. I said to these two people, who shook hands for the first time not so long ago: ''Why don't you guys go in this room and work this out? This is not a big deal.'' Thirty minutes later, they came out. No one else was in there. They worked it out; they signed the copies three times, 27 pieces each, each page they were signing. And it was over.

You do not make peace with your friends, but friendship can come, with time and trust and humility, when we do not pretend that our willfulness is an expression of God's will.

I do not know how to put this into words. A friend of mine last week sent me a little story out of Mother Teresa's life. she was asked, ''When you pray, what do you say to God?'' And she said, ''I don't say anything; I listen.'' And then she was asked, ''Well, when you listen, what does God say to you?'' And she said, ''He doesn't say anything either; he listens.'' (Soft laughter.)

In another way, Saint Paul said the same thing. ''We do not know how to pray as we ought, but the Spirit himself intercedes for us, with sighs too deep for words.''

So I ask you to reflect on all we have seen and heard and felt today. I ask you to pray for peace, for the peacemakers, and for peace within each of our hearts—in silence.

(Moment of silence.) Amen.

(Applause.)

Representative LARGENT. Thank you, Mr. President, for your remarks. You have asked us to pray for the leaders of the world and for leadership in the world. And at this time, I would like to ask my friend, Representative Harold Ford, to come forward to pray for world leaders.

Representative FORD. Thank you, Steve.

We pray, God, that you will help us to understand what the book of Ephesians means when it says, ''We wrestle not against flesh and blood but against principalities and powers.'' We pray that we may heed the ancient summons, pray as if everything depended on God and act as if everything depended on you. Whether we worship in the shadow of the cross, under the Star of David or the crescent of Islam, it is in this spirit that we gather and in this spirit that we pray. We pray that God be above us to protect, beneath us to uphold, before us to guide and around us to comfort. We offer these prayers in the name of one God of all humanity. Let all of God's children say amen. (Applause.)

Representative LARGENT. Thank you, Harold. One of the real mysteries of the power of Jesus is that, Mr. President, as you said, I may not have voted with you in the four years that I have been in Congress, but I want you to know that I care for you and love you. That is part of the mystery of Jesus and the celebration that we have here this morning as we come to pray for our leaders and for our world.

At this time I would like to ask Senator Lieberman to come forward and lead us in our benediction. (Applause.)

Senator LIEBERMAN. Thank you. Let us pray.

I pray, Lord, that you will open my lips, that I may declare your praise. We love you, Lord, because we come before you with a perfect faith that you will hear our prayer. And we have that faith not because of our confidence in our righteousness but because of our trust in your mercy.

Lord, thank you for waking us up this morning, restoring our souls to our bodies, bringing us to this place, enabling us to have this extraordinary experience. We have come along many paths to this place, but the destination we seek is a unified one, Lord, and it is you. You are the source of our lives, of our principles, of our purpose. We thank you for all that you have done for us. And as the President said so beautifully and compellingly and truthfully, for reasons that only impress us withour imperfection, so often our attempts to reach you have divided us.

But today, the spirit in this room is yours; in the Hebrew, Shekinah, the spirit of God, is here and it brings us together in a characteristically American way, in a way that the founders of this country understood, and they expressed in the very first paragraph by which they declared their independence that they held certain truths to be self-evident and that the first of these was that the rights they were granting us came from you; they were not the work of philosophers or lawyers or politicians, but were the endowment we received from you, our creator.

Lord, we thank you for the leaders who are here, the speakers who are here who have shared their faith with us. We ask your prayers, especially on the leaders of our country, the President and Vice President and their devoted and gifted wives. We pray particularly today for the President of the United States. We thank you for the gifts you have given him of intellect, of judgment, of compassion, of communication, that have enabled him to be such a successful leader of our country and have raised up so many people in this country to a better life and have brought him to a point where people around the world depend on him, put their hopes in him.

And Lord, may I say a special prayer at this time of difficulty for our President, that you hear his prayers, that you help him in the work he is doing with his family and his clergy, that you accept his atonement in the spirit in which David spoke to the prophet and said, ''I am distressed. Let me put my faith not in human hands but in the hands of God, who is full of abundant mercy.''

So, Lord, we pray that you will not only restore his soul and lead him in the paths of righteousness for your name's sake, but help us join with him to heal the breach, begin the reconciliation and restore our national soul so that we may go forward together to make this great country even greater and better.

And I pray, Lord, too, for all the leaders from around the world who are here. And in the spirit the president himself invoked, I want to reach out particularly to Chairman Arafat and Abu Mazin and Leah Rabin and her children, and to do so in the spirit of unity that fills this room, but also in the recollection and remembrance of the truth, that Abraham, with whom you entered the covenant that gave birth to at least three of the great religions that are here today, that Abraham loved his son Ishmael as he did his son Isaac. And we pray that you will bring that truth to Chairman Arafat and the leaders of Israel and you will guide them in the paths of peace so that their children and grandchildren may truly one day not just live in peace but sit together, as Dr. King evoked in all of us, at the table of brotherhood and sisterhood.

So, Lord, as we leave this place, we pray that you will take us by the hand and lead us home, but let us not leave here the spirit of unity and purpose that has filled this room. Let us resolve, each of us in our own way, to work to honor your name, to bring us closer each day to the realization of the prophet's vision, ''when the valleys will be exalted and the hills and mountains made low, when the rough spots will be made straight and the glory of the Lord will fill the earth, and all flesh will see it and experience it.'' On that day, Lord, your name will truly be one and your children will be one.

Amen. (Applause.)

Representative LARGENT. Thank you, Senator Lieberman.

Ladies and gentlemen, this concludes the 47th National Prayer Breakfast.

Thank you all for being with us here this morning. Let's leave today and live out the principles Jesus taught about loving one another, loving our God with all our heart, soul and mind. Thank you, and have a good morning.

## A PROCLAMATION RECOGNIZING MARTINS FERRY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE 100TH ANNIVERSARY

### HON. ROBERT W. NEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I commend the following article to my colleagues with great pride and satisfaction:

Whereas, The Martins Ferry Chamber of Commerce is this year celebrating their 100th Anniversary as they have been committed to servicing their community since its inception in 1901; and,

Whereas, with a deep and abiding concern for the well being of all members of the community, have given generously of their time, talents and energy to make Martins Ferry a better place to live; and,

I invite my colleagues to join with me and the citizens of Ohio in celebration and commemoration of Martins Ferry Chamber of Commerce's one hundred years of dedication to the people and businesses of their community.

## IN HONOR OF RITA C. SEVERIS, AUTHOR OF TRAVELLING ARTISTS IN CYPRUS 1700–1960

### HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Ms. Rita C. Severis, a distinguished art historian whose recently published book, Travelling Artists in Cyprus 1700–1960, offers a pioneer study of the island of Cyprus through the visions of more than 120 artists over three centuries.

Ms. Severis will be honored on the evening of April 24, 2001, by Cyprus's Consulate General to the United States, Mr. Vasilis Philippou, at a book signing presentation at the Consulate General's office in my district in New York.

A student of philosophy and journalism at University College, London and the London School of Journalism, Ms. Severis received her doctorate in the History of Art from Bristol University.

Ms. Severis is an accomplished author and journalist whose previous books include Along the Most Beautiful Path of the World, Edmund Duthoit and Cyprus, and the co-edited In the Footsteps of Women Peregrinations in Cyprus. Ms. Severis has contributed articles to various periodicals on Cypriot culture and is now working on a publication exploring an American missionary's diary in Cyprus (1834–39).

Ms. Severis carefully selected 350 compositions, from pencil and ink to pastel, lithographs, and watercolors and oil on paper, canvas, board, and wood, for Travelling Artists in Cyprus 1700–1960. The collection elegantly presents the beauty and majesty of Cyprus, with its diverse historic periods, august monuments, and magnificent natural landscapes.

Through this publication, Rita Severis has provided a work of great significance in the field of art history, while contributing to the cultural fabric of Cyprus.

Mr. Speaker, I salute Ms. Rita C. Severis for her admirable contribution to art history and to the people of Cyprus through her publication, Travelling Artists in Cyprus 1700–1960.

## A PROCLAMATION RECOGNIZING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SALVATION ARMY CAMBRIDGE, OHIO

### HON. ROBERT W. NEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I commend the following article to my colleagues with great pride and satisfaction:

Whereas, The Cambridge Salvation Army is celebrating their 100th year of dedicated service to the grateful people of Ohio; and,

Whereas, they have humbly and faithfully provided invaluable services to those less fortunate, embodying the true spirit of William Booth, the founder of the Salvation Army; and

Whereas, their success has been made possible only through the generosity of spirit that prods one to give generously to their neighbor; and,

I invite my colleagues to join with me and the citizens of Ohio in celebration and commemoration of the Cambridge Salvation Army's generous gift of one hundred years of service to the people of this city.

## HONORING DR. DEANE AND SUSAN PENN

### HON. STEVEN R. ROTHMAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a couple who have been great friends to the Jewish community of Bergen County, New Jersey, as well as personal friends of mine for many years. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Dr. Deane and Susan Penn of Alpine, New Jersey, this year's winners of the Anti-Defamation League's Torch of Liberty Award.

Those who are fortunate enough to know Susan and Deane know the depth of their dedication to the community and helping others. I would like to discuss some of their many contributions to the community.

Susan Penn brings a combination of warmth, intelligence, and drive to every project she undertakes; and their are many. She is a Vice President of the UJA Federation of Bergen County & North Hudson, and holds a number of other positions within the Federation. Susan is also deeply committed to the JCC on the Palisades, and is a member of its Board of Trustees, She has also held leadership positions in secular and Jewish educational institutes as well as community groups, too numerous to mention.

Dr. Deane Penn is a highly respected physician who has served as the President of the medical staff at Holy Name Hospital in Teaneck, New Jersey. Yet his thriving medical career has never stopped him from devoting his considerable talents to working in our community. He is a Trustee of the Jewish Home in Rockleigh, New Jersey and is a member of the Physician's Cabinet of the UJA Federation.

The Penns are also both avid tennis players and competitors. And they are sharing their love of that sport, and the Jewish people, by co-chairing the National Masters Tennis Team for the 16th World Maccabiah Games in Israel.

People who give so much of themselves as Dr. Deane and Susan Penn do not do so for the recognition. However, they certainly deserve to receive it.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to congratulate Dr. Deane and Susan Penn as well as their children Jonathan and Stacey on the occasion of this well deserved tribute from the Anti-Defamation League, and wish them health and happiness in the years to come.

## SMALL BUSINESS INTEREST CHECKING ACT OF 2001

SPEECH OF

### HON. MICHAEL G. OXLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 3, 2001*

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that some language intended to be included in the report to accompany H.R. 974, the Small Business Interest Checking Act of 2001 (H. Rept. 107–38) was inadvertently omitted when the report was filed. The paragraph beginning on page 19 and ending on page 20 of that report, explaining section 7 of the legislation, should read as follows:

This section provides that nothing in the bill is to be construed as creating any presumption or implication that, in the case of an escrow account maintained at a depository institution in connection with a real estate transaction, the absorption of expenses incidental to a normal banking function, or the forbearance of any fee in connection with the same, or the receipt of any benefits thereof by the holder or the beneficiary of that escrow account, may be treated as the payment or receipt of interest for purposes of Public Law 93–100, the Federal Reserve Act, the Home Owner's Loan Act, or the Federal Deposit Insurance Act. The Committee intends that this provision clarify that the current treatment of such transactions under Federal law and regulation, particularly the regulations of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve DD and Q, is unaffected by this legislation. Current law does not treat the provision of the services and benefits described by this section as the payment or receipt of interest to or by the holder or beneficiary of an escrow account, and that presumption will remain the law upon the enactment of this bill.

This language clarifies the intent of the Committee with respect to this provision, and corrects the omission in the printed report.

## REGARDING HUMAN RIGHTS IN CUBA

### HON. JOE SCARBOROUGH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mr. SCARBOROUGH. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in condemning the repressive and totalitarian actions of the government of Cuba against the Cuban people. I fully support H. Res. 91 and join with the sense of the House of Representatives that the President should work toward a policy of directly assisting the Cuban people, strengthening the forces of change, and improving human rights within Cuba.

Since Fidel Castro led the Cuban Revolution in 1959, the Cuban government has severely repressed its citizens. Cuba barely survives as one of the last hard-line Communist states anywhere in the world, and unfortunately continues its abysmal human rights record to this day. Following the Soviet Union's collapse and the decline of its role as Soviet satellite, Cuba experienced severe economic deterioration from 1989 to 1993. Despite limited reforms implemented in 1994, economic and social conditions there have not significantly improved. We must press for more.

The Castro regime violates all the Cuban people's fundamental civil and political rights, denying its citizens the freedoms we Americans hold most sacred. In Cuba, there is no such thing as freedom of assembly, freedom of press, freedom of speech, or freedom of religion. In law and in practice, the Castro regime suppresses all opposition and dissent, and controls and monitors religions institutions. In addition, Cuba's government regularly denies workers' rights and routinely prevents

international human rights monitors from accessing the country.

The United States' objective for Cuba is to bring democracy and respect for human rights to our island neighbor. We must continue a policy that keeps maximum pressure on the Cuban government until reforms are enacted, but we must not forget the Cuban people who are unconscionably forced to live without the most basic freedoms. Nobody deserves to live and die at the hands of communism. Fortunately, through our persistence and steadfast knowledge that the United States is morally right, Mr. Speaker, I assure you ultimately freedom will prevail.

## A PROCLAMATION RECOGNIZING DAVID M. BLAGG

### HON. ROBERT W. NEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I commend the following article to my colleagues:

Whereas, David Blagg is the recipient of the distinct honor of promotion in the United States Army; and,

Whereas, David Blagg's dedication to the United States Armed services is recognized in his advancement from Sergeant to Staff Sergeant; and

Whereas, David Blagg's distinguished career began three years ago as Private First Class of Fort Bragg, N.C. and now holds a position at the White House Communications Agency in Washington, DC; and,

Whereas, on Thursday, April 5, 2001, the Honorable David L. Hobson of the great state of Ohio will promote Sergeant Blagg to the rank of Staff Sergeant; and

Whereas, the citizens of the United States and the citizens of Ohio, with a real sense of pleasure, join me in congratulating Staff Sergeant David Blagg on this proud day of recognition.

## IN HONOR OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY JUNIOR LEAGUE MOVEMENT

### HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Junior League on the occasion of its 100th Anniversary. This year, nearly 200,000 Junior League women are celebrating 100 years of volunteer community service. With a century of action for family literacy, senior citizen care, battered women's shelters, affordable day care, AIDS education, pregnancy prevention and multicultural awareness to their credit, the members of Junior Leagues in 295 communities in four countries have much to celebrate.

The Junior League reached its centennial milestone this year with a phenomenal legacy of achievement in local communities. In 1901, Barnard College student Mary Harriman established the Junior League ''to foster among its members the interest in undertakings for the betterment of the social, economic and educational conditions in the City of New York.'' Mary Harriman's idea—that a group of women could be a powerful force for change—has resonated throughout this century. What began with 80 young women traveling to Manhattan's Lower East Side to volunteer at a settlement house, has blossomed into a growing movement of trained volunteers improving their communities through direct service, public education, advocacy, fundraising and sheer hard work.

Individual Junior Leagues contribute mightily to their local communities. Aspects of our social, cultural and political fabric that we take for granted—free school lunches, children's theatre and museums, domestic violence legislation, volunteer bureaus, quality TV programming for children—are among the innovations led by the Junior League.

Today, Leagues work with babies with HIV, abused children and the homeless and serve as mentors to young women and girls. They initiate and staff childcare centers, fund breast cancer research and protect the environment. In short, the Junior League can be credited with implementing change and improving conditions in almost every sector. In recognition of decades of these sustained contributions, in 1989, the Association of Junior Leagues International (AJLI) was presented with the prestigious U.S. President's Volunteer Action Award.

In 1901, membership in the Junior League gave women a rare opportunity to take a leadership role in the wider world. Today, even with increased professional opportunities for women, the Junior League continues to offer women a unique and powerful way to make a difference, take risks and become community leaders. In spite of the fact that two-thirds of the members are working women, they still commit their valuable time to serving their communities through the Junior League.

It is no great surprise that 46 percent of Junior League members are ''Roper Influentials''—political and social trendsetters who influence their friends and acquaintances on an impressive array of topics such as computers, investment ideas, health issues, politics, cars and children.

With nearly a century of service to its credit, the Junior League is an icon in the fabric of community life in the United States, Canada, Mexico and Great Britain. The women leaders of the Junior League are a powerful force, offering professional experience and vital support to the volunteer sector. I am proud of my own membership in the Junior League and can personally attest to the dedication of the women who give their time and expertise to the Junior League.

The Junior Leagues' Centennial celebration will last all year long, with a special international celebration in New York City at the League's 2001 Annual Conference, Wednesday, April 25 through Sunday, April 29, 2001.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to congratulate the New York Junior League on its 100th Anniversary and I wish them many more years of successful service to their communities.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. PATRICK J. KENNEDY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, on April 4, 2001, I was in the First District of Rhode Island and consequently I missed six votes.

Had I been here I would of voted: ''Yea'' on rollcall No. 79; ''Yea'' on rollcall No. 80; ''Yea'' on rollcall No. 81; ''Yea'' on rollcall No. 82; ''Yea'' on rollcall No. 83; ''No'' on rollcall No. 84.

## TEMPLE UNIVERSITY DENTAL CLASS OF 1951 CELEBRATES 50TH ANNIVERSARY

### HON. PAUL E. KANJORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Class of 1951 of the Dental School of Temple University, which will hold a reunion and celebration on may 5 and 6 in Philadelphia at Sugarloaf, the university's conference center.

When this class, which I am proud to say includes my cousin, Dr. Ray Chase, enrolled in 1947, a unique group of young men entered into the annals of history. Ninety-seven percent of these students served their country in various branches of the armed services during World War II, and all members of the class in their combined years in the practice of dentistry served in caring for the health of their respective communities throughout the United States.

During their time at Temple, a distinct feeling of camaraderie was felt among the whole class. The students came to one another's assistance not only in the seriousness of their studies, but also in the lighter pursuits. For two years, the class assembled its talent for an annual vaudeville performance complete with dancers, singers, instrumentalists and stand-up comedians. That was entirely new to the dental school and was a resounding success.

