that I reserve on behalf of the Republican majority. And, specifically, for those Members of the Theme Team and any Member of the Republican Conference that has anything to discuss this evening, I invite them to come down to the floor now and join me in the next hour in discussing topics relative to our majority agenda on the House floor.

That agenda, of course, includes an effort to save and secure a retirement security system through Social Security and Medicare. It also involves our efforts to reduce the tax burden on the American people. The third item is to build the strongest national defense in the country, in the world, one that allows for complete security for our Nation and for our children, and the third effort is to try to create the best education system on the planet.

Those are three goals towards which we are working vigorously, and hoping to accomplish and achieve.

I want to start out by talking about a fifth topic, one that is important to my constituents and one that is fresh on my mind, just coming back from a weekend of visiting with constituents. The topic back home was the Endangered Species Act.

The Committee on Resources has a special event that has just visited Colorado and held a hearing in the town of Greeley. We had a great hearing. One of our colleagues, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. Udall), was able to come up to Greeley and join us, as well as one of the members of the Senate, Senator Campbell. Also, the fourth member of that group was the chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. Pombo).

We had a great hearing. We heard from many, many people involved in agriculture in Colorado, and those who are involved in the business of wildlife management and the science of trying to preserve and protect endangered species, and prevent certain species from becoming listed on that list.

We also heard from a number of individuals from environmental groups. But the consensus clearly was that the Endangered Species Act is broken and needs to be fixed; that the act needs to be addressed in wholesale fashion and dramatically reformed.

It is very clear that the notion of protecting and preserving endangered species is a good one, and one that ought to be maintained. It is a noble goal, a worthwhile goal. It is a public goal.

The unfortunate consequence, however, of the Endangered Species Act is that the individual who happens to find one of these species on his or her property bears the almost exclusive burden in shedding the cost of protecting and preserving and achieving this public goal of species recovery. That is the unfortunate part of it. It is the unfair part of the Endangered Species Act.

Once again, I want to suggest that those we heard from in Colorado, from the farming and ranching community, from those who represent municipalities, as well, we heard from a county commissioner, a State legislator, all of these people really and truly believe that we ought to do everything we can to protect and preserve species, and we certainly do not want to see them go extinct as a result of any human activity.

But they also understand the importance of a local perspective in achieving a strategy to secure these public goals of species recovery and protection of species.

We heard from a county commissioner, for example, Kathay Reynolds, the county commissioner in Lamberton County, who was disappointed that the Fish and Wildlife Service did not reach out enough to her constituency in devising the rules to protect a mouse, a mouse called the Prebles Meadow Jumping Mouse. This was a mouse that looks just like the Western Jumping Mouse that is a more hardy variety in Colorado.

The mouse has been listed. Let me say that the mouse seems to like water. It hangs out around rivers and streams and irrigation ditches, which in the West is critical in a semi-arid region such as ours when it comes to agriculture. So the mouse likes to be around the water and in the tall grass around the water.

If you happen to find a mouse, one of these Prebles Meadow Jumping Mice in and around your property, your life is about to change, because under the proposed rules by the Fish and Wildlife Service, that means that you can no longer maintain your irrigation canals and ditches. It means that, in many cases, you may have to divert your water and use it in a way that is not conducive to sound agricultural practices.

It also means that again, in an area where water rights, where we fight very hard for water rights, that this has the ability to disrupt the allocation of such a scarce resource.

We heard from many other individuals, but there was a very good one, one that is very, very important to the West. We heard about other species, the mountain plover, the blacktailed prairie dog, and other species that are proposed to be listed in Colorado.

I want to thank the Committee on Resources, its leadership under the chairman, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. Young), as well as the chairman of the task force, the gentleman from California, for coming out to Colorado and bringing so much national attention on a big problem in our part of the country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. Hill).

Mr. Hill of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding to me.

While he and I both serve on the Committee on Resources, I was unable to join the gentleman in Colorado over the weekends. But there is no question that the Endangered Species Act is having a very dramatic and in some instances, a devastating impact on our rural communities.

Obviously, it impacts rural areas because rural areas is where habitat involving endangered species exists. But what we know now is that it operates in an unfair fashion, particularly with private property owners. But even the impact that it has on the management of public lands, it is unfair, and it is also ineffective.

We know now that has been having an adverse impact on what the objective is, which is of course to protect species, because the incentives in the Endangered Species Act certainly are such that if one does harms on one's property, it is best not to do that. So the incentive is for people to change habitat.

Also one of the huge issues associated with the Endangered Species Act is the fact that the States have responsibility for managing wildlife. That has been the tradition in this country. In the Endangered Species Act, the Federal Government has taken the dominant role, overriding the authority of the States.

What we see happening is that we are managing for a single species, which is having an adverse impact on other species. In other words, the Endangered Species Act focuses all the resources on a single species, and the broad ecology is secondary to the protection of that species.

So there are a number of reforms we need to make. One is to restore the responsibility and authority of the States, to allow for agreements with private property owners in managing their property for broad species protection, and also to make sure that people who lose the use of their property are appropriately compensated for it.

While I missed this meeting, I certainly agree that we need to reform the Endangered Species Act.

Mr. Schaffer. Farmers and ranchers are really having a tough time of it right now, not only because of various regulatory policies, the Endangered Species Act, as implemented by the Fish and Wildlife Service, being among them, but several other matters, tax-related policies and trade issues, also.

But the topic of private property ownership in America is so central and essential to our way of life and our culture. It really is rural America, which in my opinion, is where we find the real soul of America. These are the same folks, the same spirit and mentality and motivation that in fact founded the country and have sustained our great Republic to this time.
Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank my friend from Colorado and my friend, the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. Speaker, as I listened to their words, I could not help but think of the irony of the current administration, who campaigned in 1992 under a slogan of putting people first. How ironic that is, in the wake of decisions by the administration that would seek to dilute what the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution says in its final clause.

I would like to ask my colleagues and those who join us to listen closely. The final clause of the Fifth Amendment to our Constitution says, "Nor shall private property be taken for public use without just compensation." And the irony of the assertion that the Clinton-Gore gang plan to put people first is exceeded only by the boastfulness of the current president in the inter regnum between his election and swearing in when he said that he would offer the most ethical administration in history.

The irony fairly drips from those words when today, Mr. Speaker, we came to this floor to debate the trade status of the People's Republic of China, mindful of the fact that Chinese shellfish, which is technically with American charters, had given money to the Clinton-Gore campaign in 1996; mindful also of the fact that for those of us from the West, from Colorado, Montana, and Arizona, it has been said that this administration has declared war on the West, on resource-based industries, on small family farms and ranches, on a way of life that is rapidly vanishing, hastened by the bureaucratic decisions of those who would seek to short-circuit this document.

Mr. Speaker, one is reminded of a slogan of putting people first. How ironic that is. But in this instance, this is not a slogan of putting people first, from the boastful claims of having the most ethical administration in history, to the reality of taking contributions from Chinese front corporations, to having a Vice President who, in violation of existing Federal law, sought campaign donations from his Executive Office Building location, not from the Democrat National Committee, and still had the audacity to claim that his legal counsel informed him that there is no controlling legal authority.

Mr. Speaker, I will say again for the record, to my colleagues and those who would join us beyond these walls, there is a controlling legal authority. It is called the Constitution of the United States, which provides oversight capacity to the legislative branch of government, but moreover, Mr. Speaker, which provides for the executive branch, every 2 years for those who would serve in the Congress of the United States, where we stand at the bar of public opinion and are accountable to the people who sent us here.

That should give pause to this Vice President, even though the current president apparently has no concerns about it.

Mr. SCHAEFFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, this topic of corruption in the executive branch of government and in administration is one that the Committee on Resources again had a chance to look into a little further, and the gentleman from Montana (Mr. HILL) was there.

I would like to ask him to comment, if he would, for a moment on the hearing we had just a few days ago.

Mr. HILL of Montana. Mr. Speaker, as my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado, knows, we are considering a number of bills associated with putting perhaps more of the offshore receipts, revenue from offshore oil and gas development, into habitat and providing that money to the State.

So as part of that, the Committee on Resources asked the General Accounting Office to do an examination of the accounting in the use of these funds. We had one of the most startling reports that I think that I have ever read as a Member of Congress. What we have discovered is that at the very top of this administration, there has been a looting of hunters' and fishermen's funds. People who hunt and fish in the United States pay an excise tax into a fund, the Pittman Robertson fund, and a fisheries fund to provide for habitat to help sustain hunting and provide habitat for hunting.

What we have discovered is that the Fish and Wildlife Service has been looting this account.