That class spirit has continued over the fifty years since, and get-togethers, newsletters and numerous phone calls have kept these men close and have developed among them some of their dearest friends. I would now like to read into the record the names of these distinguished men:

Robert H. Alber, John R. Albert, John C. Andrews, Irving Archinow, Robert J. Arner, Alberto E. Ayes, John A. Babett, Matthew F. Barnett, Claude M. Basler, Jr., Bernard M. Blaum, Joseph M. Blessing, Jr., Howard L. Britton, Jr., Elmer H. Brown, Jr., Ralph Buterbaugh, Jr., Charles E. Carey, Edward J. Carolan, Robert J. Clauser, Cecil F. Clement, Jr., Simon G. Coben, Joseph Cohen, Walter M. Culbert;

Raymond F. Chase, Eugene S. Czarnecki, Anthony T. D'Agostino, John A. D'Alessandro, Thomas L. Davis, Hugh V. Day, Melvin Denholtz, Stanley B. Dietz, Joseph E. Donnelly, Louis L. Dublin, John H. Eck, Arthur R. Erlacher, Stephen R. Falken, Theodore Feldman, Edward F. Flood, David E. Fox, Irvin R. Friedman, Richard B. Funk,

Leonard F. Giordano, William L. Glickman, Fred Goldman, Spurgeon T. Gotwalt, John D.G. Grant;

Barton H. Greenberg, Shelly M. Greene, Lewis G. Gunn, William C. Haberstroh, Joseph F. Hacker, Jr., Robert W. Hemperly, Dallas C. Hess, Garth N. Huckins, Theodore F. Jarvis, Irving Kanefsky, Chester L. Karwanski, William Kasler, Eugene E. Katz, Frank J. Keating, Martin H. Kiefer, David Klebanoff, Milton Klempart, William J. Klink, Bertnard Kreshtool, Aaron Kuby, Theodore Kurta, Frank H. Laedlein, Albert V. LaRocca, Leroy P. Leahy, Charles J. Lentz, Joel G. Lippe, Marshall K. Ludwig, John H. McCutcheon, Walter E. Magann;

Herman D. Marggraff, C. Robert Martin, Paul D. Mattern, Perry M. Matz, Jack B. Metzger, Harry Mildvan, Frederick J. Monaghan, Sylvan Morein, Robert D. Moyer, Charles A. Nagle, Jr., John H. Nelson, Samuel S. Novich, Edward J. O'Donnell, Sidney B. Parmet, Samuel J. Paul, Daniel E. Pfeil, Richard Pitel, Erwin P. Plotnick, Irwin J. Plotnick, Arthur J. Ravage, Edward F. Reichert, Richard E. Reut, George Richterman, Charles W. Riley, Carmen Riviello, Vincent J. Roach, Homer G. Robinson, Richard A. Ross, John A. Rusch, Baxter B. Sapp, Jr.;

Bernard Sarnow, Harry L. Schiff, Burton Schwartz, Samuel J. Schwartz, Lambert Seltzer, George M. Shopp, Daniel H. Shuck, Joseph P. Skellchock, H. Norris Smith, Thomas J. Smith, Joseph A. Solecki, Jr., Stephen S. Soltis, Gilbert A. Stegelske, Frank D. Summers, Gerald O. Sveen, Earl R. Thomas, Jr., David N. Thompson, James A. Turner, Edward A. Walinchus, John W. Weaver, William C.V. Wells, Jr., Fritz D. Yealy, Donald W. Zahnke, John E. Zerbe, and Louis Zislis.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of the House of Representatives the 50th anniversary of the Class of 1951 of the Dental School of Temple University, and I wish them all the best.

## DEATH TAX ELIMINATION ACT OF 2001

SPEECH OF

### HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, April 4, 2001*

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose today's bill, which is a clumsy attempt to implement a bad idea. Complete repeal of the estate tax—a tax that by 2005 will affect only the wealthiest 1% of all decedents in the United States—is a bad idea. It marks a major step away from tax fairness, and greatly undermines our ability to address pressing federal needs. The clumsiness comes in the Republicans' attempt to hide the true costs of estate tax repeal, as well as their efforts to limit these costs through a complicated capital gains tax scheme.

As a result, not only do those who believe in tax fairness and fiscal responsibility have good reason to strongly oppose this bill, but even those who believe in estate tax repeal have grounds to reject this plan. We can make the estate tax more fair by immediately raising the exclusion limits on estates. But to repeal the tax altogether would be tremendously unfair to the 99% of Americans who will shoulder the costs.

A BETTER WAY TO REFORM THE ESTATE TAX

As a small business advocate, I have long supported proposals to raise the exclusion limits on estates subject to taxation. A very small number of family businesses and farms (just 4% of estate tax revenues come from small businesses, and just ¼ of 1% come from family farms) currently face onerous tax burdens as a result of the estate tax. While their numbers are small, these ''middle class'' family businesses and farms deserve relief from the estate tax.

And in fact, we have already made considerable progress in this effort: under current law, only the wealthiest 1% of estates will face any tax whatsoever by 2005. Under the Democratic alternative to today's bill, just 0.5% of all decedents would be subject to the tax. This 0.5% of estates would be composed exclusively of the very, very wealthy.

ESTATE TAX REPEAL IS UNFAIR

When fully implemented, the Republican plan to repeal the estate tax would provide $662 billion of tax relief to the wealthiest 1% of Americans. By any measure, that's a lot of money. But to put it in some perspective, consider how this tax cut compares to some of the Administration's spending priorities. The President has made education funding his to budget priority, yet provides only $41 billion in new funding over the next decade for education programs—and even that amount is inflated (unspecified targeted cuts in some education programs will reduce this gross figure). At the same time, the President has called for a new prescription drug benefit for seniors, but has allocated just $110 billion over ten years for it, far below any reasonable estimate of the program's true cost. In both cases, the President has devoted far more lip service than dollars to pressing national needs. Importantly, both priorities could be fully funded with the revenues lost to estate tax repeal.

It is rarely popular to promote the virtues of any tax. Nonetheless, that is just what some of the nation's wealthiest individuals effectively did recently in publicly opposing estate tax repeal. The likes of Bill Gates, Warren Buffet, and George Soros worry about the effects of repeal, arguing that the repeal will discourage and virtually eliminate substantial amounts of charitable giving, an will exacerbate the concentration of our nation's wealth in the hands of just a few families.

Concern about the concentration of wealth is particularly appropriate in recent years. Over the past decade, after-tax income for the wealthiest 1% of Americans grew by a stunning 40%, while after-tax income gains for the bottom 90% averaged just 5%. In the face of this growing income disparity, we are about to further advantage the wealthiest 1% with a $660 billion estate tax bonus. Today's bill is by far the most unfair and regressive element of the aggregate Republican tax package. but it is important to note that 40% of American families—those earning less than $27,000—will receive virtually no benefit at all from any of the Republican tax cuts, whether rate reductions, so-called marriage penalty relief, or expansion of the child tax credit.

These families are excluded from the Republican plan, not because the don't pay any taxes; in fact, all of them pay substantial federal taxes through the payroll tax, and for many, these taxes are onerous. These taxpaying families are excluded from the Republican's tax relief simply because the Republicans chose to aware the lion's share of tax relief to the very wealth. Yet, the 40% of families excluded from the Republican plan are the same taxpayers whose incomes have barely registered a gain in the midst of a decade-long economic expansion. Again, they—40% of all American families, those at the bottom—get nothing.

A CLUMSY ATTEMPT TO LIMIT REVENUE LOSSES

The Republicans faced a funding dilemma in crafting this legislation—they have already promised too much tax relief to wealthy Americans in other tax bills and have run out of room in their own budget to pay for estate tax repeal. As a result, they have resorted to a scheme that hides the true costs of repeal, while also attempting to recover some of the revenue losses through new capital gains taxes.

The drafters of this bill have back loaded its costs so that the true cost of repeal falls outside the 10-year budgetary window. They accomplish this by phasing in repeal at a snail's pace through 2011, and then quickly implementing complete repeal in the following year. As a result, the cost of this bill through 2011 is $193 billion; yet, if it were implemented immediately, the cost would skyrocket to $662 billion. Due to backloading, the same family businesses and farms that would benefit almost immediately from the Democratic plan to raise estate exclusion limits would continue to pay substantial estate taxes for the next ten years under the Republican plan.

But even cost backloading was not enough to limit the 10-year revenue losses from the Republican bill. In order to find more cost savings, the bill's drafters decided to shift the capital gains treatment of taxable estates from a ''stepped up'' basis to a ''carryover'' basis. Under current law, heirs are subject to capital gains taxes on estate assets sold based on the value of these assets when they were transferred from the decedent (''stepped up'' basis). Under this bill, heirs would be subject to capital gains taxes based on the value of these assets when they were purchased by the decedent (''carryover'' basis). The fatal flaw of this change lies in its complexity. In 1976, Congress passed legislation shifting from a stepped up basis to a carryover basis on estate assets, but the plan was abandoned before it could take effect. Congress repealed the 1976 tax change in 1980 after realizing that the change was unworkable and would impose an unacceptably large administrative burden on estate planners, heirs, and the Treasury Department.

There is a way out of this mess for the Republicans. They should adopt the Democratic alternative, which immediately raises the exclusion for estates to $2 million ($4 million per couple). By 2010, these exclusions would rise to $2.5 million ($5 million per couple). Such changes would appropriately target the estate tax to very wealthy estates and would do so almost immediately, not ten years from now. Raising exclusion limits would retain the core progressivity of our tax code while limiting revenue losses.

## SALUTING MT. WHITNEY HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

### HON. WILLIAM M. THOMAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to honor three students,

Zach Vanderham, Jessica Parks, and Darren Mann, who are seniors at Mt. Whitney High School in Visalia, California in my district. These three young people have developed an anti-smoking program aimed at their peers that I hope will serve as a model for other schools throughout the country. They have created a CD ROM titled ''Teens Kick Ash'' that explains the dangers of smoking in a manner to which other young people can relate and understand.

As part of a competition organized by a national student marketing organization, Zach, Jessica, and Darren developed this CD in order to dissuade their fellow students from taking up this destructive, dangerous habit. Their project has proven so effective that the CD's have been distributed to dozens of other schools in the Visalia Unified School District, which have incorporated the project into their curriculum. Mr. Speaker, all Americans now know the dangers that smoking presents, and realize that we must do more to prevent our young people from starting this destructive habit. I am very pleased that these three students from Tulare County, California have had the good sense and initiative to educate their peers on smoking's dangers and to do their part to keep the next generation of Tulare County citizens from starting to smoke.

I have an article from the Visalia Times Delta newspaper that I ask unanimous consent be included in the RECORD in its entirety.

STUDENTS DESCRIBE SMOKING DANGERS

LA JOYA SHOWS PROJECT CREATED BY THREE MT. WHITNEY DECA STUDENTS

(By Melinda Morales)

Twenty three seventh-grade students sat in the dark in Dave Rodgers' health class at La Joya Middle School Tuesday, waiting not for the lights to come on but for the show to begin.

They would be the first group of students to view a CD–ROM production called ''Anti Tobacco Education 2000, Teens Kick Ash,'' created by three Mt. Whitney High School students.

The students, members of DECA—an association of marketing students—had taken on the job of creating the CD–ROM as part of a marketing project for the annual DECA competition in Jan Jose next month. They wanted to see how other students would react to what they saw.

''We felt smoking was a big problem in our community and we wanted to produce a CD about it,'' said Zach Vanderham, a senior and DECA member. ''They seemed to really enjoy it.''

What captivated the students were the video vignettes, produced by drama students at Mt. Whitney, interspersed throughout the disc. One that got a reaction from the class showed students coughing and choking as they smoked for the first time and asked why anyone would want to continue smoking after that kind of reaction.

The CD–ROM presentation is the first of its kind, produced by students in the Visalia Unified School District. Rodgers, a health education specialist, said getting information to students in the middle schools is a priority for him.

''Any opportunity I get to have someone come in from the outside and talk to my students about drugs and the dangers they present, I jump on it,'' he said. When they get to high school, sometimes it's too late.''

He said the combined video and audio presentation in CD form, organized format and worksheet for the lesson are easy to use.

''We try to incorporate technology as much as possible,'' Rodgers said. ''And kids like visuals.''

Beatrice Mejia, 12, said the facts and grim photos on the effects of chewing tobacco made an impression on her.

''I didn't know that the tobacco could do so much damage,'' she said.

The project was the brainchild of Mt. Whitney DECA adviser Stephen Rogers, who worked with the Tulare County Health and Human Services Agency to get the money for the project.

''We got a $5,000 grant to buy the equipment for the project,'' Rogers said. He made arrangements with a production company in Los Angeles to show his students how to use the equipment and create their own story. Then he let them go.

''They really did it all themselves,'' he said. The grant enabled them to buy the equipment and produce 350 copies of the disc that will be used in schools throughout the district.

The grant came from the state's Tobacco Use Prevention Education fund which is to be used strictly for educating kids about the dangers of tobacco. Lucinda Mejdell-Awbrey, coordinator of student support services for health and human services, said the tobacco education money was used last year to put on health fairs in the middle schools in the district.

''The money comes from the tax on tobacco sales, and the amounts have been dropping each year because tobacco sales are going down,'' Mejdell-Awbrey said. Most of the money is used to purchase educational materials for health teachers of fourth- through eighth grades.

Jessica Parks, a junior, helped Vanderham lead the presentation to the class, guided the students through the worksheets and answered questions. Darren Mann, senior, operated the computer and navigated the course for Parks and Vanderham. He also did much of the hands-on computer work for the project.

The three students, who began working on the project in November, will now complete the written requirements for the presentation and submit it for the competition in March.

## CONGRATULATIONS TO ST. FRANCIS HOSPITAL ON 45 YEARS OF SERVING OUR COMMUNITY

### HON. GERALD D. KLECZKA

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, April 28, 2001 the Milwaukee community will gather to celebrate the 45th Anniversary of St. Francis Hospital.

The blessed Felician Sisters opened the doors to this beautiful new facility in 1956, and with the leadership of its first administrator, Sister Mary Liliose, started to minister quality and compassionate health care to those in need.

In the years that have followed, St. Francis Hospital has grown and matured, combining a patient-centered, healing ministry with the latest in advanced technology. Today, the facility offers an array of services, specializing in areas such as laser/laparoscopic surgery, orthopedics, sports medicine and women's health services. In addition, this 260 bed, general acute care hospital is internationally recognized for its outstanding cardiac care programs.

Now a St. Francis Hospital Center for Cancer Care is currently being constructed in Franklin, Wisconsin, to provide comprehensive services to cancer patients throughout southeastern Wisconsin. The facility has been designed with input from cancer survivors and will provide a healing environment to attend to the unique medical and spiritual needs of cancer patients and their families.

A large part of what makes St. Francis Hospital such a special place is its strong commitment to building a healthier community. From its free health care screenings for seniors to its Angel of Hope Clinic located in a homeless shelter on Milwaukee's south side, the staff of St. Francis consistently serves with great care and compassion.

On behalf of all the people whose lives have been touched by the Felician Sisters and the physicians, nurses and support staff at St. Francis Hospital, thank you for 45 years of outstanding care to the community, and God's blessings for many more years of exceptional service to the people of Wisconsin.

## IN RECOGNITION OF JUAN NEKAI BABAUTA AND HIS WORK WITH THE CLOSE UP FOUNDATION

### HON. ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity today to recognize my friend Juan Nekai Babauta, the Resident Representative to the United States from the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI), for his efforts on behalf of the Close Up Foundation. I particularly commend Mr. Babauta for his continued commitment to the issue of civic education for young people and especially for his diligent work with the Close Up Foundation, the nation's largest nonprofit, nonpartisan citizenship education organization.

Mr. Speaker, as many of my colleagues know, the CNMI became a territory of the United States and an American commonwealth in 1976. Since then the citizens of the CNMI, with whom my constituency, the people of Guam, share indigenous identity and Chamorro heritage, have elected a Resident Representative to serve them in the Nation's capital. To date the CNMI is the only American jurisdiction that has not been afforded representation in Congress, thus I often feel compelled to offer remarks here in the House for Guam's Pacific neighbors.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, many of the islands of Oceania face daunting challenges in the area of economic stability and growth. Their relatively limited size, small population and extended distance from major markets, makes building a strong and sustainable economy among the most difficult tasks facing contemporary government. With the competing needs of various sectors of society, the government is forced to make tough choices. Roads must be maintained and airports must be modernized, hospitals must be improved and schools must be expanded and repaired, health care must be available to all and social safety nets must be in place for the neediest citizens. Pressing demands on an island's resources must be balanced with an eye towards meeting the needs of the day, while not ignoring future needs. Public servants like Juan Nekai Babauta make invaluable contributions to the extremely difficult balancing act

between available resources and societal needs.

All of the islands of the Pacific are also confronting numerous problems when it comes to their youth. In CNMI, as is also the case in Guam, the government must find ways to combat apathy and cynicism among their young people. There is a constant concern with ensuring that young people will enter adulthood committed to being active, contributing citizens of their communities. For public servants like Juan Nekai Babauta, there is a recognition that preparing the next generation of leaders is a priority for the future welfare of the islands. Throughout his years of service, Mr. Babauta has been a champion for education and a strong advocate for young people. As the Resident Representative for CNMI, he has aggressively and successfully lobbied this Congress to provide $3 million in federal funds for an endowment at the Northern Marianas College. He also achieved success in his attempt to open admission to our U.S. service academies to CNMI students. These and other pursuits demonstrate Mr. Babauta's effectiveness and his work on behalf of his constituency.

Throughout his career, Mr. Babauta has recognized that preparing the next generation of leaders must include preparation through a focus on civic education. His commitment to this end is evidenced through his unwavering support of the Close Up Foundation's program in the Pacific Islands.

Mr. Speaker, as you and my other colleagues in the House know well, the Close Up Foundation operates one of the most successful and innovative civic education programs in the country. Most of us have had the privilege of meeting students who are in Washington for an intensive course of study about the federal government. Annually, I personally meet with students and teachers from Guam who are participants in Close Up's civic education program that is specially designed for Pacific Islands students and educators. As an educator by profession, I have been personally impressed with Close Up's Island-based activities, including their development of island-specific curricular materials, teacher training seminars and programs related to teaching young people about the merits of community service.

Mr. Babauta, when back home in Rota and Saipan has encouraged students and teachers to participate in the program. He has used his position and contacts to assist educators and schools to raise funds that would allow students to participate in the Close Up program, including taking advantage of local media outlets to promote the program. Mr. Babauta even assists students and teachers with the process for obtaining passports and other travel documents that will allow them to travel to Washington for the Close Up program. All of these activities speak to his deep belief in the importance of civic education to CNMI students, including the need for them to explore the historic ties between the United States and the Pacific Islands. Equally important, Mr. Babauta's support for the Close Up program signals his conviction that for the CNMI and other Pacific Islands to secure a future of engaged citizenry committed to democratic government, it is important that they be educated in how democracy is reliant upon the involvement and input of the people.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank Mr. Babauta for his work with Close Up Pacific Islands program. His efforts over the years demonstrate his commitment to the welfare of the young people of the Pacific, and his conviction that educating young people about democracy, the importance of community service, and the rights and responsibilities of citizenship is indispensable for the future of the CNMI and other Pacific Islands.

## HONORING MRS. GERRY GEIFMAN, RECIPIENT OF THE STATE OF ISRAEL BONDS' JERUSALEM MEDAL

### HON. LANE EVANS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to congratulate one of my constituents, Mrs. Gerry Geifman, who will be honored tonight by the State of Israel Bonds at the Quad City Israel Independence Dinner.