They set up special secret accounts. Out of these accounts, they paid for expenses that are inappropriate, illegal. There is not adequate accounting for these funds. If I can make this last point, this gentleman ordered one of their employees to approve a funding request by an anti-hunting group, using funds paid in by hunting and fishing men and women, to use those funds to fund an organization fund for the animals in an anti-hunting campaign.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Montana (Mr. HILL) repeat his assertions, because I think, given the culture of the present day, given the media proclivities here on Capitol Hill and beyond, sometimes, quite often, these stories are missed for whatever reason. Could the gentleman repeat what he has found in the Committee on Resources?

Mr. HILL of Montana. Mr. Speaker, what I am going to do is direct those funds into anti-hunting efforts. In some instances, there is evidence that they used those funds to pay for expenses that are not authorized by Congress. In other instances, they have failed to account for those funds. They have failed to establish any criteria for the approval or the granting of those funds. This is at the very highest levels of the administration.

Now, the person that revealed this information to our committee was fired for failing to go along and has recently ordered into a settlement with the Fish and Wildlife Service. But, interestingly, that settlement has a conditional clause, a gag order attached to it. So at our hearing, that employee was unable to give us all the details that he wanted to give us.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, if I could ask the gentleman from Montana, is it his impression that this administration was using these people in a way in a campaign that would be unlawful?

Mr. HILL of Montana. Mr. Speaker, this is certainly consistent with the agenda of this administration, which is to restrict the public use of lands. I long suspected that part of that effort is to reduce access by hunters and people who fish and use the public lands for that purpose. This is consistent with that pattern of activity and that agenda.

But in this instance, this is not a small sum of money. This is $550 million a year that goes into this trust fund, and they were peeling off between 6 and 8 percent of this fund, which is
$40 million a year for this purpose. What we also discovered is they took money, this president, this is a trust fund for habitat, and they were taking this money to backfill the other parts of their budget because they were running short of money in different areas. So they took money from this account for that purpose.

So there are extremely serious allegations here. We are going to continue to have more hearings on it. I am advocating for the committee and the Fish and Wildlife Service to find a way to lift the gag order on this former employee so this person can tell us the whole truth. There were questions that I asked at the hearing that this person was unable to answer because of the confidentiality agreement that had been entered into. But these are very serious matters.

But I know it is troubling to the sportsmen and women in Montana who, through the purchase of guns and ammunition and sporting goods and fishing gear, are paying an excise tax into this fund for habitat purpose, to have this administration using that money or trying to use that money, meeting with, conspiring with anti-hunting groups just to undermine the very people who are paying the tax.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, the interesting thing is I probably would not have discovered this scandal were it not for a handful of conscientious employees and others who were urging the Interior Department on management of this fund who found the courage to stand up and represent and think about the taxpayers and what is morally proper and risk their jobs and perhaps their future careers as well.

They came forward to Congress and explained what was going on, which it allowed us to have the hearing and move forward. This is a scandal of major proportions.

The gentleman touched on a point that I want to move into next, and that is he said that there is a pattern in the administration when it comes to public use of public lands. That is also true of private lands. There is a deeply held belief in this administration that human beings are a problem, that human beings should not be enjoying our national parks, our national wilderness areas, our National Forests, and so on; that these should be off limits for human activity, whether it is hunting or recreation or even when it comes to private property when it comes to responsible land use.

We talked earlier about the Endangered Species Act focusing on enabling local school districts to make sure that every teacher in the classroom was qualified to teach our children, giving local school districts additional flexibility.

I want to use an example for my colleagues from Montana (Mr. HILL), the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH), and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HOEKSTRA), who is joining us here tonight, was very helpful and has long been driving for in the House of Representatives, an agenda that we identify as enabling us to secure the future for American citizens as we move into the next millennium. I know we are going to focus on the tax relief package tonight. But we need to put it in context of the other elements of our plan.

We are focusing on education. We have passed a number of different education bills in this Congress. The most important, or one of the bills last week, again was the Teacher Empowerment Act focusing on enabling local school districts to make sure that every teacher in the classroom was qualified to teach our children, giving local school districts additional flexibility.

We are also, as we move through the tax plan and the tax relief efforts, ensuring as our first step to set aside in a lockbox all of the FICA taxes that the American taxpayers are paying in each and every week. As part of that, there is a right-to-know provision of the tax relief bill that is going to enable taxpayers, when they get their W-2 form, not only to see the amount of FICA taxes that they pay each and every year, but the matching amount that their employers pay each and every year.