At the dinner, Mrs. Geifman will receive the Jerusalem Medal. The award is given to those who have a distinguished history of efforts on behalf of Israel, the Jewish people and the community.

Considering her deep involvement in issues involving the Quad Cities and the local Jewish community, it is easy to see why she is being so honored. Her charitable works are numerous including: serving as past president of Hadassah, the Tri-City Jewish Center Sisterhood, and B'nai B'rith. She also serves on the boards of the Jewish Federation, Tri-City Jewish center, and the Rock Island YWCA. She has also dedicated much of her time to the Davenport Museum of Art, Friends of Art, the Geifman Endowment Sponsorship of Augustana College, Audubon School, Washington Junior High School, Rock Island High school PTA among others.

It is unfortunate that Mrs. Geifman's late husband is not alive to see her receive this important honor. The charitable and volunteer work they performed together over the years was an inspiration to our community. Her continued efforts have served as a true example of the value of leadership and the spirit of volunteer work.

Again, I commend her for her work and this well-deserved recognition of years of service to our local Jewish community and the Quad Cities.

## SENSE OF CONGRESS RESOLUTION

### HON. CLIFF STEARNS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a Sense of Congress resolution that the Constitution of the United States allows for a prohibition against acts of desecration of the flag of the United States.

I do so because I believe that nothing could be more important to most Americans than to preserve and honor our Nation's flag.

In the past, those who have been prosecuted for flag burning have not been prosecuted for what they said, but for the method they chose to express themselves. Justice Stevens wrote that the government has a legitimate interest in preserving the flag, similar to the government's interest in protecting the Lincoln Memorial from acts of vandalism.

Some say our flag is just a piece of cloth. Well, that's like saying America is just a piece of land, that Florida's just another state. No, there's something special about it. It's our flag. It represents us—you, me, our families, our friends, our heritage and our future. It represents our memories and our dreams.

To desecrate the American flag is to desecrate the memory of the thousands of Americans who have sacrificed their lives to keep that banner flying, intact. It is to desecrate everything this country stands for.

Yes, Congress must be extremely careful when dealing with proposals that would amend the Constitution, particularly the First Amendment. American citizens must have the opportunity to voice discontent, however, that freedom of expression is not absolute.

Supreme Court Justice John Paul Stevens claims that the act of flag-burning has nothing to do with disagreeable ideas, but rather involves conduct that diminishes the value of an important national asset. The act of flag-burning is meant to provoke and arouse, not to reason. Flag-burning is simply an act of cultural and patriotic destruction.

My Sense of Congress resolution reaffirms that Congress should have the power, but doesn't have the power until the constitutional amendment is ratified by the states.

## ON THE DELEGATION OF U.S. CATHOLIC BISHOPS TO SUDAN MARCH 24–APRIL 6

### HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I want to share with you the findings of the U.S. Catholic Bishop's Conference who recently led a delegation to the country of Sudan.

Since 1983, the government of Sudan has been waging a brutal war against factions in the south who are fighting for self determination and religious freedom. More people have died in Sudan than in Kosovo, Bosnia, Rwanda and Somalia combined. Most of the dead are civilians—women and children—who died from starvation and disease. Over 2 million people have died. The Committee on Conscience of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum has issued a genocide warning for Sudan.

Because of the large-scale death and destruction, the findings arising from the U.S. Catholic Bishops' delegation is noteworthy and timely.

The dire situation in Sudan calls for a high profile, high level special envoy to bring peace and to stop the atrocities. It is my fervent hope that the Bush administration will appoint such an envoy without delay.

DELEGATION OF U.S. CATHOLIC BISHOPS TO SUDAN—MARCH 24–APRIL 6

OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the trip were three-fold: to show solidarity with the Catholic Church in Sudan; to conduct a fact-finding mission to the North and South; and to increase efforts toward advocacy in the U.S. to help promote a just and lasting peace.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The delegation was comprised of three bishops: Bishop John Ricard, Bishop of Pensacola-Tallahassee, president and chairman of the board of Catholic Relief Services, and member of the Committee on International Policy; Bishop Nicolas DiMarzio, Bishop of Camden, New Jersey and chairman of the Committee on Refugees and Migration; Bishop Edward Braxton, Bishop of Lake Charles, Louisiana and member of the Committee on International Policy; Staff from Catholic Relief services and the United States Catholic Conference committees on Migration and Refugees and International Policy.

The delegation went to: Khartoum, and its outlying areas; Rumbeck; Narus; Nimule; Yambio; and Kauda in the Nuba Mountains.

During the visit, the delegation met with: Northern and Southern leaders of the Catholic church and the New Sudan Council of Churches; Government ministers in Khartoum including the first vice-president, and the former Minister of State, the State Minister for Foreign Affairs, and the State Minister of Engineering, and the Minister of Religious Affairs; SPLM/A officials, including governors, military commanders and other senior officials. The delegation met with other civil society groups in both North and South.

The Bishops raised issues of: peace; religious freedom; human rights; plight of displaced persons and refugees; slavery and abduction; bombing and terrorization of civilian populations.

It is important for this delegation to state that we are not specialists of Sudanese culture, politics, and other aspects of social life. We speak from the perspective of a Church deeply concerned with the plight of all Sudanese, those living in the North, South, the contested areas, and those forced to flee their country and seek asylum in neighboring states or elsewhere.

MAJOR FINDINGS

1. Conflict and persecution in Sudan are a direct result of a systematic campaign of Islamization and Arabization by those who hold political and economic power in Khartoum.

2. Religious persecution, the systematic denial of basic religious freedom, and a program of Islamization continue to characterize the approach of the Government in Khartoum towards those who do not profess a particular version of Islam.

3. Cultural persecution, the systematic undermining of the dignity of non-Arab Sudanese citizens, and the relegation of people to a status of inferiority and subservience continue to shape social institutions and fundamental attitudes of people living in northern Sudan, for which government is responsible.

4. The bombing of civilian targets, the systematic use of Antonov bombers to terrorize populations in contested areas, and other tactics employed to drive people from oil-rich regions are part of the military strategy of the government in Khartoum.

For example: There was a bombing April 16 of Kauda that narrowly missed hitting the plane carrying Bishop Macram Max, Bishop of Diocese of El-Obeid.

And then only yesterday, April 23, Antonov bombers inflicted serious damage on a Catholic school in Narus.

5. Oil exploration, development and sales contribute to an expansion of the war, deepen the plight of the peoples of southern Sudan and other contested areas, harden the resolve of the government in Khartoum to seek a military solution to the conflict, and further widen the gap between the government and those contesting its practices and legitimacy,

6. The government in Khartoum must be called to accountability for its promotion, directly or indirectly, of the intolerable practice of slavery and other gross violations of human rights, and the abduction of Southern children living in and around Khartoum and their forced induction into Koranic schools. The SPLM/A must also cease the practice of the abduction and conscription of minors and other practices that violate human rights.

7. Divisions among the various ethnic groups in the South, coupled with the lack of political support by the leadership of the SPLM/A for various initiatives seeking to reconcile and unite people, compromise the peace process, further destabilize a fragile social infrastructure and undermine advances in development in the region.

8. Internally displaced persons living in the North and the South live in desperate conditions with little hope for immediate improvement; Sudanese refugees in neighboring countries languish in refugee camps, with few prospects for their future. Fatigue on the part of the international community is due to the protracted nature of the conflict and the inability to improve prospects for a better life for the displaced, We are encouraged by the special attention that dedicated groups in the U.S. and elsewhere have been able to bring to the humanitarian crisis in Sudan, and the increased attention being given by the U.S. Congress and Media.

9. Increasing threats of famine in western Sudan, northern Bahr el Ghazal and elsewhere, further complicated by the political manipulation of humanitarian access by the Government in Khartoum and the expropriation of large amounts of humanitarian assistance by the SPLA, exacerbate human suffering and contribute to the loss of innocent lives.

10. There is urgent need for investment in development in southern Sudan, particularly for education and technical training, and for the formation of individuals and communities in the basic principles of responsible governance and civil administration.

POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The war in Sudan must be brought to an immediate and just end. The full and active engagement of the U.S. government could provide the necessary impetus to all parties to the conflict to negotiate an immediate and verifiable cessation of hostilities, monitored by the United Nations or another international body. It is particularly crucial that there be an immediate end to the bombing of civilian targets and a halt to the expulsion of civilian populations from their homelands.

2. We support the Sudanese Bishops and others in calling for the U.S. to play a central role in leading a new, multilateral effort involving the member states of IGAD, those of the IGAD Partner's Forum, and the international community to push all parties to the conflict to a negotiated peace, based on the Declaration of Principles to which the two main parties are signatories.

3. We support the call for the President of the United States should name a high-level special envoy to Sudan with a clear mandate and direct access to the President and the Secretary of State.

4. As we give attention to the terrible situation in the South, the U.S. government and the international community must also address serious human rights violations in the North, particularly: Religious persecution and denial of religious freedom; cultural persecution; economic exclusion; denial of the right of free expression, free association and other fundamental rights; the plight of more than 2 million internally displaced in the North.

5. The U.S. government and the international community should exert pressure upon corporations and governments involved in the exploration, extraction, production and sale of Sudanese oil to take steps to ensure that their activities do not contribute to the escalation of the war, the deepening of human suffering, the continued displacement of peoples from their homelands and ways of life, and urge the oil industy to take an active role in helping to promote a just and lasting peace.

6. The United States and the international commnunity should increase humanitarian relief, specifically to internally displaced persons, press for greater access to humanitarian relief in contested areas, based on the Beneficiaries Protocol signed by the two main parties to the conflict, and increase development assistance to the South for education, health and capacity building of civil institutions.

7. The U.S. government and the international community must press the Government in Khartoum to bring the practice of slavery to an immediate end and secure the release and return of all slaves to their families and communities. The international community also must use its influence to press all parties to the conflict to end the abduction of minors and their induction into Koranic schools in the North, or into military service in both the North and South and provide for their immediate and safe return to their families and communities.

## HONORING JOY KURLAND

### HON. STEVEN R. ROTHMAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a woman who has dedicated her life to fostering understanding and mutual respect among various racial, ethnic, and religious groups in an effort to promote our common humanity. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor my good friend, Joy Kurland of Parsippany, New Jersey, this year's winner of the Anti-Defamation League's Distinguished Community Service Award.

As the Director of the Jewish Community Relations Council of the UJA Federation of Bergen County and North Hudson since 1990, Joy has played a vital role in strengthening Judaism throughout New Jersey. Much of her work has been to foster understanding and respect among the many racial, ethnic and religious groups that form the tapestry of our community.

I was privileged to work with Joy both as a member of the Jewish Community Relations Council as well as the Interfaith Brotherhood Sisterhood Committee. It was truly a pleasure to work with someone who is as dedicated as Joy, and I was always impressed by her hard work, common sense, dedication, and professionalism.

Joy is also a forward-thinking person who never loses sight of the future: our young people. She is always working with young people and encouraging them to increase their participation in the Jewish community. She has supervised the campus youth programs for Jewish Student Services of MetroWest at Montclair State University, Drew University and Fairleigh Dickinson University.

People who give so much of themselves, as Joy Kurland, do not do so for the recognition. However, she certainly deserves to receive it.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to congratulate Joy Kurland as well as her husband Leon and her daughter Meredith, who is a social worker, on the occasion of this well deserved tribute from the Anti-Defamation League, and wish them health and happiness in the years to come.

## INTERNATIONAL WORKERS RIGHTS

### HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I submit to the record a story of two young women whose voices we in hear. Last Thursday, ''Ms. A'' and ''Ms. B'' traveled from Bangladesh to our nation's Capital to tell their story. The two women are the survivors of the horrendous fire that occurred in the Chowdhury Knitwear factory in Bangladesh on November 25, 2000.

Sadly, their story echoes the events of the 1911 fire that occurred at the Triangle Shirtwaist Factory in New York City where 146 young garment workers were killed.

The women traveled to the United States to tell their compelling story of the dangerous working conditions under which they are forced to work. Fifty-one of their co-workers were killed in the fire that blazed through the factory. Many of the workers were electrocuted, suffocated, or trampled to death, due to the doors of the factory being locked that evening by the owners to keep union organizers out. Through timid voices they explained that they are forced to work long hours, and had not received a raise in two years. They spoke of their fear for their jobs when they returned home because of their trip to the United States. However, they stated that they traveled to the United States to tell their story in hope of making a difference for the workers in the Chowdhury factory in Bangladesh and workers around the world.

In Bangladesh nearly 80% of garment workers do not earn the legal monthly minimum wage of $17. The average workday is 12–14 hours, many times for as little as 5 cents an hour. The workers are denied the right to organize and are subjected to deplorable working conditions. ''Ms. A''and ''Ms. B'' sew for first-world clients at the Chowdhury Knitwear Factory. The factory produces towels and bedding products that are shipped to the European Union. However, the owner of the factory owns and operates another factory across the street that makes products that are shipped to the United States.

Unfortunately, there are many factory workers who can tell stories such as ''Ms. A'' and ''Ms. B's''. There are factories like the Chowdhury Knitwear factory in Bangladesh all over the world. In the past decade hundreds of workers have been killed in factory fires throughout Asia, in Thailand, and in China. We have a responsibility to impel companies in countries such as Bangladesh to provide their workers with safe conditions and the right to organize, and collectively bargain. America should not allow the import of goods from nations that allow the exploitation of their own workers.

As a member of the International Workers Right Caucus, I strongly urge the United States Congress, and all nations to ratify the International Labor Organization Standards providing individuals abroad basic worker rights.

Mr. Speaker, I submit to the record the story of these women and their associates because I am their voice, the voice that can be heard by the American public, and by the U.S. government.

It is because of the conditions that exist at the Chowdhury Knitwear factory in Bangladesh that I will continue to fight for labor rights both home and abroad.

## MINNESOTA PUBLIC RADIO'S MARKETPLACE WINS PEABODY AWARD

### HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of, and to honor Minnesota Public Radio's highly regarded business and financial news program Marketplace™, for their receipt of a prestigious Peabody Award for 2000. The George Foster Peabody Awards were established in 1940 to recognize distinguished achievement and meritorious service by radio and television networks, stations, producing organizations, cable television organizations and individuals. Marketplace will be honored during a May 21st awards ceremony in New York to celebrate the 60th anniversary of the George Foster Peabody Awards.

Marketplace is public radio's only national program about business, the global economy and finance. It was the first, and is still the only, daily national business show originating from the West Coast. Its location in Los Angeles has provided Marketplace easier access to the Pacific Rim and has encouraged the staff to develop their own voice, one not overwhelmed by the traditionally Eastern-dominated media. With eight domestic bureaus (Boston, Ann Arbor/Detroit, Cleveland, New York, Philadelphia, Portland, San Francisco and Washington, DC) and two international bureaus (London and Tokyo), Marketplace is a truly global program using business and economics as its twin lenses to better view and understand the world. It distinguishes itself from general news programming by taking a broader view of business and exploring business and finance issues on a deeper more human, more engaging level.

The program premiered in January 1989 from Long Beach, California. Over the years, it has been described as well informed, hip, irreverent, and the business show for the rest of us. Last year, Minnesota Public Radio, which is based in my home district of Saint Paul, Minnesota, acquired Marketplace from the University of Southern California. This added one more strong program to Minnesota Public Radio's already impressive resume of celebrated shows including A Prairie Home Companion and Saint Paul Sunday. Marketplace's future looks as bright as its past with Minnesota Public Radio building a state-of-the-art digital production center in downtown Los Angeles that will serve as the program's newest home.

Marketplace was created by Jim Russell, an award-winning journalist and a former executive producer of All Things Considered, who has more than thirty years of broadcasting experience under his belt. In 1988, he envisioned a public radio business program that sounded smart, literate and witty; one that could appeal to an audience of non business types. Today, Marketplace is heard on more than 300 public radio stations across the United States with a national audience of nearly 4 million weekly listeners.

The executive producer of Marketplace is J.J. Yore, who has been a reporter, editor and broadcast producer for nearly twenty years. As executive producer, he is the one responsible for setting the program's overall editorial direction and tone, which the Peabody Awards Committee described as, ''sophisticated, creative and accessible.''

David Brancaccio has been the show's senior host since 1993. He is a former foreign correspondent and broadcast reporter with a knack for telling a good story. His style has been described as lively and engaging. Before taking his current position with Marketplace, he served as the show's London bureau chief for three years. His international reporting experience and considerable travel overseas add to Marketplace's global perspective on business-related news.

Praise for Marketplace abounds. Early in its history, it was named ''best business program'' in the U.S. by the prestigious Columbia Journalism Review. More recently, Marketplace received the 1997 Loeb Award in the radio category, the 1997 Clarion Award for ''Regular News'' and in January 1998, the highly coveted duPont-Columbia Award for ''Excellence in Overall Show.'' In 2000, Marketplace's Japan Bureau won the Overseas Press Club's Best Business Reporting in Broadcast Media Award. According to Washingtonian Magazine, Marketplace is in the top four most-listened-to programs by business leaders. The Station Resource Group reported that, according to industry leaders, Marketplace is one of five ''must-have'' programs for public radio stations.

Marketplace's most recent honor, the Peabody Award, is one of the most competitive in the fields of broadcasting and cable. For the year 2000, Marketplace was one of only 34 award winners chosen from nearly 1,100 entries. The Peabody Award differs from other broadcast and cable awards because it is given solely on the basis of merit, rather than within designated categories. Judging is done by a fifteen-person national advisory board whose members include TV critics, broadcast and cable industry executives, scholars, and experts in culture and fine arts. Dr. Louise Benjamin, Interim Director of the Peabody Awards, said, ''The Peabody Board chose Marketplace because the program offers listeners a refreshing, perceptive account of the day's international economic news. It also gives its audience insight into how the global economy affects their communities and their lives.''

I congratulate Marketplace on their notable achievement as a 2000 recipient of the George Foster Peabody Award. The Peabody and Minnesota Public Radio's Marketplace belong together as they both represent the qualities we, here in the U.S. House of Representatives, applaud: excellence, distinguished achievement, and service.

## HONORING DR. MICHAEL B. HARRIS

### HON. STEVEN R. ROTHMAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a man who has distinguished himself not just for his contributions to the medical field, but for his charity and selfless devotion to others. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Dr. Michael B. Harris of Englewood, New Jersey, this year's winner of the Anti-Defamation League's Maimonides Award.

Maimonides was one of the great Jewish scholars. In addition to being the first person to write a systematic code of all Jewish law, the Mishneh Torah, he was also an expert on medicine, and one of his most notable sayings is, ''The well-being to the soul can be obtained only after that of the body has been secured.''

The list of Dr. Harris' accomplishments is long and distinguished. He currently serves as Director of the Tomorrow's Childrens' Institute, Chief of Pediatric Hematology/Oncology at the Hackensack University Medical Center, and Professor of Pediatrics at the University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey Medical School, as well as having authored or co-authored more than 50 articles and 50 abstracts in the field of pediatric hematology/oncology.