I want to use this apple to represent the surface area of the globe, we have to keep in mind that approximately three-fourths of the earth is covered with water. Now, if I cut this apple into quarters, we have represented here the available use of land mass that exists on the earth.

Now, keeping in mind that also of this land mass, approximately half is mountains or desert or arctic regions or areas that are too hot. That leaves us with an eighth of the land mass that could be useful for growing food.

Now, of this one-eighth, we have a certain portion, about a quarter, that is simply too wet or too hot. We have another quarter that is simply not habitable for or not useful for growing agricultural products. The land is just not rich enough. Then we have another quarter that may be that way because of concrete, because of infrastructure, roads, bridges, and municipalities and so on.

That leaves us with one thirty-second of the land mass on the entire planet that is available for agriculture. Bear in mind that we are just talking about the surface.

So let me show my colleagues what that represents from the whole apple that I started with. Here is how much we are talking about. Whenever the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Federal Government, or any other Federal agency proposes to move farmers and ranchers off of this little piece of land and take that land out of production, that puts the human population at great peril over a long period of time, and it is the reason we need more sensitivity in Congress and in Washington in general in looking out for these rural individuals.

I want to say that this Congress just last week reached out to some of the people who worked that tiny patch of land, and we reached out in a way that has powerful impact. Because when the farmers and ranchers who work that land reach retirement age and start contemplating planning their estates and handing that land to their children, they are confronted with a very unfortunate reality; and that is, upon their death, when they hand that farm or ranch over to their children, the Federal Government walks in and demands upwards of 50 percent of the value of that asset before the children can use that farm or ranch to keep it in production.

That is true for any business owner. It is true for any homeowner who wants to hand their family’s assets and wealth over to their children.

We put forward in our tax plan, among the $792 billion in tax relief over a 10-year period an effort to eliminate the inheritance tax all together. That owner’s tax that I just referenced, in 10 years, will be gone if this tax is able to move through the Senate and ultimately be signed by the President.

I want to use an example for my colleagues briefly, and that is one of this apple, just to dramatize the importance of these public lands-private lands use issues when it comes to agriculture.
trillions of dollars, but let these three
$1 bills represent the $3 trillion surplus
as calculated by the Congressional
Budget Office. Now, it is worth noting
that almost $2 trillion of that surplus
we have locked away to save Social Se-
curity and Medicare. We have locked $2
trillion, or close to that, of the surplus
away to save Social Security and Medi-
care. Mr. SCHAFFER, that leaves $1
trillion to consider.

Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know,
it is the intent of the new majority to
learn the lessons of history, which are
fairly simple and which boil down to
this. If we leave this money in the
hands of the Washington bureaucrats,
it will be spent. Therefore, our mission
in this commonsense conservative ma-
jority in this 106th Congress is clear:
We must return the money to the peo-
ple to whom it belongs, the American
taxpayer.

This money does not belong to the
government, Mr. Speaker. It belongs to
all of those who work hard and play by
the rules and pay their taxes. There-
fore, one of the actions that provided tax
relief, which we passed last week, is
intention on returning the money to whom
it belongs. Because, Mr. Speaker, the
money belongs to the people, not to the
Washington bureaucrats.

And whether it is estate planning re-
form, putting to death the death tax
over a 10-year period; whether it is spe-
cial accounts for education to empower
parents to plan not only for a child’s
college education but also to seek al-
ternatives in the grades K through 12;
whether it is retirement, or use some of
it to pay down the national debt; whether
it is reducing the marriage
tax penalty; or whether it is an across-the-
board decrease in the rate of taxation,
we hold to this simple truth, Mr.
Speaker: The money does not belong to
the government. It belongs to the Ameri-
can people. The American people should hold on to more of
their hard-earned money to save, spend
and invest as they see fit.

Mr. Speaker, that stands in stark
counter to the vision offered by the
President of the United States, who
came to this well of the House to de-

erive a State of the Union message in
January and said that it was his intent
to save 62 percent of the Social Secu-

That is 38 percent to be intended to spend
the other 38 percent on new programs. And,
indeed, as he stood at that podium, he
outlined in the span of 77 minutes some
80 new programs that would cost the
American taxpayers at least an addi-
tional $100 million in new taxation.

And, indeed, his budget was so re-
prehensible that not one member of
the minority party would bring that bud-
get forward in legislative language to
have it voted on. It was up to the ma-
jority party to make the case

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my good
friend, the gentleman from Colorado
(Mr. SCHAFFER), who can make the case
graphically for us.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Well, I just want to
reiterate what the gentleman from Ari-
izona just said.

When the President came and made
his State of the Union address, here is
what he proposed. Of the $137 billion es-

timated surplus in the Social Security
Trust Fund and in Social Security in-
come, he proposed keeping 60 percent
of it, Social Security and spending
another 40 percent of it. In other words,
taking it away from the Social Secu-

rity program and spending it on more
bureaucracy, more government, and an
increasing the Federal budget.

Well, our Republican plan is very dif-

c
erent. We have proposed and have
moved forward on our plan to lock up
the entire $137 billion. This graph, this
chart, could not be clearer in showing
the difference between the Clinton-

Hill Budget and the Republican plan.

That is the dramatic difference be-
tween the two visions in Washington,
D.C. and the dramatic difference that
we stand for and propose that is in the
interest of America’s retirees and those
who are planning for retirement.

Mr. HILL of Montana. If the gentle-

man will continue to yield, when I
am at home, I ask my constituents if
their bosses came to them and said
they were going to give them a raise
amounting to $3,000, what would do
with that money. None of them say
they would give it to the Federal Gov-
ernment. Most of them say they would
put some aside, maybe save some for
retirement, or use some of it to pay
down their debt, or maybe spend a lit-
tle of it on their families.

Really, that is what we are talking
about doing here, putting some of this
money aside for retirement, for Social
Security, and to pay down the national
debt. And one-third of it, one-third of
that money, is going to go to help fam-
ilies decide how they can better spend
their money and let them set those
spending priorities.

Now, the President says that is reck-
less. The President said we would give
the money back. If he could just trust
that the American people would spend
it the right way. I guess my view is
that the people I represent know better
how to spend their money better than
anybody here in Washington, or any-
body in this chamber, including myself.

They have a better understanding of
how they need to spend that money
than I have. And they should have the
right and the privilege to make that
decision.

Now, if any of them want to give that
money back to the U.S. Treasury, I am
sure the U.S. Treasury would accept it.
But the fact of the matter is, they have
needs for their families.

I just want to make one point fol-
lowing up on something the gentleman
and about the death tax issue, because
I firmly believe this would be the last
generation of family farmers and
ranchers that we have in America if we
do not do something. Our farm econ-
omy is in trouble, and we have issues
that we need to deal with there, trade
and regulatory issues, but the death
tax issue is overwhelming.

Most of the farmers and ranchers in
my home State are not making any
money. They are not generating cash
flows. They have no mechanism to fi-
inance the death tax. They cannot buy
life insurance, they cannot pay the
lawyers and the high-priced account-
ants. They have no way to do it, so
they are compelled to sell. Who do they
sell to? To movie stars that want to
sell their movie stars to the New York
or ranch it. Or they sell to subdividers.

We have to do something to help folks in agriculture. There
are a lot of things we need to do, but
one of them is to lift this burden.

The lowest marginal tax rate on the
dehat tax is 38 percent. When they hit
the exemption, the threshold, they are
paying 38 percent of the value of that
estate in taxes. There is no way that a
family farmer and a family rancher in
my home State today can afford to pay
that tax.

We are going to wipe out these fam-
ily farmers and family ranchers. I do
not want to see that happen. I do not
want to see the destruction of those
rural communities. I do not want to
see the unraveling of the culture of ag-
culture and the importance that is to
the American family and the Na-
tion. So that is why this provision of
this bill is so essential, and we have to
make sure that we defend it.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I
thank the gentleman for yielding.

When we take a look at what is in
the tax cuts, I find it a very interesting
discussion to try to identify exactly
what part of the Tax Code is the most
unfair. I mean, I think we all started
out by saying tax relief is essential.
When we combine State, local, and
Federal taxes and have a tax system
that takes 40 percent of the average
family income, I think we are united.
That is unfair. That is too much.

That means that in a two-wage-earn-
er family, one wage-earner works the
total year to pay the tax bill. We
think that is unfair and that puts too
much stress on the family. That is why
we pushed an across-the-board tax cut
so that every individual in America
will benefit from that.