While that sounds like it would be enough work for two people, he still finds time to donate his expertise and give of himself to the community. He is the Chair of the Medical Advisory Board of the Israeli Children's Cancer Foundation and was recently asked to serve as Chair of the Medical Advisory Committee of Gilda's Club of Northern New Jersey. And he has been a member of the Board of Directors of Congregation Ahavath Torah in Englewood for many years.

People who give so much of themselves as Dr. Michael Harris do not do so for the recognition. However, he certainly deserves to receive it.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to congratulate Dr. Michael Harris, as well as his wife Frieda, and his children Miera, Aimee, Jonathan and Aaron on the occasion of this well deserved tribute from the Anti-Defamation League, and wish them health and happiness in the years to come.

## OPERATION DESERT STORM AND THE 926TH FIGHTER WING

### HON. RICHARD H. BAKER

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Speaker, in early August 1990, Iraqi military forces illegally invaded Kuwait, a neighboring sovereign state. Immediately, American military forces began deploying to the area to deter the Iraqis from further aggression. During Operation Desert Shield, the build-up phase for the later operation, Desert Storm, troops and supplies were put into motion and decisions were made about who, when, where, and how for the possible coming conflict should diplomatic efforts prove unfruitful. During this buildup period, it was decided there would be participation in this campaign by the reserve forces of the United States military; and the unit to represent the United States Air Force Reserve would be the 706th Fighter Squadron, along with supporting personnel, of the 926th Fighter Wing from New Orleans, Louisiana.

Approximately 500 members of the 926th Fighter Wing were recalled to active duty and placed on military orders on Dec. 29, 1990. (Personnel of the 926th Security Forces Squadron had already served a tour of duty in Saudi Arabia in the fall of 1990 during the build-up phase of Operation Desert Shield.) On the evening of Jan. 1, 1991, the University of Tennessee was participating in the Sugar Bowl at the Superdome in New Orleans as 18 combat-loaded A–10s took off from the Naval Air Station at Belle Chasse, Louisiana, and turned eastward toward Saudi Arabia. By Jan. 6, the 18 A–10s and the approximately 500 maintenance and support personnel would arrive at King Fahd International Airport to support the military operation. This was the first U.S. Air Force Reserve fighter unit to be activated by a presidential recall and then sent to serve in a combat military operation.

The members of the 926th Fighter Wing were in country less than two weeks when, early in the morning, on Jan. 17, the first combat sorties were launched to strike military targets in Iraq and Kuwait. The war had begun. The early intent was to take down the enemy's communication ability, followed closely by removing their artillery assets, and demoralizing the ''elite'' Republican Guard. The air campaign that ensued was a complete success, resulting in a swift four-day ground war and a victory by allied forces. On Feb. 28, 1991, the war was over.

Amid the joy of victory work continued, and preparations began for the demobilization of deployed American forces, including the return of the members of the 926th Fighter Wing who distinguished themselves in combat and served with honor alongside their active-duty counterparts. On May 17th, the last of the 18 A–10s and 500 people originally deployed to the region, returned safely to Naval Air Station, New Orleans, Louisiana. Mission Accomplished! All personnel and all aircraft deployed returned safely to home station.

Since that time, members and aircraft of the 926th Fighter Wing have continued to answer the call to duty whenever and wherever needed. In 1995, approximately 300 members deployed to Aviano Air Base, Italy, in support of Operation Deny Flight. Members have also deployed in support of humanitarian missions in the Americas. Again, in 1998 members of the unit deployed to Saudi Arabia and Kuwait in support of Operation Southern Watch to support and help enforce the no-fly zone over Iraq instituted after Operation Desert Storm. In September and October 1999, A–10s and personnel from the wing returned to Kuwait to participate in Aerospace Expeditionary Force (AEF) 1.

This tradition of service and sacrifice continues into the 21st century as in mid-January, 2001, members of the 926th Fighter Wing began deploying to Southwest Asia for the wing's second rotation on the AEF. Their mission this time being combat search and rescue for Operation Northern Watch.

The successes of the 926th Fighter Wing during combat operations in Operation Desert Storm, and throughout all of the on-going missions since then, are due to the outstanding leadership, devotion to duty, and sacrifice of the men and women of the unit; and, the valuable support of their families. As a nation, we give thanks to the members of the 926th Fighter Wing, New Orleans, Louisiana, and their families, as we salute and honor them, during this 10-year anniversary of Operation Desert Storm, for their service to our country in the cause of freedom.

## HOLOCAUST DAYS OF REMEMBRANCE 2001

### HON. LOUISE M. SLAUGHTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, this past week we observed the Holocaust Days of Remembrance and our nation's annual commemoration in the Capitol Rotunda of the victims of the Holocaust. This year marks the 60th anniversary of the beginning of the genocide of the European Jews.

This year's theme, ''Remembering the Past for the Sake of the Future,'' is part of a vow that we have taken never to forget the Holocaust, lest history repeat itself. This message must resonate through the years. Our children and our children's children must learn of the Holocaust to ensure that it will never happen again.

We must also not forget that Holocaust survivors continue to wait for the reparations they deserve for the physical pain and mental suffering they endured so many years ago. Time is running out for Germany to provide a measure of justice to the survivors of the Holocaust, most of whom are now in their 70's or 80's.

I have stood with Holocaust survivors in the Capitol Rotunda filled with the saddest and most tragic of memories from their lives, lives like that of my constituent, Mr. Alec Mutz. Two years ago, I was privileged to light a memorial candle with Mr. Mutz, who survived three ghettos and five concentration camps. Mr. Mutz is just one of an estimated 50,000 Jewish survivors in North America who were Nazi-era slave laborers.

During the last Congress, I introduced H.R. 271, the Justice for Holocaust Survivors Act, a bill to allow survivors like Mr. Mutz to pursue just reparations from Germany for the unspeakable suffering they endured during the Holocaust. H.R. 271, which garnered the support of 96 bipartisan co-sponsors, would have enabled Holocaust survivors who have been denied reparations by the German government to sue the German government in United States federal courts to claim restitution.

On March 30, 2000, I was informed by the Administration that the German government had agreed to double its compensation package to the victims of slave labor camps from 5 billion to 10 billion Deutsche marks (DM), or the equivalent of 5 billion U.S. dollars. I was also informed that H.R. 271 served as a catalyst in the talks between the U.S. and Germany to reach a compensation agreement.

On July 17, 2000, the United States and Germany signed an agreement to establish a German Foundation, ''Remembrance, Responsibility, and the Future,'' to be the exclusive forum for the resolution of all Holocaust-era personal injury, property loss, and damage claims against German banks, insurers, and

companies. In return, the U.S. government promised that the Department of Justice would urge the courts to reject all existing and future lawsuits against German companies by slave laborers and other victims of the Nazi-era. This process is called ''legal peace.''

However, nine months after the agreement, not one Deutsche mark has been paid to the victims and last month, a federal judge in New York refused to dismiss a batch of lawsuits, questioning whether the money would be there to pay the claims. That is why in the coming weeks I plan to introduce legislation to increase oversight of the Foundation, interpret the U.S.-German Agreement more clearly, and expand communication between the Administration and Congress about the status of the Foundation.

Mr. Speaker, as we act to remember the Holocaust with the commemoration of the Days of Remembrance, let us also act to give these courageous survivors a beacon of hope for the Just resolution of the wrongs that they have suffered. I urge my colleagues to take notice of the current failure of the U.S.-German Agreement and join me in calling for a resolution to the problems with the claims process before it is too late to grant justice to our aging Holocaust survivors.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET
*Washington, DC, April 24, 2001.*

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 503—UNBORN VICTIMS OF VIOLENCE ACT OF 2001

The Administration supports protection for unborn children and therefore supports House passage of H.R. 503. The legislation would make it a separate Federal offense to cause death or bodily injury to a child, who is in utero, in the course of committing any one of 68 Federal offenses. The bill also would make substantially identical amendments to the Uniform Code of Military Justice. The Administration would strongly oppose any amendment to H.R. 503, such as a so-called ''One-Victim'' Substitute, which would define the bill's crimes as having only one victim—the pregnant woman.

## HONORING THE BOGOTA SCHOOL SAFETY PATROL PROGRAM

### HON. STEVEN R. ROTHMAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mr. ROTHMAN Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the School Safety Patrol Program which has been in existence in the Borough of Bogota, New Jersey since 1936.

Through this program, which operates in conjunction with the Bogota Police Department, a group of students from each of Bogota's three elementary schools is chosen for the Safety Patrol based on academic achievement and leadership abilities. The members of the Safety Patrol are assigned a post each day for the purpose of assisting the other students in safely crossing the street near the school as well as being stationed around the school and the playground to assure the safety and welfare of their fellow students.

Serving as a member of the Safety Patrol is both an honor and a responsibility. And for the last 50 years, the Borough of Bogota has rewarded the members of the Safety Patrol with a three-day trip to Washington, DC. This year, I am pleased to meet with the members of the Safety Patrol when they come to the Capitol, and I would like to read their names into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to honor their outstanding dedication:

Andres Acosta, Gabrielle Avitable, Weis Baher, Megan Bandelt, Joe Baranello, Anthony Butler, Raymond Carrasco, Lauren Casteneda, Kristin Costa, Christopher Desmond, Daniel Distasi, Zachary Gilbert, Mary Hanna, Ben Hunkin, Thomas Khristopher, Georgios Kotzias, Brian Lauer, Brooke Lonegan, Matthew Luciano, Wade Morris, Richard Nowatnick, Devin Pantillano, Monica Patel, Anthony Perpepaj, Sara Puleio, Brian Pumo, Raquel Rivera, Brian Roche, Caitlyn Rumbaugh, Christine Smith, Audrey Snell, Michelle Sontag, Jeanette Symmonds, Alexander Zetelski, and Sarah Zupani.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the Bogota School Safety Patrol Program on ajob well done, and I wish them luck in all their future endeavors.

## TRIBUTE TO SOUTHWEST MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY LADY BEARS

### HON. ROY BLUNT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay honor to the Women's Basketball program at Southwest Missouri State University. The Lady Bears played their way into the NCAA Final Four in St. Louis before losing to Purdue University.

For the second time in 9 years, the Lady Bears of Southwest Missouri found themselves in this select rankina of great women's teams in 2001 and though they did not play in the final game, they brought great pride and excitement to the residents of the Seventh District of Missouri and beyond.

Southwest Missouri State University women's basketball ranks nationally among the top teams in fan attendance. Their legions of dedicated followers were charged with excitement over the team's success. The late season run of the Lady Bears packed Hammons Student Center every game and sent fans searching for tickets as they won their way through the NCAA tournament in Piscataway, New Jersey and Spokan, Washington for the right to play in the Final Four in nearby St. Louis, Missouri-just three hours from Springfield. Wherever the team played, a bus or an airplane filled with its loyal fans followed.

The 2001 season for the nationally ranked Lady Bears was filled with milestones. Coach Cheryl Burnett won her three hundredth victory in 14 seasons. The 29-6 record is the second best in the Lady Bear's history behind the 1992 31-3 mark that also saw the Lady Bears in the Final Four.

Five seniors anchored the squad: All-American Jackie Stiles, Tara Mitchem, Carly Deer, Melody Campbell and Tiny McMorris. Stiles was the nation's leader scorer with more than 30 points a contest and finished the season as the NCAA's most prolific woman's scorer ever with 3,393 points in her four year career. She was also the first woman to score 1,000 points or more in a single college season. While Stiles dazzled competitors with her scoring, it was team defense that played stunned competitors into submission.

The Lady Bears fans understand the character of the team. Every young woman on the squad has a tenacious work ethic and they are tireless, never-give-up competitors. They played as a team of talented women who shared the glory of their successes with their fans as they represented a regional school in the Midwest competing and winning against better know teams trom larger schools.

The Southwest Missouri State University Lady Bears are special not just because of where they are from but because of how far they have come in winning their way into the elite of their sport. The members of the Lady Bears of Southwest Missouri State University are models for other young women to follow and inspire them in their drive for academic success off the court as well as sports success on it. Over and over these young women said how proud they were to have played and represented SMSU on the court. We will miss them, but remember their accomplishments that are written in the history books of the great women's basketball teams in America.

I know my Missouri colleagues will join me in applauding the great work of Coach Cheryl Burnett with the 2001 team, as well as expressing their belief that all of the senior members have bright futures ahead of them with the commitment to excellence they demonstrated during the 2001 season and that their underclass teammates will carry their legacy into the future.

## IN RECOGNITION OF BETTY GALLER

### HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Betty Galler as she is honored by the Free Sons of Israel at it's Foundation Fund's 75th Anniversary Celebration, for her 72 years of dedicated service to the organization.

In the past 72 years Betty has unselfishly led the Foundation Fund in numerous humanitarian efforts. The long and impressive list includes donations to Camp Vacamas—(a camp for underprivileged children)—ambulances for American Red Mogen David in Israel, purchasing prothesis for those wounded in the Six Day War, and parties at the Kingsbridge Veterans Hospital and at Francis Delafield Hospital. That is only a few of the wonderful causes to which Betty has dedicated her time and energy.

It is obvious what a remarkable human being Betty is. The Free Sons of Israel, the nation's oldest Jewish fraternal order, and the Free Sons Foundation Fund is extremely fortunate to have a person like Betty Galler working for them. Now at the age of 93, she shows no signs of ending her long and unbelievable career.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me now in extending our thanks and appreciation to Betty Galler, the Guest of Honor at the Free Sons

Foundation Fund's 75th Anniversary Celebration, for her 72 years of tireless community service.

## IN CELEBRATION OF CRISSY FIELD, SAN FRANCISCO

### HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, for decades, Crissy Field stood as an idle monument to its former life as a World War I landing strip. The cracked runway and gray rubble lined San Francisco's shoreline and window to the Bay. Part of a national park within the Presidio's boundaries, it begged for renewal.

After years of effort and an unprecedented philanthropic success on behalf of the Park's Crissy Field restoration, we are now on the verge of celebrating a modern-day Crissy Field that also incorporates its history. While evidence of the landing strip is no longer visible, a rich historic marsh land has been brought back to a state that existed long before aviation.

In two weeks, on May 6, the public will be welcomed to a great celebration of the Crissy Field restoration project. Almost magically, acres of rubble have been transformed into a magnificent public gateway along the Presidio's border. A tidal marsh now exists, surrounded by native plants and a public promenade that stretches for over a mile along the beachfront.

This event, marking the completion of the restoration and the public opening, was born as a concept a few years ago under the partnership of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA) and the Golden Gate National Parks Association (GGNPA). In a remarkably short period of time, and in a remarkable show of support, this concept has come to life.

Under the leadership of the first GGNPA Chair, Toby Rosenblatt, and now under the continuing excellent leadership of Chair Charlene Harvey, the dream of Crissy Field will be realized. This unique public-private partnership has made it possible to turn a contaminated, abandoned airfield into a conservation prize for our national park system.

This would not have been possible without the vision of these individuals, the many contributors who followed this dream and the significant efforts of Greg Moore, Executive Director of the GGNPA, and Brian O'Neill, Superintendent of the GGNRA. Both Brian and Greg were honored this week by the National Park Foundation for their energy, innovation and enthusiasm in bringing this project to fruition. Greg Moore accepted the National Park Foundation award for ''Restoration of Crissy Field'' as the recipient of the 2001 National Park Partnership Award in the environmental conservation category.

As the GGNPA Executive Director, Greg spearheaded the philanthropic drive for Crissy Field which raised $34 million to fund this spectacular restoration of San Francisco's Bay shoreline. The gift of $18 million from the Evelyn and Walter Haas, Jr., Fund and the Robert and Colleen Haas Fund is the largest ever made to America's national parks. This is a phenomenal accomplishment and one of which we are very proud in our community. Congratulations to Charlene Harvey, the entire GGNPA Board, the many philanthropic participants and to Greg Moore and an excellent staff for their lasting contribution to our environment.

The Presidio and all of our Golden Gate National Parks are a source of great pride to us and we are pleased that they welcome millions of visitors each year for recreation and renewal. Congratulations to all who have been involved in this spectacular project. It is a testament to the great enthusiasm the public holds for our national parks. It is a testament to the spirit of our San Francisco community and the able leaders who brought this vision to life for us all.

## COMMEMORATING THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

### HON. STEPHEN HORN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, once again I join my colleagues in remembering those who suffered the tragic events of the Armenian Genocide. Each year, we join the world in commemoration of the Armenian genocide because the tragedy of lost lives through ethnic cleansing must not be forgotten.

The Armenian genocide marked the beginning of a barbaric practice in the 20th century with more than a million and a half Armenians killed and forcibly deported. As the target of persecution by the Ottoman Turks, Armenians were systematically uprooted from their homeland and eliminated. To this day, the Turkish government continues to deny that millions of Armenians were killed simply because of their ethnicity.

As an educator, I believe it is critical to emphasize the role education must play in our international community. We must ensure that we do not continue to see actions of racial intolerance or religious persecution, which has led to so many cases of ethnic cleansing. The tragedies of the past two decades including Cambodia, Rwanda and Kosovo attest to this fact. We must, therefore, continue to commit to first teaching our children tolerance.

If we refuse to acknowledge, understand, and vigorously oppose racial and religious intolerance, wherever it arises, we are doomed to repeat the same tragedies again and again.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for this opportunity to commemorate the Armenian Genocide. I also want to thank the many Armenian-American organizations throughout the nation, and in particular in California, for their tremendous work on behalf of the Armenian-American community.

## INTRODUCTION OF THE JAMES PEAK WILDERNESS, JAMES PEAK PROTECTION AREA AND WILDERNESS STUDY AREA ACT

### HON. MARK UDALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to protect a key part of the high alpine environment along Colorado's Continental Divide.

The 13,294-foot James Peak is the predominant feature in a 26,000 acre roadless area within the Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forest just north and east of Berthoud Pass. The James Peak roadless area straddles the Continental Divide within 4 counties (Gilpin, Clear Creek, Grand and Boulder). It is the largest unprotected roadless area on the Northern Front Range. The area offers outstanding recreational opportunities for hiking, skiing, fishing, and backpacking.

I have been interested in wilderness protection for the James Peak area since my election to Congress in 1998. In 1999, 1 introduced a bill (H.R. 2177) in the 106th Congress that would have designated about 22,000 of the James Peak roadless area as wilderness, including about 8,000 acres in Grand County. This proposal was designed to renew discussions for the appropriate management of these lands that qualify for wilderness consideration.

The bill I am introducing today—the James Peak Wilderness, James Peak Protection Area and Wilderness Study Area Act—is the product of nearly two years of subsequent discussions with county officials, interested groups, and the general public.

The previous bill had broad support. However, after its introduction, the County Commissioners of Grand County—which includes the western side of the James Peak area—expressed some concerns with the proposed wilderness designation for the lands in that county. They indicated that in their view any such legislation needed to make accommodation for any ''dispersed recreation'' opportunities in the area and needed to address private inholdings. The Commissioners also indicated that the Rollins Pass road should be excluded from wilderness.

I agreed to work with Grand County on these and a number of other issues. We held several discussions, including a public meeting in Grand County. After that, the Grand County Commissioners indicated that they could not ''entirely support [H.R. 2177] as presented,'' and outlined a ''James Peak Protection Area'' alternative.

The Commissioners' ''protection area'' alternative did not spell out all details, but its essence was that instead of designation of wilderness there should be designation of a ''protection area'' that would include the lands in Grand County proposed for wilderness in my previous bill and also an additional 10,000 acres of national forest land. The Commissioners' proposals also would have allowed for a section of high tundra above Rollins Pass along the divide to be open to motorized and mechanized recreation (snowmobiles and mountain bikes).

I gave serious attention to this alternative and also carefully considered the views of a variety of interested individuals and groups who had concerns about it. Based on that, on February 12, 2001, I released a more detailed legislative proposal for public review and comment.

This proposal was based on the Commissioners' ''protection area'' alternative. It would have designated as wilderness 14,000 acres of the James Peak roadless area in Boulder, Clear Creek and Gilpin Counties. It also would have designated 18,000 acres in Grand County as a ''James Peak Protection Area,'' and

would have added 2,000 acres (that were encompassed by the Commissioners' ''protection area'' alternative) to the Indian Peaks Wilderness Area (these acres were recommended for wilderness by the Forest Service).

The proposal included language to spell out in more detail the management regime of the ''protection area.'' These provisions (including a ban on hardrock mining, a ban on campgrounds, and a ban on timber cutting) were largely based the management rules for the Bowen Gulch ''backcountry recreation'' area and the existing ''special interest area'' Forest Service management under the 1997 Forest Plan. Inclusion of the latter provision was at the request of the Grand County Commissioners.

Following the release of this proposal, I met with the Grand County Commissioners to discuss this proposal and for the option of wilderness for some lands in the Grand County part of the James Peak roadless area. This was a productive meeting. We discussed a number of issues, most of which have been addressed in the bill that I am introducing today. In summary, those issues included:

(1) Prohibiting Motorized and Mechanized Recreation Atop Rollins Pass—Although this area was identified as a possible location for motorized and mechanized recreation in the previous proposal, all agreed (including the snowmobile and mountain bike users) that this area should not be available for such use.

(2) Reopening the Rollins Pass Road—The Commissioners and the users of the Rollins Pass road (also known as the Corona Pass road) indicated an interest in reopening this road for two-wheel drive traffic. Presently, this road is blocked due to the closure of the Needle Eye tunnel and degrading railroad trestles. As a result, a number of motorized recreational users have been creating roads and trails to bypass these blockages. The users of Rollins Pass road indicated that if this road could be reopened, then they would be willing to work with the Forest Service to close these bypasses. The Grand County Commissioners agreed with this suggestion.

(3) The Berthoud Pass Ski Area—The Commissioners expressed an interest in drawing any proposed boundaries near Berthoud Pass to accommodate the existing Berthoud Pass Ski Area's permitted boundary. Everyone agreed that this should be done.

(4) Private Inholdings—The Commissioners expressed an interest in ensuring that the rights of private inholders be preserved.

(5) Forest Service Management—The Commissioners requested that the proposal include specific language indicating that the ''protection area'' would be managed according to the 1997 Forest Plan. In addition, the Commissioners and recreational users requested that this management be flexible enough to allow the Forest Service to relocate trails, roads or areas in order to address future management issues.

(6) Wilderness Addition to Indian Peaks—The Commissioners expressed support for including the approximately 2,000-acre wilderness addition to Indian Peaks—an area that was ''recommended for wilderness'' in the 1997 Forest Plan.

(7) Buffer Zone—The Commissioners indicated an interest in considering the inclusion of language that would prohibit the establishment of a restrictive ''buffer zone'' around the area. This provision would ensure that the existence of a ''protection area''/wilderness area would not lead to managerial restrictions on the lands outside the proposed boundaries.

(8) Telecommunication Opportunities on Mount Eva—The Commissioners also indicated an interest in keeping the top of Mt. Eva open for telecommunication facilities as this area was used in the past for such activity. However, the State Land Board permitted the previous facilities on Mt. Eva as the intention was to site these facilities on the State Land Board section. But the facilities were mistakenly located on Forest Service land. Nevertheless, these facilities were removed when the company went bankrupt. In addition, there are no access roads or services to this area. Given all of these difficulties, it was suggested that other locations for these options may be more appropriate.

(9) Rogers Pass Trail—Members of the public also expressed interest in keeping this trail open and available for mountain bike recreational use. It is unclear whether this trail is in fact open to such use. Nevertheless, the Grand County Commissioners indicated that they would like to pursue the option of allowing such use of this trail.

(10) Prohibition of Land Exchanges—The Commissioners expressed an interest in having the bill prohibit any further land exchanges in the area to prevent further development from encroaching into Forest Service areas.

I reworked my proposal to incorporate these issues. It was my hope that in accommodating these concerns in the bill, that the Grand County Commissioners would reconsider some wilderness protection for the lands in the James Peak roadless area south of Rollins Pass. However, the three Grand County Commissioners were divided on this question (one Commissioner did suggest extending the wilderness boundary westwards over the Divide and down to timberline in Grand County).

Nevertheless, the Grand County Commissioners did express support for the wilderness addition to the Indian Peaks Wilderness Area, support for the ''protection area'' to be managed according to the 1997 Forest Plan and for the adjustments that I had made based on their input. Regrettably, however, they expressed opposition to any wilderness designation now for lands south of Rollins Pass or Rogers Pass.

The Commissioners also indicated a concern that such a designation might have some effect on water rights. I think it is clear that there are no grounds for such concerns. Careful review has convinced me that there are no water rights except those for national forest purposes and no diversion facilities in the portion of the James Peak roadless area south of Rollins Pass. In addition, if any such rights do exist, they would not be extinguished by wilderness designation. Furthermore, as any wilderness designation for this area would be governed by the 1993 Colorado Wilderness Act, the courts would be barred from considering any assertion that the designation involved a federal reserved water right. Further, this area is essentially a headwaters area. Wilderness protection would thus ensure that water would continue to flow out of this area—unimpeded—for downstream users and benefits.

The Grand County Commissioners did indicate that they understood and found acceptable the Forest Service's process for periodic review of the way it manages national forest lands in Grand County. Further, the Commissioners indicated they would not oppose having the Forest Service again review the lands south of Rollins Pass for possible wilderness designation. They indicated that they were aware that the Forest Service had reviewed this area in the past and could have recommended it for wilderness, but did not do so. The Commissioners also indicated that if the Forest Service were to review the area again, they would respect that process.

Accordingly, the bill I am introducing today provides for such a renewed study of these lands. It designates the James Peak roadless lands in Grand County south of Rollins Pass as a ''wilderness study area'' and directs the Forest Service to re-look at this area for suitability as wilderness. This provision will preserve the status quo on approximately 8,000 acres south of Rollins Pass by keeping this area in its current roadless and pristine state. The bill would require the Forest Service to report its recommendations for these 8,000 acres within three years. It will then be up to Congress to decide regarding the future management of these lands.

This part of the bill also addresses the Roger Pass trail issue—an issue of importance to the Grand County Commissioners and users of this trail. While I believe that this trail should be included in wilderness (it is within the proposed wilderness study area), the bill directs that the Forest Service evaluate whether and to what extent this trail should be managed for mechanized recreational use.

I believe that the bill I am introducing today keeps faith with my commitment to work with local County Commissioners and others. It addresses a majority of the issues that were raised.

These lands are indeed special. They contain a number of high alpine lakes and tundra ecosystems. This area also represents one of the last remaining unprotected stretches of the Continental Divide that comprises the Northern Front Range Mountain Backdrop.

With the population growth occurring along the Front Range of Colorado, I am concerned that if we do not protect these special lands for future generations, we could loose a critical resource for future generations. That is why I am introducing this bill and why I will work hard for its enactment into law.

For the benefit of our colleagues, I am attaching a fact sheet that summarizes the main provisions of the bill.

JAMES PEAK WILDERNESS, JAMES PEAK PROTECTION AREA AND WILDERNESS STUDY AREA ACT

Summary—The bill would designate the James Peak Wilderness Area, add to the existing Indian Peaks Wilderness Area, designate a James Peak Protection Area and a James Peak wilderness study area, all within the Arapaho Roosevelt National Forest in Colorado.

Background: In 1999, Congressman Mark Udall introduced the James Peak Wilderness Act (H.R. 2177) which would have designated about 22,000 acres of land in the Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forest as wilderness north of Berthoud Pass and south of the Indian Peaks Wilderness Area. Since then, there have been further discussions with county governments, the Forest Service, and the public. On January 31, 2000, the Grand County Commissioners proposed the alternative of designating lands in that county as a ''protection area'' instead of wilderness. On February 12, 2001, Congressman Udall released a proposal that was similar to the

Grand County ''protection area'' proposal. This bill is a refined version of that proposal resulting from discussions with the Grand County Commissioners and other interested parties.

The Lands: The 13,294-foot James Peak is the predominant feature in a 26,000-acre roadless area within the Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forest just north and east of Berthoud Pass. The James Peak roadless area straddles the Continental Divide within 4 counties (Gilpin, Clear Creek, Grand and Boulder). It is the largest unprotected roadless area on the Northern Front Range. The area offers outstanding recreational opportunities for hiking, skiing, fishing, and backpacking, including the popular South Boulder Creek trail and along the Continental Divide National Scenic Trail. It also includes the historic Rollins Pass road which provides access for mechanized and motorized recreation in the area.

James Peak is one of the highest rated areas for biological diversity on the entire Arapaho National Forest, including unique habitat for wildlife, miles of riparian corridors, stands of old growth forests, and threatened and endangered species. The area includes a dozen spectacularly situated alpine lakes, including Forest Lakes, Arapaho Lakes, and Heart Lake. Many sensitive species such as wolverine, lynx, and pine marten only thrive in wilderness settings. Adding James Peak to the chain of protected lands from Berthoud Pass to the Wyoming boundary will promote movement of these species and improve their chances for survival.

What the bill does: James Peak Wilderness: The bill would designate over 14,000 acres of the James Peak area in Clear Creek, Gilpin and Boulder Counties as the James Peak Wilderness Area; Indian Peaks Wilderness Area Addition: The bill would add about 2,000 acres in Grand County to the existing Indian Peaks Wilderness area (these acres were recommended for wilderness in the Forest Service's 1997 revised plan); James Peak Protection Area: The bill would designate about 18,000 acres in Grand County as the James Peak Protection Area and provide the following: Forest Service to manage the area consistent with the management directions for this area under the 1997 Forest Plan for the Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forest; No transfer of federal lands by exchange or otherwise; Forest Service required to designate appropriate roads, trails and areas for motorized and mechanized recreation.

James Peak Wilderness Study Area: The bill would designate about 8,000 acres in the part of the Protection Area generally south of the Rollins Pass Road as a wilderness study area. For these lands, the bill would direct the Forest Service to do the following—study this area and report in three years as to the suitability of these lands for inclusion in the National Wilderness System; meanwhile, manage the study area to preserve its wilderness characteristics; and evaluate whether and, if so, to what extent mechanized recreation (mountain bikes and snowmobiles) should be allowed in the wilderness study area, especially along the Rogers Pass trail.

Fall River Trailhead: The bill would establish a new trailhead and Forest Service facilities in the Fall River basin east of the proposed wilderness area—to be done in collaboration with Clear Creek County and the nearby communities of St. Mary's Glacier and Alice Township

General provisions: The bill also would: encourage but not require the Forest Service to acquire two non-federal inholdings within the wilderness study area; prohibit the creation of a restrictive buffer zone around the wilderness area, the Protection Area or wilderness study area; direct the Forest Service to work with the respective counties if the Rollins Pass road is reopened to two-wheel drive traffic.

What the bill does not do: Designate any portion of the James Peak Roadless Area in Grand County as wilderness: The bill would not create wilderness in the James Peak roadless area in Grand County. Instead, it would designate a James Peak Protection Area, subject to use and management restrictions, as proposed by the County Commissioners and within that would designate a wilderness study area.

Restrict Off-Road Vehicle Use Throughout the Area: The bill would prohibit motorized and mountain bike recreation use in the wilderness and wilderness study areas, but would allow this use, consistent with the Forest Service's management directives, in the Protection Area. Furthermore, the bill would require the Forest Service to identify appropriate roads, trails and areas for such use within three years. Such identifications can be revised by appropriate Forest Service processes.

Affect Water Rights: The bill would not affect any existing water rights. In addition, all lands designated by the bill are headwaters areas.

Affect the Berthoud Pass Ski Area: The bill would exclude this Ski Area's existing permitted boundary.

Affect Search and Rescue Activities: The bill would not affect the activities related to the health and safety of persons within the area. Such necessary activities will be allowed, including the need to use mechanized equipment to perform search and rescue activities.

## HONORING DR. THOMAS E. STARZL

### HON. MELISSA A. HART

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Ms. HART. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Thomas E. Starzl arrived in Pittsburgh some 20 years ago, and began his legendary work at the University of Pittsburgh. It wasn't long after that the city became a world renowned Mecca for organ transplantation. Since his arrival, more than 11,300 organ transplants have been performed at the University—an accomplishment unmatched by any other program in the world. These transplants represent the thousands of lives that Dr. Starzl touched, and the true magnitude of his contribution to medicine. Like Dr. Starzl himself, many of these patients are heroes—who even in their death taught invaluable lessons that have advanced the field of organ transplantation for the betterment of all mankind. Today, we think nothing of replacing organs that have failed. But if it weren't for the trailblazing efforts of Dr. Starzl, which have spanned more than four decades ago, we would not be standing here in celebration of life—indeed thousands and thousands of lives.

This year marks the 20th anniversary of Dr. Starzl's first liver transplant in Pittsburgh, a milestone that spawned two decades of major advances by Dr. Starzl and University of Pittsburgh faculty. Their work sparked clinical and research activity of immense importance to the medical community. Countless numbers of surgeons and researchers have come to Pittsburgh from around the world to learn from the work of Dr. Starzl. Surgeons returned to their home institutions with newly forged skills to offer patients life-saving services. Research scientists went back into the laboratories, challenged by Dr. Starzl's own quest to answer some of medicine's most challenging questions.

On April 27, Dr. Starzl's former students and colleagues will pay tribute to him as he enters emeritus status at the University of Pittsburgh. It will be a celebration much to Dr. Starzl's liking—an academic gathering in order to share important scientific information.

Dr. Starzl is a true pioneer who has transformed the world of medicine. Since that day in 1963 when he performed the world's first liver transplant at the University of Colorado, he has been at the forefront of the heroic and life-saving advancements that are continually being made in the medical community. His work will have a lasting influence on the field of organ transplantation, and the world of medicine as a whole. Dr. Starzl continues to inspire a new generation of medical pioneers, and serves as an example of what determination and passion and for one's work can achieve. So we honor you today, Dr. Starzl, for your life's work. We thank you for your passion, which has touched so many lives, and surely will touch many, many more.

## HONORING O.D. McKEE

### HON. ZACH WAMP

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Speaker, Many folks would have turned a little faint at the thought of trying to start a business during the depths of the Great Depression in the 1930s.

But not O.D. McKee.

''O.D.,'' as he was known to his many friends and admirers, believed that he could be successful in the baking business. And he and his wife, Ruth, were not afraid to work hard.

Together they built a small bakery into a giant business with 5,000 employees and plants in three states. I am proud that O.D. and Ruth McKee, who died in 1995 and 1989, were citizens of the 3 rd District of Tennessee. And I am very thankful that their company, McKee Foods Corporation, headquartered in Collegedale, TN, near Chattanooga, continues to be an important and vibrant corporate citizen of the 3 rd District.

It is entirely fitting that the company has dedicated the O.D. McKee Conference Room at the company's plant in Collegedale.

The McKees and their family typify the values of people who are successful as business leaders—and human beings—in America. They had dreams, drive and determination as they built McKee Foods and its ''Little Debbie'' Snack cakes and other products into internationally recognized symbols of quality.

In the early years, the company operated out of a plant on Main Street in Chattanooga. But later, the McKees sold out and moved to Charlotte, N.C., and began another operation there. ''O.D.'' personally designed that plant, which contained many innovations that put it well ahead of its time. In the 1950s, the McKees repurchased the Chattanooga business from Ruth's brother. In 1960, they introduced the ''Little Debbie'' brand.

Their operations were—and are—a model for what a good company should be. O.D. and

Ruth were true partners in the business. He supplied the vision and sales skills that helped to build the company. She contributed down-to-earth, practical business sense, managing many aspects of the bakery's operations, particularly in the early years. At a time when this kind of arrangement was not very common in American business, they drew equal salaries. Today, their company continues to be based on trust and mutual respect among all employees. It is a major part of the economy in Southeast Tennessee. In addition to the facility in Collegedale, it has plants in Apison, Tenn.; Gentry, Ark., and Stuarts Draft, Va., and markets its products in all 50 states, Canada, Puerto Rico and U.S. military bases worldwide.

Truly, it is fitting that we pause to honor O.D. McKee and the wonderful legacy he and his wife, Ruth, built.

## TRIBUTE TO DR. JOSEPH J. JACOBS: ENTREPRENEUR, HUMANITARIAN, AND NOMINEE TO RECEIVE THE PRESIDENTIAL CITIZENS MEDAL

### HON. NICK J. RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Dr. Joseph J. Jacobs, an renowned entrepreneur who created the Joseph J. Jacobs Engineering Group many years ago. Dr. Jacobs is a chemical engineer by profession, who has over the years become an outstanding humanitarian, an economist, an educator, a philanthropist, and an author who wrote a book in 1995 entitled: The Compassionate Conservative which became the by-word of President George W. Bush's Administration. Above all, this proud Lebanese-American became a great good friend of mine.

I have recently written to President George W. Bush asking him to award Joseph Jacobs the Presidential Citizens Medal, an award that recognizes citizens who have performed exemplary deeds of service for their country or their fellow citizens and one that is awarded at the sole discretion of the President.

Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent that my letter to President George W. Bush recommending that he award the Presidential Citizens Medal to Dr. Joseph Jacobs, be printed hereafter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. On reading this letter, a tribute to Joseph J. Jacobs, my colleagues will be reminded of the numerous citizens in the United States who are sons and daughters of immigrants, who have worked hard to create businesses that in turn create jobs and good fortune for themselves and others.

Dr. Joseph Jacobs, son of immigrants from Lebanon, has used his fortune to establish the Jacobs Family Foundation in order to perpetually give back to the citizens of the United States through education, through humanitarian services for underrepresented groups, and through love for his fellow human beings.

APRIL 17, 2001.