Then we go to the inheritance tax,
which clearly we work all of our lives,
we pay taxes all of our lives, and then we want to leave part of that to our children. And Uncle Sam again is one of the first ones in line and makes the dream of passing a family farm or small business on to our children, makes it so much more difficult to realize.

Another part of the Tax Code that is unfair is the marriage penalty. We penalize people for being married. Interesting concept. I think again we are united in saying this is an unfair element of the Tax Code.

For the individual who wants to go out and buy health care, does not receive health care from a corporation or a large buying organization, they have to buy with after-tax dollars. If they work for a large corporation, they get it provided and there is no tax consequences to it. That is unfair for the entrepreneur, for the person who wants to start off their own business. We are trying to remedy that.

For the family that wants to set aside dollars for education, we are putting that in so that again it enables people to invest in their people. We think that that makes this a better Tax Code.

So we all have our own personal problems with the Tax Code, but we recognize that there are a lot of inequities and unfairness in the Tax Code. But it starts with tax relief, and then it moves on to these individual elements.

I think we are all looking forward to the day as this Tax Code starts to address fairness, saying we need to make this Tax Code fairer that we can move on to the next debate after 2000, which is how to simplify the Tax Code.

Two essential elements I think of our longer term vision of what we want to have, which is a fairer Tax Code and a more simple Tax Code. And as we move in that direction, we will make a lot of progress.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would continue to yield, the way I try to see it as the first Arizonan in history to serve on the Committee on Ways and Means with the authority to deal with this Tax Code, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, is to say it this way: Tax relief first. Tax reform next.

Because, Mr. Speaker, if there is any lesson we have learned from this current administration, it is that words essentially mean nothing.

That is a shock for those of us who grew up under the notion that we would play by the rules, obey the existing law of the land, and then move forward.

Sadly, what we find with this administration and, Mr. Speaker, I think my colleagues, especially my friend from Michigan, will bear me out since he arrived after the election of 1992, a full term in the absence of those in Congress, the irony of this fact.

It has been said and is a basic tenet of our civics training that the President proposes and the Congress disposes. And yet, Mr. Speaker, I think my colleagues would be interested, as in another, to hear and to understand that throughout this second term of this administration, indeed since 1993, this administration has not shown the common courtesy of delivering to the Congress of the United States executive branch proposals in legislative language.

The last time that happened, Mr. Speaker, was with a proposal in 1993 to socialize our health care. And so, therefore, Mr. Speaker, all the talk of administration plans for Social Security, of administration plans for tax relief, of administration plans for bolstering our national defense are as the wind; there is nothing to them.

For this administration lacks the courage and the ability to actually help us govern. And we see it most egregiously when it comes to the death tax.

My friend from Montana is quite right. And when we represent folks in Arizona on family farms and on ranches, in Colorado, Montana or Michigan, the fact is this for many a landholder, they are to use the proverbial term, "land rich, cash poor."

And when the patriarch of a family dies, the one in whose name the family ranch or the family farm belongs, the survivors are asked to pay a tax, that is unfair and that is onerous.

Mr. Speaker, if nothing else, those who hear these words should remember this fact, that our common-sense conservative majority is committed to ending, to putting to death, the death tax over the course of the next decade. Because fundamentally, as my friend from Colorado said so well and it was quoted in the New York Times, in 1991 near 2 years ago, when he said there should be no taxation without representation, he understands the unfairness of this tax.

And compounding it, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that with all the turmoil and drang, with all the trauma introduced into the lives of the survivors, with all the basic unfairness of taxing the work and the labors of those who have gone to their heavenly reward, still in all, the Federal Treasury only takes from the dead one fifth of the total accrued revenue for the Treasury of the United States.

And yet, Mr. Speaker, 75 percent of that one percent is spent tracking down and harassing survivors, forcing families to sell their farms, forcing families to sell their small businesses, and it shows the inequity of this Tax Code.

But, Mr. Speaker, we are cognizant of realities. A President who would stand for fairness, for the person who wants to go to New York, one day after standing at this podium and saying that he wants to save 62 percent of the Social Security surplus for Social Security and, therefore, spend the extra 38 percent, as my friend from Colorado holds up the words, January 20 of this year the President of the United States, in a rare moment of candor, said the following quote: "We could give it," meaning the budget surplus, "we could give it all back to you and hope you spend it right. But . . ."

Mr. Speaker, that embraces the central conflict. This current President, despite his obvious failings in terms of personal honor and a knowledge of accountability to the people of the United States and, dare I say, accountability of the executive branch to the legislative branch to help us govern, this President stands by a fundamental tenet of faith that is jaundiced and is misguided.