Hon. GEORGE W. BUSH,
*President, The White House,*
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: For many years it has been my distinct privilege to have as a good friend, Dr. Joseph J. Jacobs, Chairman of the Board, Jacobs Engineering Group, Inc., in Pasadena, California, who is a great humanitarian who has contributed an abundance to society during his lifetime.

I am writing to highly recommend a Presidential Citizens Medal for Dr. Jacobs which, in your discretion, you can award at any time during this year should you decide to do so (in accordance with Executive Order No. 11494 issued by then President Nixon).

The Presidential Citizens Medal is awarded in recognition of citizens of the United States who have performed exemplary deeds of service for their country or their fellow citizens and is issued at your sole discretion.

Dr. Joseph J. Jacobs is the founder and chair of the Jacobs Engineering Group of international renown with numerous worldwide divisions, is more than 50 years old. He built his company from a one-man chemical process consultancy to its present status as the leading engineering-construction company in the United States if not the world.

For many years Dr. Jacobs served as Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Polytechnic University of New York (1974–1984 and 1992 to 1994). The University has named the Administration building for Dr. Jacobs and a chair in the Chemical Engineering Department has been established in his and Mrs. Jacob's names. On April 29, 2001 Dr. Jacobs will be honored for his contributions to the St. Nicholas Home, a non-sectarian, non-profit nongovernmental support residence for the elderly in Brooklyn, New York. His contributions to the education system and humanitarian efforts in the area of his birth, marks Dr. Jacobs as a remarkable leader who gives back to society in recognition of the support he received over the years in making Jacobs Engineering Group one of the finest in the United States

The recipient of many awards in the Chemical Engineering world, Dr. Jacobs has established the Jacobs Family Foundation, which targets its philanthropy on the issues of community based economic development, youth and families at risk, Arab-American cultural awareness and access to educational and training opportunities for under represented groups. In addition to grant support, the Foundation provides technical assistance to non-profits in the areas of strategic planning, leadership development and fund raising.

Dr. Jacobs is the author of numerous articles on Chemical Engineering and economics, and was a contributing author to the Encyclopedia of Chemical Technology. Having made substantial contributions to the study of a number of serious social issues, one resulted in a highly praised PBS program aired in 1986 on ''The Problems of Aging Parents of Adult Children.''

In 1991, Dr. Jacobs completed his autobiography ''The Anatomy of an Entrepreneur: Family, Culture and Ethics'' from which we learn that he traces his high standards of morality and ethics back to the ethnic background of his family and the Lebanese American community in Brooklyn, NY where he was born and raised.

Dr. Jacob's second book reflecting these values was entitled, ''The Compassionate Conservative'' published by Huntington House in 1995, and a second edition was published in December 1999; a book whose title you have made the by-word of your Administration.

It is my profound hope that you will award the Presidential Citizens Medal to Dr. Joseph Jacobs in the coming year, an award that is made solely at your discretion. From the foregoing, and from the attached biography on Dr. Jacobs, I believe that you will agree that he is an exemplary man who deserves your recognition.

I will look forward to your response to this sincere request on behalf of a wonderful man who has given much to the citizens of the United States throughout a lifetime of hard work and achievement.

With warm regard, I am

Sincerely,

NICK J. RAHALL II,
*Member of Congress.*

## A TRIBUTE TO THE AFRICAN AMERICAN MUSEUM IN PHILADELPHIA

### HON. ROBERT A. BRADY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the African American Museum in Philadelphia (AAMP) upon its selection by the Smithsonian Institution as a new Smithsonian Affiliate. Thus, AAMP becomes the only museum in Philadelphia, the fourth in Pennsylvania and one of 67 cultural institutions across the nation with such a designation.

The Smithsonian affiliate outreach program brings the institution closer to all Americans by creating exhibition opportunities throughout the nation by the sharing of its collections and resources. And, the affiliation provides AAMP with opportunities to display objects from its collections in the Smithsonian's Arts and Industries building on the national Mall in Washington, DC.

Founded in 1976, in celebration of the U.S. Bicentennial, the AAMP is dedicated to collecting, preserving and interpreting material and intellectual culture of African Americans. AAMP attracts a multi-cultural, multi-generational audience. Located in the First Congressional District, the Museum has a collection of more than 500,000 objects, images and documents.

AAMP will open its inaugural exhibition marking the affiliation, Affirmations: Objects and Movements, September 20, 2001. The exhibition will contain objects from the Smithsonian's national museums of American History, American Art and the Anacostia Museum and Center for African American History and Culture.

The incorporation of the AAMP into the Affiliate program is an important milestone in the history of this vital institution and it also coincides with the Museum's celebration of its 25th anniversary.

## TRIBUTE TO JAMES RAMOS, SR.

### HON. JOE BACA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to extend my personal regards and congratulations to James Ramos, Senior, on the occasion of his 60th birthday.

May this special day be filled with joy and happiness and may the future bring James good health, abundant wealth and the time to enjoy both.

James is the youngest of eight children, born and raised in the East Highlands community, and started to work in support of his family as a young man of fourteen in a citrus

packinghouse. He went on to serve his country in the Army and returned to work for the San Bernardino Unified School District for over 26 years. He has always modeled a strong work ethic for his family, and those who love him, speak of his lifelong dedication of service to others.

James should be proud of his marriage of 35 years to the beautiful Rena, and of the four wonderful children he has raised to be upstanding and contributing citizens and proud parents, in their own right.

''Jaime'', my friend, may the rain always fall gently on your house and may your face always greet the rising sun.

James' family offers the following on the occasion of his birthday:

Touching our lives with his gentle strength and guiding us through the years, everyone cherishes ''Jaime'' for the contributions he has made. Growing up, we remember our father for fishing with bologna, jerky and Velveta Cheese, for playing ''Billy Boy'' on his guitar while we danced and sang along, and how much dedication he has committed toward leading our family.

Raised in the East Highlands Community, he was the youngest of eight. Over the years he has accomplished so much.

His strong work ethic can be used as an example to us all. Starting at the mere age of 14, he worked in a packinghouse. Dad has served in the United States Army. And he has worked for 26 years for the San Bernardino School District. All of his hard work and dedication to serving others has been shown by living his dream of working with state and local dignitaries. He has been manied to Rena for 35 years. Together they have four children: Ken, Alaina, James and Tom Tom, while Barbara is loved as well. Instilling the importance of higher education he encouraged his children to pursue college. He is also a grandfather of 14 and has a great-grandchild on the way.

Dad, we love you. Don't ever think for one day that the things you do go unnoticed because not only does God see them, we do too.—Love, Your Kids.

## A TRIBUTE TO MR. BILL WILLIAMS

### HON. CHRISTOPHER JOHN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mr. JOHN. Mr. Speaker, each morning in my hometown of Crowley, in the heart of South Louisiana's Cajun Country, residents turn on the radio to a familiar sound. Between the classic melodies of the 1930s and 40s, listeners are treated to their daily dose of local news, talk and happenings in and around the Crowley area. In many households, this start to each new day is a family tradition. Young and old alike tune in to AM 1450 in the early hours of each morning to hear the voices of Bill Williams and Shel Kanter supply the local news, school lunch menus, and the ever-popular mystery quiz. Far from ordinary and always full of surprises, Bill and Shell truly are the ''voices'' of Crowley.

Bill and his partner Shel have made the Bill Williams/Shel Kanter radio program a morning staple. Forty-four years of continuous air time is a feat in any media market, but Bill and Shel offer so much more than a radio show. They perform a service to our community each morning, by getting our day off to a positive start and reminding us that humor is the rule rather than the exception.

I would like to honor Mr. Bill Williams for his lifetime of service and dedication to the citizens of Crowley. I join with the Crowley community in commending him for his selfless and tireless efforts to better and promote our home. Though he was bom in Illinois, and spent a considerable portion of his life in the Northeast, Bill has become such a vital part of our community over the past 44 years, that it is difficult to imagine there is any other place he would desire to call home.

Off the air, Bill is a leader in the Town of Crowley. He serves on the Crowley City Council and has worked diligently to make the International Rice Festival one of the most recognized cultural celebrations in Louisiana. He is commonly known as ''Mr. Rice Festival,'' and he was recently honored by the Louisiana Rural Tourism Commission for his success in growing the annual event. Bill has made the Rice Festival an annual celebration of our area's rich agricultural industry, culture, cuisine and history. Today, the International Rice Festival is the oldest and largest agricultural festival in Louisiana, due in large part to Bill's efforts.

I want to offer him a heartfelt thanks for his constant efforts to build upon Crowley's tradition of excellence. Bill, I honor you, I honor your devotion to the betterment of our community, and most importantly I thank you for your lifetime of dedication to our wonderful hometown.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. XAVIER BECERRA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, on April 3 and 4, I was unable to cast my votes on roll call votes: No. 76 on motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 768; No. 77 on motion to suspend the rules and agree to H. Res. 91; No. 78 on motion to suspend the rules and agree to H. Res. 56 as amended; No. 79 on motion to suspend the rules and agree to H. Con. Res. 66; No. 80 on agreeing to the resolution H. Res. 111; No 81 on motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 642 as amended; No. 82 on agreeing to the substitute amendment to H.R. 8 offered by Mr. RANGEL; No. 83 on motion to recommit H.R. 8 with instructions; and No. 84 on passage of H.R. 8. Had I been present for the votes, I would have voted ''yea'' on roll call votes 76, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, and ''nay'' on roll call votes 77 and 84.

## A TRIBUTE TO RHODA STAHL

### HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Rhoda Stahl on the celebration of her 90th birthday on Thursday, April 26, 2001.

Rhoda has lived a long and fullfilling life. She married her childhood sweetheart, Harry Stahl, on March 1, 1931. Together they had three children, Renee, Joel, and Larry. After the birth of their second child, the family moved to Long Island City, NY.

While in Long Island City she aided her husband by serving as the First Lady of Congregation Adath Israel while he was the congegation's President.

Rhoda was a devoted wife and mother during her 58 years of marriage to Harry. In 1978, she retired to Florida and then in 1989 she moved to San Diego, to live the rest of her long life near her daughter Renee.

Rhoda is now the proud grandmother of nine and great-grandmother of six. She is fortunate enough to spend her 90th birthday with friends and family from New York, Maryland, Virginia, and San Francisco.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in extending my best wishes and congratulations to Rhoda Stahl on the occasion of her 90th birthday and in wishing her many more happy and healthy years with her loving family.

## EARTH DAY

### HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, on Earth Day, we celebrate an important milestone of the modern environmental movement in 1970, and we celebrate three decades of progress in protecting the environment. Thanks to the persistence and hard work of environmental champions from all walks of life, Americans enjoy cleaner air and cleaner water than in 1970.

Yet we still have far to go to achieve a sustainable approach to living on the Earth. We need leaders who have the vision to see that the fate of human beings and the environment are inextricably intertwined. We need leaders who appreciate that with new ideas, new practices, and new technologies, we can enjoy prosperity and economic growth without sacrificing the environment.

Instead, in his first 100 days in leadership, President Bush has acted swiftly to roll back a series of initiatives to protect the environment and human health:

Arsenic. Revoked new regulations to reduce the level of arsenic, a known carcinogen, in drinking water.

Hard-rock mining. Dumped new regulations that would make it tougher for mining companies to walk away from pollution caused by mining.

Global warning. Broke his campaign promise to reduce emissions of carbon dioxide, the primary cause of global warming.

Kyoto protocol. Announced that the United States—which has already signed the Kyoto protocol to reduce greenhouse gas emissions—will withdraw from any further negotiations and will not seek ratification of the climate change treaty.

National forests. Postponed rules to protect 58 million acres in our national forests by prohibiting new roads, and is widely expected to try to overturn the new rules completely.

National monuments. Encouraged proposals to change boundaries and loosen protections

against mining and logging operations in the new monuments.

Energy efficiency. Scaled back regulations to make air conditioners and heat pumps more efficient—at a time when electricity is in short supply and prices are shooting up in California and around the country. Electricity generation is a major contributor to air and water pollution.

In the new millennium, we must realize that the environment is central to our lives. Because of global warming, it is predicted that the oceans cold rise by as much as three feet in the period between 1990 and 2100. In San Francisco, where the ocean is already practically lapping at our feet, it is daunting to think about the damage the rising waters are likely to cause to our peninsula.

This Administration seeks 19th century solutions to 21st century problems. The Administration's policies on energy and global warming are a prime example. Faced with energy shortages and high energy prices, the Administration advocates increased drilling for oil and gas. Yesterday, the White House reaffirmed its commitment to drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, one of our priceless natural treasures. In the face of world-wide concern about global warming, the Administration has renounced the climate change treaty.

The Administration is responding to pressure from many companies in the electricity, coal, oil, and gas industries to continue with business as usual. But instead of clinging to the energy policies of the past, the United States should lead the world in developing energy efficiency and renewable energy technologies.

I salute business leaders who recognize the value of environmental protection. In fact, a number of major corporations have recognized the threat of global warming and are acting to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions. But sometimes the corporate sector needs a push to adopted new technologies and new ways of thinking. We need political leaders who understand this dynamic.

No discussion of the environment is complete without focussing on environmental justice.

Environmental health will be a major human rights issue in the 21st century. Everyone has the right to live in an environment free of deadly pollutants and toxic waste, and every child has a right to be born free of exposure to toxic chemicals. But today, millions of Americans are exposed to dangerous contaminants in our food, water, air, and even our mother's milk. Minority and low-income communities are particularly vulnerable to environmental health hazards, since the factories and waste dumps that emit pollutants are often located near poor or minority communities that have less political power.

Last Thursday, President Bush announced the United States would sign the treaty on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) that was negotiated by the Clinton Administration. I am delighted that the US will sign the POPs treaty, which will ban or phase out 12 pollutants that are extremely hazardous to the health of humans and animals. But I note that the treaty is supported by the chemical industry—so this excellent decision did not require political courage or vision. Furthermore, we should ensure that new chemicals are safe to human health and the ecosystem before they become pervasive in our air, water, food, and our bodies.

This Administration is still living in the 20th century when it comes to environmental issues. It's time to move into the 21st century. Working together, we can make each Earth Day a celebration of progress, not a day of protest.

## TRIBUTE HONORING OFFICER DON WYBLE

### HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to honor Salida patrolman, Don Wyble. On March 20, Don was named ''Police Officer of the Year'' for the 11th Judicial District for his outstanding work as a police officer during the past year. Don is the second Salida Police Officer to be recognized as the ''Officer of the Year.''

According to Salida Police Chief, Darwin Hibbs, Don was nominated for his work both on and off duty. Don serves as the chairman of the Chaffee County Adult Protection Team, which discusses the needs of elderly citizens and then attempts to provide services. He also serves as the police department's liaison with Triad, a group dedicated to protecting the public from large scale scams. ''I think Don represents our department well. He has a tremendous work ethic and has always done a tremendous job,'' said Hibbs in a recent article from the Mountain Mail.

Don began his work with the police department as a reserve in 1980. In 1988 he was upgraded to full-time code enforcement, and then in the spring of 1990, Don was promoted to patrolman. ''I have to be proud of the opportunity to represent Salida. This award is for all of the department, not just me. It takes all of us to get the job done.''

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I ask that we take this opportunity to thank Don for his service to the community of Salida, Colorado. I know that Don will continue to protect and serve his community for years to come.

Don, your community, state and nation are proud of you!

## FREE TRADE

### HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of members an editorial appearing in today's Wall Street Journal which is headlined ''Free Trade Doesn't Require Treaties''. The column is authored by Pierre Lemieux, a professor of economics at the University of Quebec.

Professor Lemieux seems to grasp quite well what few in Congress have come to understand—that is, ''The primary rationale for free trade is not that exporters should gain larger markets, but that consumers should have more choice—even if the former is a consequence of the latter.'' Mr. Lemieux went on to point out that the leaders of the 34 participating states in the recent Quebec summit ''are much keener on managed trade than on free trade and more interested in income redistribution and regulation than in the rooting out of trade restrictions.''

The professor's comments are not unlike those of the late economist Murray N. Rothbard, devotee of the methodologically-superior Austrian school, who, with respect to NAFTA, had the following to say:

> [G]enuine free trade doesn't require a treaty (or its deformed cousin, a 'trade agreement'; NAFTA is called an agreement so it can avoid the constitutional requirement of approval by two-thirds of the Senate). If the establishment truly wants free trade, all it has to do is to repeal our numerous tariffs, import quotas, anti-dumping laws, and other American-imposed restrictions of free trade. No foreign policy or foreign maneuvering in necessary.

In truth, the bipartisan establishment's fanfare of ''free trade'' (and the impending request for fast track authority) fosters the opposite of genuine freedom of exchange. Whereas genuine free traders examine free markets from the perspective of the consumer (each individual), the mercantilist examines trade from the perspective of the power elite; in other words, from the perspective of the big business in concert with big government. Genuine free traders consider exports a means of paying for imports, in the same way that goods in general are produced in order to be sold to consumers. But the mercantilists want to privilege the government business elite at the expense of all consumers, be they domestic or foreign.

Mr. Speaker, again I commend Mr. Lemieux's column and encourage the recognition ''that free trade is but the individual's liberty to exchange across political borders.''

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 24, 2001]

FREE TRADE DOESN'T REQUIRE TREATIES

(By Pierre Lemieux)

MONTREAL.—Three-quarters of a century before the Summit of the Americas convened in Quebec City last weekend, John Maynard Keynes marveled at globalization. ''[T]he inhabitant of London could order by telephone, sipping his morning tea in bed, the various products of the whole earth. . . .'' Keynes wrote. ''[H]e could at the same time and by the same means adventure his wealth in the natural resources and new enterprise of any quarter of the world. . . . [H]e could secure forthwith, if he wished, cheap and comfortable means of transit to any country or climate without passport or other formality.''

The decades preceding World War I were a period of globalization that was at least as extensive as today's. To the extent that the proposed Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA) moves this continent to ward freer trade, it would help recover the lost promise of the pre-1914 world. But the Quebec summit sent conflicting messages, none of them revolutionary.

The leaders of the 34 participating states showed that they are much keener on managed trade than on free trade, and more interested in income redistribution and regulation than in the rooting out of trade restrictions. ''The creation of a free trade area is not an end in itself,'' said Canadian Prime Minister Jean Chrétien.

With excruciating political correctness, he added: ''We have focused on a global action plan of co-operation to reduce poverty, protect the environment, promote the adoption of labor standards and encourage corporate

responsibility.'' The participants' ''Plan of Action'' contained measures that range from tobacco regulation and gun control to the monitoring of financial transactions.

What of the ''no passport'' world celebrated by Keynes? In Quebec, as at other international trade meetings, state representatives behaved as agents of their country's exporters. You give us this ''concession,'' they intone, and we will allow your exporters to enter our markets in return. Yet this misrepresents grossly the nature of trade and a free economy.

The primary rationale for free trade is not that exporters should gain larger markets, but that consumers should have more choice—even if the former is a consequence of the latter. By presenting themselves as members of an exporters' club, trade negotiators lay themselves open to attack by those who claim that free trade only works to the benefit of corporations.