Because, Mr. Speaker, he believes that the Federal Government can spend the money of the people better than can the people. That is a serious problem.

Mr. HUEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, if my colleague will leave that statement up, it is exactly how this President thinks, that Washington can spend the money better than the American people.

Today, or projected for the year 2000, Federal revenue will be 20.6 percent of gross domestic product. So the amount of revenue going into Washington as a percent of our gross domestic product is increasing. And actually, if we provide and attempt to provide tax relief, our attempt will not even get us back to the level of 1993, which means that the Federal Government is getting bigger and bigger.

Some people believe that this tax relief package that we are trying to provide, this fairness that we are trying to give back to the American taxpayer, is coming at the expense of the Federal Government. No, what we are trying to do is we are trying to get back to where we were in 1993 and 1994. It is a rightsizing of the Federal Government. It is not a downsizing. It is a rightsizing, of getting back to where we were in 1993 after that tax increase.

Mr. HILL of Montana. I think it is really important for people to understand that $800 billion is a large sum of money, but the Federal Government over that 10-year period is going to spend $23 trillion. So it is $800 billion of $23 trillion. Your comments about a fairer, simpler tax code, I think it is also important to note that we are making a down payment in this bill on simplifying taxes. We are eliminating the alternative minimum tax, some of
the more onerous provisions and complexities of the tax code.

I asked the Committee on Ways and Means to tell me what this means to the people of my district. In my district, we do not have high incomes. We are about 46th in the Nation in terms of the average income. But in my district over the course of the next 10 years, this is $2.4 billion that will be left in my economy, in the economy of my State. It comes out to just under $10,000 for the average family of four in Montana, how much they will save in taxes with the tax package.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. This goes on top of the tax bill that we did in 1997. This tax relief plan does not have the signature element that we had in our last tax relief package, of the $400 to $500 per child tax credit, but the impact will be as big on the provision of the tax code, as that tax relief package is. So this definitely means more money in a family’s pocket at the end of the year.

Mr. HILL of Montana. Certainly in 1997, we said we have to focus on families. We have to focus on the value of the exemption for families and so we provided a tax credit. That was the feature, and lowering the capital gains tax for investment. This is a much broader package of tax reductions. Every taxpayer will enjoy reductions in taxes as a consequence of this and there are also some targeted elements. But the important element from my judgment is the average family of four in Montana is going to have $10,000 they can invest in a house or in their children’s education or to buy a car or to buy or build a home, the values that they consider the most important. $10,000 is a fair amount of money, I think, to any family. So this is significant. It is meaningful tax relief.

But the gentleman is right. We have the highest tax burden today in the peacetime history of the country. Even with this tax reduction, we still are going to have a tax burden in this country that is higher than when President Clinton took office. We still have not unraveled the largest tax increase in history that was passed in 1993 with all Democrat support. The most important element here, though, is that we are dealing with the most unfair provisions of the tax code, we are working to try to simplify it. Of course we want to provide tax relief for the working men and women of this country.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I think it is important to point out because, Mr. Speaker, as I have appeared on different media outlets to hear the predictable cacophony and chorus from the left and indeed, Mr. Speaker, it has become so reflexive, I daresay my colleagues who join me in this need cannot offer an answer to fill in the blank. My friends on the left talk about tax cuts for the rich, which is totally false but apparently alluring to those who are captured by the politics of envy, to those who would believe that they do not control their destiny but, Mr. Speaker, it is patently false and as I heard my colleagues talk and thought about what occurred in the State of Arizona, I could not help but think of the President of the United States during our most recent recessed censure to the State of Arizona, specifically coming to South Phoenix.