Economists have known for centuries that free trade can be promoted without free-trade agreements. A country's inhabitants would obtain many of the advantages of free trade if only their own government would stop imposing restrictions on imports. Behind the veil of financial transactions, products are ultimately exchanged against products, so that the more imports that come into a country, the more will foreign demand grow for its exports. Or else, foreign exporters will have to invest in the country, thereby creating a trade deficit; nothing wrong with that either.

In other words, if you want free trade, just trade. Much of the pre-World War I free trade was, indeed, due to Britain's unilateral free-trade policies.

Trade agreements are only helpful to the extent that they help tame domestic producers' interests, support the primacy of consumers, and lock-in the gains from trade. Such treaties should not aim at reducing competition by pursuing other goals, of the sort embraced by the heads of state at Quebec. That would amount to no more than managed trade, the pursuit of which, paradoxically, might be said to unite both the leaders present and the mobs demonstrating against them.

William Watson, a Canadian economist, has noted in the Financial Post that the demonstrators who don't trust governments to negotiate free trade come, contradictorily, from political constituencies generally known for their blind faith in government. As for the small group of anarchists, they apparently do not realize that closed borders, and the prohibition of capitalist acts between consenting adults, actually increase state power.

On one stretch of Saturday's march, demonstrators wore large bar codes taped to their mouths, as if free trade meant turning them into speechless numbers. How droll! These demonstrators were certainly, and perhaps proudly, carrying in their wallets government-imposed Social Security numbers, drivers' licenses and Medicare cards, which, surely, have made them numbered state cattle. Another fabulous irony: American would-be demonstrators complained about being denied entry into Canada, while their entire message is predicated on tighter borders.

Once we realize that free trade is but the individual's liberty to exchange across political borders, it is easy to see that forbidding it requires punishment or threats of punishment. You have to fine or jail the importer who doesn't abide by trade restrictions. In FTAA debates as in other trade issues, a source of much confusion is the failure to realize that free trade is a consequence of individual sovereignty.

## HONORING THE LATE DR. CHARLES TEISSIER FREY

### HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I ask this body to pause for a moment and pay respects to one of the great citizens of the Western Slope of Colorado. On March 27, Dr. Charles Teissier Frey passed away. He was 83 years old. His passing is a great loss to the community of Cedaredge, Colorado. Dr. Frey is survived by his four sons, Larry, Robert, William, Stephen, his five grandchildren, wife Ada Lewis, and his sister, Evelyn.

Dr. Frey has been a member of the community since 1947. Before moving to Colorado, Dr. Frey attended Tulane University and Louisiana State University Medical School where he learned to be a doctor. In 1942, he joined the U.S. Army as a physician. Dr. Frey was a member of the American Board of Family Practice and the American Academy of Family Physicians. He has been given numerous honors, awards and distinctions as well as the National Rural Health Practitioner of the Year for 1987.

While in Cedaredge, Dr. Frey served on the Town Council for eight years. He also served as a volunteer with Project HOPE, were he worked on a Navajo Reservation in Belize, British Honduras and Taiwan. He was also a member of the Cedaredge Community Church.

In the late 60's, Dr. Frey gathered a group of acquaintances and friends to arrange funding for a nursing home which would be dedicated to maximum service and minimum profit. For 15 years the Horizons Nursing Home paid no dividends and no fees to the Board of Directors, while serving seniors admirably.

Mr. Speaker, the community of Cedaredge and Dr. Frey's family will miss him greatly. He has done so much for the community, that's why I would to take a moment and honor Dr. Charles Teissier Frey. He is a great American and distinguished Coloradoan who will be greatly missed.

## TRIBUTE HONORING DOCTOR GORDON GILBERT

### HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment and pay special tribute to a very special person. Doctor Gordon Gilbert, a professor of physics at Mesa State College for over 20 years who has seen and done a lot in his lifetime. It is with this life of service that I would now like to recognize.

After receiving his masters degree from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Dr. Gilbert went on to work for the Apollo Space Project at NASA. He was part of the team involved with the lunar landing. When that program finished, he went back to MIT to earn his doctorate. When he finished school, the University of Arizona offered him a faculty position, where he spent 10 years observing and researching galaxies and quasars from the new Kitt Peak National Observatory.

Dr. Gilbert's dream has always been to teach, and that finally came true in 1980, when a small liberal arts college in Colorado hired him and a group of distinguished colleagues to build their physics program, which today is cutting edge. Dr. Gilbert has an unusual but highly successful style in his classes. He has been known to show up as Isaac Newton, Galileo, or Albert Einstein.

Dr. Gilbert has continued to teach and do research while battling prostate cancer for the last 10 years. ''I'm told I have about three more years. I've been told that every other year since 1992.'' Despite all he has accomplished, his greatest gift is being a dad to his three kids, Beth, James, and Thomas. ''It may be true. I don't laugh at it. I don't take it for granted. But I do know the roses have never smelled sweeter.''

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Gilbert has done a lot for science, space exploration and his students. And despite having cancer, he is still giving it his all in the classroom and with his family. I applaud, Gordon and all that he has accomplished in his lifetime, and I want to thank him and wish him all the best in the future.

## TRIBUTE TO COLORADO STATE SENATOR JIM DYER

### HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker. I would like to take this opportunity to thank Colorado State Senator Jim Dyer of Durango for his years of service to the State of Colorado and to wish him good luck in his new position. Senator Dyer has accepted a nomination by Colorado Governor Bill Owens to join the Colorado Public Utilities Commission. Although the State Senate will miss Jim greatly, I know that Jim's leadership and service to the State of Colorado will continue with the PUC.

Senator Dyer has been a member of the State Legislature for 15 years serving in the House for 12 years and the Senate for 3 years. He was first elected to the House in 1986, and then in 1998 he was elected to the state Senate. He served as the chair of Agriculture and Natural Resources Committee, as well as on the Veterans and Military Relations Committee and the Transportaiton Committee. ''I think we've all been served well by Jim. Regardless of the fact we're of different political parties, he's a good friend of mine. . . . Jim has always taken a strong stance for us locally. Jim has never lost the viewpoint that small government is important to the process,'' said County Commissioner Fred Klatt.

Senator Dyer has also had a distinguished career in the military. Senator Dyer served in the U.S. Navy from 1959–1964 and the U.S. Marines from 1964–1979 with three tours of duty in Vietnam. During his years in the military, Senator Dyer was recognized with the Soldiers Medal, three Bronze Stars, the Air Medal, the Gallantry Cross with Palm (Republic of Vietnam), and the Order of Military Merit (Republic of Korea).

In his spare time, Senator Dyer is involved as a member of the VFW, the American Legion, the National Rifle Association, and the

Durango Historical Society. ''I feel he has been a very fine Senator and represented our area very well. He has always been responsive to our needs and responsive when he could do things for us at the state level,'' said Mayor Jim Shepard.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate Senator Jim Dyer on his new position and wish his good luck in the future. He will be missed in the state legislature.

Mr. Speaker, Senator Dyer is a person of high integrity and honor. I consider it a privilege to have known and worked with him.

Jim has served the State of Colorado well in the state Senate and I know he will continue that record of leadership in his new capacity with the Colorado Public Utilities Commission.

## TRIBUTE TO SENATOR GINETTE (GIGI) DENNIS

### HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mr. MCINNIS Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to thank Colorado State Senator Gigi Dennis for her years of service to the State of Colorado and to wish her good luck in her new position. Senator Gigi has served in the Colorado State Senate since 1995, but is resigning at the end of the month to accepted an appointment from President George W. Bush to become the Colorado Director of the Department of Agriculture's Office of Rural Development. ''I'm proud of her,'' said her husband Dean Dennis. ''I'm proud of her accomplishments.'' I know that Gigi's friends and neighbors in south-central Colorado, her colleagues in the Colorado legislature, and elected officials all across Colorado—including me—share Dean's sentiments. We are all proud of Gigi!

Senator Dennis has held numerous positions of real significance during her seven years in office, including Vice Chair of the Transportation Committee, a Member of the Legislative Council and Chairman of the Majority Caucus. Senator Dennis also served as the Rio Grande County Republican Secretary. Additionally, she served as a member of the State Accountability Commission on Education, and the Vice Chairman of the Education Committee (NCSL).

Senator Dennis summed up her feelings like this: ''This resignation is not like walking away from my constituents, but creating a bigger circle of people I can impact through this office. In the end, it doesn't make any difference who gets the credit or who wins the fight. . .but whether Colorado citizens are better off for what we do. I'm extremely honored that President Bush has selected me for this position. This is another terrific opportunity to continue to help the State of Colorado, particularly the rural areas that I've represented over the years.''

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate Senator Gigi Dennis on her new position and wish her good luck in the future. She will be missed in the state legislature.

Gigi has served the State of Colorado well in the state Senate and I know she will continue that record of leadership in her new capacity with the Department of Agriculture.

## HONORING OMI, WINNER OF THE MALCOLM BALDRIGE AWARD

### HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate, Operations Management International, Inc., one of the 2000 Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award winners. President Clinton presented the Malcolm Baldrige award to OMI. The award, first presented in 1988, recognizes US companies for business performance excellence and competitive improvement. It is the highest-level quality award given in the U.S.

The Baldrige Award evaluates organizations on seven performance excellence criteria: leadership, strategic planning, customer and market focus, information and analysis and human resource focus. This award recognizes organizations that play a major role in energizing our nation's economy and quality of life. OMI uses these criteria as a cornerstone for its ''Obsessed With Quality'' process. OMI is an employee-owned global leader in the management of water, wastewater and utility systems.

This is the first time that a water treatment company has won the Baldrige Award. OMI operates and maintains more than 160 public and private sector wastewater and water treatment facilities in 29 states and eight countries. Their primary services are processing raw wastewater to produce clean, environmentally safe effluent and processing raw groundwater and surface water to produce clean, safe drinking water.

''OMI began its quality journey in 1990 when we initiated our 'Obsessed with Quality' process. Winning the Baldrige Award demonstrates how our quality process continues to positively affect the millions of lives our people touch . . . My thanks to all OMI associates for a job well done,'' said OMI President Don S. Evans.

Mr. Speaker, OMI is helping our economy grow and is setting an example for other businesses to follow. I want to thank them and congratulate them for their continued success.

## HONORING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF WESTERN STATE COLLEGE

### HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to wish Western State College in Gunnison, Colorado a happy 100th birthday. Since 1901 Western State College has been a model of excellence. It is that record of achievement that I would now like to honor.

On April 16, 2001, then Governor James B. Orman signed a bill creating the Colorado State Normal School at Gunnison. This bill was a victory for the citizens of Gunnison, who would claim the first college west of the divide. This was the culmination of years of work on the part of Gunnison area citizens. Early efforts for a college came in 1885 when Archie M. Stevenson, a Gunnison resident and state senator for the district, introduced a bill in the Colorado General Assembly.

The cornerstone for the Normal School building was laid in October of 1910 with the first classes beginning in September of 1911. A total of 13 students attended classes taught by ten professors. In 1923 the college's name was changed to Western State College and it became a liberal arts college. Over the years Western has earned a reputation as a College whose faculty care deeply about teaching and working closely with the students.

Western State College has developed strong academic programs in many areas and have attracted faculty with degrees from all over the world. Western's biology program has received a ''Program of Excellence'' award from the Colorado Commission on Higher Education. In 1975, Western's Water Workshop began, and continues to attract participants from around this region to work on one of west's most pressing issues.

Western has recently opened a state of the art $9 million science building, making it one of the most sophisticated science facilities in the state. Its athletic department has placed in the top 10 nationally over the past few years in the Sears Cup for outstanding Division II schools.

Mr. Speaker, for 100 years, Western State College has continued to excel in its educational mission. I would like Congress to praise the institution for its outstanding accomplishments and wish it continued success and another 100 years of excellence.

## TRIBUTE HONORING THE WINERY

### HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, April 24, 2001*

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize two of Grand Junction's leading restaurateurs and an outstanding dining establishment. After 28 years, Winery owner Frank Bering is retiring from the business, turning over the reins to Chris Blackburn who recently purchased this long-time staple of Main Street eateries. I would now like to pay tribute to both of these outstanding individuals and a wonderful restaurant known throughout western Colorado—The Winery.

Frank founded The Winery 28 years ago after he moved to the Western Slope from Chicago. Frank decided Grand Junction needed a good restaurant after he ordered a glass of red wine, which was served chilled instead of room temperature. With the help of Grand Junction residents, Frank opened The Winery. ''I'm bittersweet about it, but I'm going on to a new life,'' Frank said in a recent Grand Junction Daily Sentinel story about leaving the business.

Frank's restaurant did very well, thanks both to great food and the oil and uranium boom of the late 70's and early 80's. It was then that Frank decided to open up G.B. Gladstone's, and managed to keep it going through the economic bust of the 80's. My good friend Chris Blackburn, who recently bought Gladstone's as well, views Frank as a pioneer who saw potential where no one else did. According to John Moss, another restaurant owner and personal friend of mine, Frank did more

than build a reputation and make a living—he changed the culture and the community of Grand Junction.

Mr. Speaker, both Frank and Chris deserve the thanks and commendations of this body. As Frank moves on to new pursuits, we say thank you for your hard work and service. As Chris takes the helm at one of Grand Junction's best known restaurants, we say best wishes for continued success.

# *Daily Digest*

# Senate

## *Chamber Action*

***Routine Proceedings, pages S3797–S3866***

**Measures Introduced:** Thirteen bills and three resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 758–770, S.J. Res. 13, S. Res. 72, and S. Con. Res. 33.

**Pages S3851–52**

**Measures Reported:**

S. 763, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow tax-free expenditures from education individual retirement accounts for elementary and secondary school expenses, to increase the maximum annual amount of contributions to such accounts. (S. Rept. No. 107–12) **Page S3851**

**Measures Passed:**

***Printing Authority:*** Committee on Rules and Administration was discharged from further consideration of H. Con. Res. 66, authorizing the printing of a revised and updated version of the House document entitled "Women in Congress, 1917–1990", and the resolution was then agreed to. **Page S3866**

**Executive Communications:** **Pages S3848–51**

**Statements on Introduced Bills:** **Pages S3855–64**

**Additional Cosponsors:** **Pages S3852–55**

**Additional Statements:** **Pages S3845–47**

**Notices of Hearings:** **Page S3865**

**Authority for Committees:** **Pages S3865–66**

**Privileges of the Floor:** **Page S3866**

**Adjournment:** Senate met at 9:30 a.m., and adjourned at 6:05 p.m., until 9:30 a.m., on Wednesday, April 25, 2001. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S3866.)

## *Committee Meetings*

*(Committees not listed did not meet)*

### APPROPRIATIONS—BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

*Committee on Appropriations:* Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development concluded hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2002 for the Central Utah Project (CUP) Completion Act and the Bureau of Reclamation of the Department of the Interior, after receiving testimony from J. William McDonald, Regional Director, Pacific Northwest Region, Bureau of Reclamation, and J. Ronald Johnston, Program Director, CUP Completion Act Office, both of the Department of the Interior.

### APPROPRIATIONS—INTERIOR

*Committee on Appropriations:* Subcommittee on Interior concluded hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2002 for the Department of the Interior, after receiving testimony from Gale A. Norton, Secretary of the Interior, who was accompanied by several of her associates.

### APPROPRIATIONS—ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

*Committee on Appropriations:* Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development concluded hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2002 for the Army Corps of Engineers, after receiving testimony from Claudia L. Tornblom, Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army for Management and Budget/Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works; and Lt. Gen. Robert B. Flowers, USA, Commander/Chief of Engineers, Maj. Gen. Hans A. Van Winkle, USA, Deputy Commanding General for Civil Works, and Rob Vining, Chief, Programs Management Division, Directorate of Civil Works, all of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

### BUSINESS MEETING

*Committee on Armed Services:* Committee met in closed session to consider certain pending nominations.

### NOMINATIONS

*Committee on Armed Services:* Committee concluded hearings on the nominations of Dov S. Zakheim, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary (Comptroller), Charles S. Abell, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary for Force Management Policy, and Victoria Clarke, of Maryland, to be Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs, all of the Department of Defense. Mr. Zakheim was introduced by Senator Reed, Mr. Abell

was introduced by Senator Hutchinson, and Ms. Clarke was introduced by Senator McCain.

## RECRUITING INITIATIVES

*Committee on Armed Services:* Subcommittee on Personnel concluded hearings on recruiting initiatives of the Department of Defense and the military services and to receive an update on the status of recruiting and retention goals, after receiving testimony from Lt. Gen. Timothy J. Maude, USA, Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel; Vice Adm. Norbert R. Ryan, Jr., USN, Chief of Naval Personnel; Maj. Gen. Terrance P. Murray, USMC, Acting Deputy Chief of Staff for Manpower and Reserve Affairs; Lt. Gen. Donald L. Peterson, USAF, Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel; Maj. Gen. Dennis D. Cavin, USA, Commander, United States Army Recruiting Command; Rear Adm. George E. Voelker, USN, Commander, United States Navy Recruiting Command; Maj. Gen. Gary L. Parks, USMC, Commander, United States Marine Corps Recruiting Command; Brig. Gen. Paul Hankins, USAF, Commandant, Air Force Officer Accession and Training Schools, Maxwell AFB; and SFC Lindsey Streeter, USA, YNI (SW/AW) Sherry Strothers, USN, GSgt. Alexander Rodriguez, USMC, and Senior Airman Eric Ramos Rodriguez, all Enlisted Recruiters.

## BUSINESS MEETING

*Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:* Committee ordered favorably reported S. 206, to repeal the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935, to enact the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 2001, with amendments.

## NOMINATIONS

*Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:* Committee concluded hearings on the nominations of Grant D. Aldonas, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary for International Trade, Kenneth I. Juster, of the District of Columbia, to be Under Secretary for Export Administration, Maria Cino, of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary and Director General of the United States and Foreign Commercial Service, all of the Department of Commerce, and Robert Glenn Hubbard, of New York, to be a Member of the Council of Economic Advisers, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf. Ms. Cino was introduced by Senators Santorum and Schumer, and Mr. Hubbard was introduced by Senator Schumer.

## CHILD PASSENGER SAFETY

*Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:* Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs, Foreign Commerce, and Tourism concluded hearings to examine what measure may be needed to improve child passenger safety as they graduate from child safety seats to adult seatbelts, focusing on the benefits of the use of booster seats by children between the ages of four and eight years old, after receiving testimony from L. Robert Shelton, Executive Director, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation; Elaine B. Weinstein, Acting Director, Office of Safety Recommendations and Accomplishments, National Transportation Safety Board; Flaura Koplin Winston, University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine, Philadelphia, on behalf of the Children's Hospital of Philadelphia; Kyran P. Quinlan, University of Chicago Department of Pediatrics, Chicago, Illinois; Judith Lee Stone, Advocates for Highway and Auto Safety, and Heather Paul, national Safe Kids Campaign, both of Washington, D.C.; Adrian K. Lund, Insurance Institute for Highway Safety, Arlington, Virginia; James Vondale, Ford Motor Company, Dearborn, Michigan; Tom Baloga, Britax Child Safety, Inc., Charlotte, North Carolina; and Autumn Alexander Skeen, Walla Walla, Washington.

## NASA AERONAUTICAL RESEARCH

*Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:* Subcommittee on Science, Technology, and Space held hearings to examine the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's aeronautics research program funding requirements, receiving testimony from Senator Warner; Representative Goode; Daniel S. Goldin, Administrator, and Jeremiah F. Creedon, Director, Langley Research Center, both of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; Edward M. Bolen, General Aviation Manufacturers Association, Washington, D.C.; Dennis Deel, Lockheed Martin Space Systems Company, New Orleans, Louisiana; Roy V. Harris, Jr., NASA Aeronautics Support Team, Hampton, Virginia; and David O. Swain, Boeing Company, Seattle, Washington.

Hearings recessed subject to call.

## MEDICARE REFORM AND PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

*Committee on Finance:* Committee continued hearings to examine prescription drug options currently available to Medicare beneficiaries and necessary reforms to expand prescription drug coverage, receiving testimony from Steven M. Coppock, Hewitt Associates, Rowayton, Connecticut; Karen M. Ignagni, American Association of Health Plans, Deborah J. Chollet, Mathematica Policy Research, Inc., and Raymond C. Scheppach, National Governors Association, all of Washington, D.C.; and Stephen Crystal, Rutgers University Institute for Health, Health Care Policy, and Aging Research, New Brunswick, New Jersey.

Hearings recessed subject to call.

**SMALL BUSINESS RIGHTS**

*Committee on Small Business:* Committee held hearings to examine the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act and the protection of small business rights, receiving testimony from Victor Rezendes, Managing Director, Strategic Issues Team, General Accounting Office; Shawne Carter McGibbon, Acting Director, Interagency Affairs, Office of Advocacy, U.S. Small Business Administration; Thomas J. Gibson, Associate Administrator for Policy, Economics and Innovation, Environmental Protection Agency; Margaret F. Hayes, Assistant General Counsel for Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce; Todd McCracken, National Small Business United, Washington, D.C.; Tim Kalinowski, Foam Supplies, Inc., Earth City, Missouri; Paul J. Corey, Paul J. Corey Painting and Decorating, Dedham, Massachusetts, on behalf of the Painting and Decorating Contractors of America; and Hubert Potter, Hobucken, North Carolina.

Hearings recessed subject to call.

# House of Representatives

## *Chamber Action*

**Bills Introduced:** 38 public bills, H.R. 1540–1577; 2 private bills, H.R. 1578–1579; and 4 resolutions, H. Con. Res 105 and H. Res. 120–122, were introduced. **Pages H1554–56**

**Reports Filed:** Reports were filed as follows:

Filed on April 20, H.R. 503, to amend title 18, United States Code, and the Uniform Code of Military Justice to protect unborn children from assault and murder, amended (H. Rept. 107–42, Pt. 1);

Filed on April 20, H.J. Res. 41, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to tax limitations, amended (H. Rept. 107–43);

Filed on April 20, H.R. 1209, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to determine whether an alien is a child, for purposes of classification as an immediate relative, based on the age of the alien on the date the classification petition with respect to the alien is filed, amended (H. Rept. 107–45);

Filed on April 20, H.R. 863, to provide grants to ensure increased accountability for juvenile offenders, amended (H. Rept. 107–46);

Filed on April 20, H.R. 392, for the relief of Nancy B. Wilson, amended (H. Rept. 107–44);

Filed on April 20, H.R. 1209, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to determine whether an alien is a child, for purposes of classification as an immediate relative, based on the age of the alien on the date the classification petition with respect to the alien is filed (H. Rept. 107–45);

Filed on April 20, H.R. 863, to provide grants to ensure increased accountability for juvenile offenders, amended (H. Rept. 107–46);

H.R. 146, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating the Great Falls Historic District in Paterson, New Jersey, as a unit of the National Park System (H. Rept. 107–47);

H.R. 309, to provide for the determination of withholding tax rates under the Guam income tax (H. Rept. 107–48);

H. Res. 118, providing for consideration of H.J. Res. 41, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to tax limitations (H. Rept. 107–49); and

H. Res. 119, providing for consideration of H.R. 503, to amend title 18, United States Code, and the Uniform Code of Military Justice to protect unborn children from assault and murder (H. Rept. 107–50). **Page H1554**

**Guest Chaplain:** The prayer was offered by the Guest Chaplain, Rev. Michael Cronin of Winona, Minnesota. **Page H1501**

**United States—China Security Review Commission:** The Chair announced the Speaker's appointment of Mr. Stephen D. Bryen of Maryland, Ms. June Teufel Dreyer of Florida, and Mr. James R. Lilley of Maryland to the United States—China Security Review Commission. **Page H1502**

**Suspensions:** The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

***Taiwan Participation in the World Health Organization:*** H.R. 428, amended, concerning the participation of Taiwan in the World Health Organization (passed by a yea-and-nay vote of 407 yeas with none voting "nay", Roll No. 86); and **Pages H1503–06, H1515–16**

***Increase the Peace Day:*** H. Res. 113, urging the House of Representatives to support events such as the "Increase the Peace Day." **Pages H1506–07**

**Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 2002:** The House disagreed with the Senate amendment to H.

Con. Res. 83, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2002, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2011 and agreed to a conference. **Pages H1507–15**

Subsequently appointed as conferees: Chairman Nussle and Representatives Nussle and Spratt. **Page H1515**

By a yea-and-nay vote of 200 yeas to 207 nays, Roll No. 85, rejected the Spratt motion to instruct conferees to (1) increase the funding for education in the House resolution to provide for the maximum feasible funding; (2) provide that the costs of coverage for prescription drugs under Medicare not be taken from the surplus of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund; (3) increase the funding provided for Medicare prescription drug coverage to the level set by the Senate amendment; and (4) insist that the on-budget surplus set forth in the resolution for any fiscal year not be less than the surplus of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund for that fiscal year. **Pages H1507–15**

**Recess:** The House recessed at 2:40 p.m. and reconvened at 5:07 p.m. **Page H1507**

**Senate Messages:** Message received from the Senate appears on page H1501.

**Quorum Calls Votes:** Two yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of the House today and appear on pages H1514–15 and H1515–16. There were no quorum calls.

**Adjournment:** The House met at 12:30 p.m. and adjourned at 10:57 p.m.

# *Committee Meetings*

## LABOR, HHS AND EDUCATION APPROPRIATIONS

*Committee on Appropriations:* Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services and Education, held a hearing on Howard University, Gallaudet University, National Technical Institute for the Deaf and American Printing House for the Blind. Testimony was heard from H. Patrick Swygert, President, Howard University; I. King Jordan, President, Gallaudet University; Robert R. Davila, Vice President, National Technical Institute for the Deaf; and Tuck Tinsley, President, American Printing House for the Blind.

## PAPERWORK INFLATION—PAST FAILURES AND FUTURE PLANS

*Committee on Government Reform:* Subcommittee on Energy Policy, Natural Resources and Regulatory Affairs held a hearing on ''Paperwork Inflation—Past Failures and Future Plans.'' Testimony was heard from Charles O. Rossotti, Commissioner, IRS, Department of the Treasury; J. Christopher Mihm, Director, Governmentwide Management Issues, GAO; Austin Smythe, Executive Associate Director, OMB; and public witnesses.

## OVERSIGHT

*Committee on the Judiciary:* Subcommittee on the Constitution held an oversight hearing on ''State and Local Implementation of Existing Charitable Choice Programs.'' Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

## UNBORN VICTIMS OF VIOLENCE ACT

*Committee on Rules:* Granted, by voice vote, a modified closed rule providing two hours of debate on H.R. 503, Unborn Victims of Violence Act of 2001. The rule provides that the amendment printed in the Rules Committee report shall be considered as adopted. The rule makes in order the amendment printed in the Congressional Record and numbered 1, if offered by Representative Lofgren of California or her designee, which shall be considered as read and shall be separately debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. Testimony was heard from Chairman Sensenbrenner.

## TAX LIMITATIONS—CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

*Committee on Rules:* Granted, by voice vote, a modified closed rule providing two hours of debate on H.J. Res. 41, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to tax limitations. The rule provides for an amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the Congressional Record if offered by the Minority Leader or his designee, which shall be considered as read and shall be separately debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. Testimony was heard from Chairman Sensenbrenner.

## OVERSIGHT—COMBATING TERRORISM

*Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure:* Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings and Emergency Management and the Subcommittee on National Security, Veteran's Affairs and International Relations of the Committee on Government Reform held a joint oversight hearing on Combating Terrorism: Options to Improve the Federal Response, focusing on the following bills: H.R. 525, Preparedness Against Domestic Terrorism

Act of 2001; H.R. 1158, National Homeland Security Strategy Act; and H.R. 1292, Homeland Security Strategy Act of 2001. Testimony was heard from Representatives Gilchrest, Thornberry and Skelton; Raymond Decker, Director, Diffuse for Threat Issues, Defense Capabilities and Management Team; GAO; William Ellis, Senior Specialist, American National Government and Public Administration, Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress; Gen. Charles G. Boyd, USAF (Ret.), Executive Director, U.S. Commission on National Security for the 21st Century; and public witnesses.

## PATIENT PROTECTIONS IN MANAGED CARE

*Committee on Ways and Means:* Subcommittee on Health held a hearing on Patient Protections in Managed Care. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

## COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, APRIL 25, 2001

*(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)*

### Senate

*Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry:* to hold hearings on agricultural trade issues, 9:30 a.m., SR–328A.

*Committee on Appropriations:* Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, to hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2002 for the Department of Health and Human Services, 9 a.m., SD–124.

Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies, to hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2002 for the Corporation for National and Community Service and the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation, 10 a.m., SD–138.

Subcommittee on Defense, to hold hearings on chemical demilitarization, 10 a.m., SD–192.

Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2002 for the Department of Agriculture, 1:30 p.m., SD–138.

*Committee on Armed Services:* Subcommittee on Strategic, to hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 2002 for the Department of Defense and the Future Years Defense Program, focusing on the National Nuclear Security Administration, 2:30 p.m., SR–232A.

*Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:* Subcommittee on Housing and Transportation, to hold hearings to examine the Department of Housing and Urban Development's program, budget, and management priorities for fiscal year 2002, 10 a.m., SD–538.

*Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:* to hold hearings on the nomination of Brenda L. Becker, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs; and the nomination of Michael P. Jackson, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of Transportation; to be followed by hearings to examine labor problems facing the airline industry today, focusing on the balance between labor and management in negotiations as well as the effect of a strike at a major airline on the aviation system and the consumer, 9:30 a.m., SR–253.

Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs, Foreign Commerce, and Tourism, to hold hearings to examine west coast gas prices in comparison to other parts of the country, 2:30 p.m., SR–253.

*Committee on Finance:* to hold hearings to examine Medicare and social security benefits relative to prisoners, fugitives, the deceased and other ineligibles, 10 a.m., SD–215.

*Committee on Foreign Relations:* to hold hearings on the nomination of Andrew S. Natsios, of Massachusetts, to be Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, 10:30 a.m., SD–419.

Full Committee, to hold hearings on the nomination of Lincoln P. Bloomfield, Jr., of Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary of State (Political-Military Affairs); the nomination of Paula J. Dobriansky, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of State (Global Affairs); and the nomination of Richard Nathan Haass, of Maryland, for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of Service as Director, Policy Planning Staff, Department of State, 2 p.m., SD–419.

*Committee on the Judiciary:* to hold hearings to examine certain issues surrounding the use of polygraphs, 10 a.m., SD–226.

### House

*Committee on Agriculture,* to continue hearings on Federal Farm Commodity Programs, 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Conservation, Credit, Rural Development, hearing to review energy supply and demand issues affecting the agricultural sector of the U.S. economy, 2 p.m., 1300 Longworth.

*Committee on Appropriations,* Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies, on Budget Overview and Foreign Agricultural Service (International Programs), 9:30 a.m., 2362–A Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State and Judiciary, on Members of Congress, 10 a.m., H–309 Capitol.

Subcommittee on Defense, executive, on NSA, 9:30 a.m., H–405 Capitol.

Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, on U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 10 a.m., 2362–B Capitol.

Subcommittee on Interior, on the Secretary of the Interior, 10 a.m., B–308 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services and Education, on the Secretary of Education, 10 a.m., 2358 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Transportation, on the Secretary of Transportation, 10 a.m., 2358 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service and General Government, on U.S. Customs Service, 10 a.m., and on

Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms, 2 p.m., H–143 Capitol.

Subcommittee on VA, HUD and Independent Agencies, on the Department of Veterans Affairs, 9:30 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

*Committee on Energy and Commerce,* hearing H.R. 1542, Internet Freedom and Broadband Deployment Act of 2001, 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

*Committee on Financial Services,* Subcommittee on International Monetary Policy and Trade, hearing on U.S. Policy towards the African Development Bank and the African Development Fund, 1:30 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

*Committee on Government Reform,* hearing on ''Autism—Why the Increased Rates?—A One Year Update,'' 11 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

*Committee on House Administration,* hearing on Election Reform, 10 a.m., 1310 Longworth.

*Committee on International Relations,* Subcommittee on East Asia and the Pacific, hearing on After Hainan: Next Steps for US–China Relations, 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Europe, hearing on The U.S.-European Relationship: Opportunities and Challenges, 1:45 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

*Committee on Resources,* Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, oversight hearing on ''BLM and Forest Service Oil and Gas Permitting,'' 2 p.m., 1324 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Forests and Forest Health, hearing on the following bills: H.R. 427, to provide further protections for the watershed of the Little Sandy River as part of the Bull Run Watershed Management Unit, Oregon; H.R. 434, to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into a cooperative agreement to provide for retention, maintenance, and operation, at private expense, of the 18 concrete dams and weirs located within the boundaries of the Emigrant Wilderness in the Stanlislaus National Forest, California; and H.R. 451, to make certain adjustments to the boundaries of the Mount Nebo Wilderness Area, 3 p.m., 1334 Longworth.

*Committee on Science,* hearing on Proposed R&D Budget for 2002, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

*Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure,* Subcommittee on Aviation, oversight hearing on FAA's Capacity Benchmarks, 2 p.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Railroads, oversight hearing on Railroad Infrastructure Policy, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

*Committee on Ways and Means,* to mark up H.R. 10, Comprehensive Retirement Security and Pension Reform Act of 2001, 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

*Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence*, executive, briefing on Hot Spots, 2 p.m., H–405 Capitol.

## Joint Meetings

*Conference:* meeting of conferees on H. Con. Res. 83, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2002, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2003 through 2011, 2:30 p.m., S–301, Capitol.

*Next Meeting of the* SENATE

9:30 a.m., Wednesday, April 25

Senate Chamber

**Program for Wednesday:** After the recognition of two Senators for speeches and the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 11 a.m.), Senate may begin consideration of S. 1, to extend programs and activities under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

*Next Meeting of the* HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Wednesday, April 25

House Chamber

**Program for Wednesday:** Consideration of H.J. Res. 41, Tax Limitation Constitutional Amendment (modified closed rule, two hours of debate).

## Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Ackerman, Gary L., N.Y., E613, E618
Baca, Joe, Calif., E617
Baker, Richard H., La., E612
Baldwin, Tammy, Wisc., E598
Becerra, Xavier, Calif., E618
Berman, Howard L., Calif., E589, E592
Biggert, Judy, Ill., E593
Blunt, Roy, Mo., E613
Brady, Robert A., Pa., E617
Capps, Lois, Calif., E589, E591, E593
Castle, Michael N., Del., E594
Davis, Tom, Va., E589, E591, E593
Eshoo, Anna G., Calif., E596
Evans, Lane, Ill., E609
Farr, Sam, Calif., E590, E591
Hart, Melissa A., Pa., E616
Horn, Stephen, Calif., E614
Hutchinson, Asa, Ark., E595
Inslee, Jay, Wash., E599
John, Christopher, La., E618
Kanjorski, Paul E., Pa., E606
Kaptur, Marcy, Ohio, E611
Kennedy, Patrick J., R.I., E596, E606
Kleczka, Gerald D., Wisc., E608
Kucinich, Dennis J., Ohio, E590, E592
LaFalce, John J., N.Y., E607
Largent, Steve, Okla., E599
Lofgren, Zoe, Calif., E594
Luther, Bill, Minn., E595
McCollum, Betty, Minn., E611
McInnis, Scott, Colo., E619, E620, E620, E620, E621, E621, E621, E621
Maloney, Carolyn B., N.Y., E605, E606
Markey, Edward J., Mass., E596
Menendez, Robert, N.J., E590, E592
Miller, George, Calif., E599
Moran, James P., Va., E595
Neal, Richard E., Mass., E591, E592
Ney, Robert W., Ohio, E604, E605, E606
Oxley, Michael G., Ohio, E605
Paul, Ron, Tex., E619
Pelosi, Nancy, Calif., E614, E618
Rahall, Nick J., II, W.Va., E617
Reynolds, Thomas M., N.Y., E593
Rothman, Steven R., N.J., E605, E610, E612, E613
Scarborough, Joe, Fla., E605
Sensenbrenner, F. James, Jr., Wisc., E594
Slaughter, Louise McIntosh, N.Y., E612
Stearns, Cliff, Fla., E609
Tancredo, Thomas G., Colo., E590, E592
Thomas, William M., Calif., E607
Thurman, Karen L., Fla., E598
Udall, Mark, Colo., E614
Underwood, Robert A., Guam, E608
Wamp, Zach, Tenn., E616
Waxman, Henry A., Calif., E589
Wolf, Frank R., Va., E609
Woolsey, Lynn C., Calif., E594

**Congressional Record** The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed at one time. ¶Public access to the Congressional Record is available online through *GPO Access,* a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. The online database is updated each day the Congressional Record is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d session (January 1994) forward. It is available through GPO Access at www.gpo.gov/gpoaccess. Customers can also access this information with WAIS client software, via telnet at swais.access.gpo.gov, or dial-in using communications software and a modem at (202) 512–1661. Questions or comments regarding this database or GPO Access can be directed to the GPO Access User Support Team at: E-Mail: gpoaccess@gpo.gov; Phone 1–888–293–6498 (toll-free), 202–512–1530 (D.C. area); Fax: 202–512–1262. The Team's hours of availability are Monday through Friday, 7:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m., Eastern Standard Time, except Federal holidays. ¶The Congressional Record paper and 24x microfiche will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, $197.00 for six months, $393.00 per year, or purchased for $4.00 per issue, payable in advance; microfiche edition, $141.00 per year, or purchased for $1.50 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly Congressional Record Index may be purchased for the same per issue prices. To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250–7954, or phone orders to (202) 512–1800, or fax to (202) 512–2250. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily Congressional Record is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the Congressional Record.