Now, he could have visited a lot of areas, the Navajo nation, the sovereign Native American nation is Navajo, unemployment, or San Manuel, Arizona, site of the largest underground mine in North America that has been closed thanks in part to the Clinton-Gore-Babbitt War on the West, but this President, Mr. Speaker, chose to go to an area that might be more politically hospitable, to South Phoenix in Arizona, and he proposed what he called the New Market Initiative. Again, Mr. Speaker, this has not been put into legislative language like a cotton candy, it appears alluring but when you get to it, the details are somewhat sticky and inconvenient, the President of the United States proposes $100 million in loans for depressed areas but, Mr. Speaker, the taxpayers must provide some $45 million to set up that loan process, the Federal taxpayers must pay two-thirds of the overhead for the so-called New Market Initiative, and yet, Mr. Speaker, I look to the plan to help the neediest among us offered in our tax relief and tax fairness legislation, a plan championed by our good friends the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. TALENT), the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATT), and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DAVENPORT), the Democrat, that deals with those depressed areas not just in terms of business start-up and not in terms of make-work for Federal bureaucrats but true empowerment that deals with savings, what that talks in Washington, that also deals with business start-ups, and yet the President of the United States has the audacity to come before the American people and claim that this responsible bipartisan plan to help those who need help is somehow irresponsible and reckless.

Mr. Speaker, it simply is something we have seen all too often with this President, an inability to tell the truth and to deal candidly with the American people.

Mr. SCHAEFFER. The gentleman really points out the dramatic difference in the approaches that the two parties take in Washington, the party represented by the Democratic Party, and the party that we represent, the Republican Party. Because I believe both parties care about rural and depressed areas, but there is a difference in the sincerity and the tenacity with which we approach real and meaningful help.

What the gentleman would describe as the President’s proposal is a typical one of the liberal agenda in Washington, which is to raise taxes on the American people, send that cash here to Washington, D.C., and then have politicians redistribute the wealth to the charities of certain politicians’ choices. That does work but it is not fair.

What we have proposed and what we have actually passed through the tax relief effort is not tax provisions for the rich but tax provisions for average Americans and in fact tax provisions that help those who are the poorest among us.

Let me give my colleagues a couple of examples. The commercial revitalization deductions allow for tax relief for those individuals who are making investments in depressed areas around the country. We provided a section and we provided for an effort to encourage employers to hire people off of welfare and put them to work. Now, imagine that. In a country right now that is enjoying very, very low unemployment and has enjoyed phenomenal success in welfare reform, over a 50 percent reduction in the welfare caseload over the last 2 years, we use the tax bill to reduce the burden on Americans so that we can help even more people come off the welfare system, to leave the situation of dependency on the Federal Government and enjoy full economic participation as real Americans, as entrepreneurs, as fully employed, fully engaged citizens. That is a dramatic difference in our efforts to help the very same people that the President suggests he wants to help.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SCHAFFER. The gentleman real-

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I just really want to reinforce some of the comments that my colleagues from Arizona and Colorado have made.

When we are talking about what we would like to do reform, we are not talking about an idea or a direction or a hope, we are talking about legislative language that has been introduced, that has been debated, and that has passed.
dollars into some of those programs, spend the dollars we are spending now provides for it, we are saying, let us are prepared to do that, our budget put more dollars in education, and we are ing. All of the education bills that we what the President is arguing for is to We can do all of this; it is a unique op- Medicare, if the President will come to aside for us to deal with reforming debt $2 trillion. There are funds set to lock up every dollar of Social Security taxes for Social Security retire- to transfer money, power and influence out of the hands of the Washington bu- reaucrats and back home to people liv- ing on the front lines, who understand their lives better, who understand that must pay for all the research, even on bogus petitions.

"Accurate population numbers are not avail- able, therefore, goals for recovery cannot be defined."

Mark Hillman, CO State Senator: “The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, The USFWS must perform an initial investigation and taxpayers must pay for all the research, even on bogus petitions.”

"Restoration and preservation of prairie dog habitat as it may have existed 100 years ago would mean shutting down some of the most prolific wheat producing land in the nation. Sam Hamilton, former U.S. Fish and Wildlife administrator has said: ‘The incentives are wrong. If a rare medal is on my property, the value of my land goes up. But if a rare bird is on my property, the value of my property goes down.”

It is patently absurd to proffer a policy based on the asserting that Washington law- makers—much less Washington bureau- crats—care more about environmental quality in Colorado, or any other state, than do the residents who live there precisely because of our priceless environment.”

Don Aman, CO Commissioner of Agri- culture: “In its current form, it serves the needs of neither the endangered species nor the taxpayers who provide the funds to support the program. Western farmers and ranch- ers view the ESA as a law that grants a fed- eral agency the ability to unilaterally de- termine how their land is farmed or ratched which could decide the economic future of their en- terprise; the ESA grants too much authority to a ruthless bureaucracy.”

Ralph Morgenweck, USFWS Moutain-Prarie Regional Director: “The Service is fully com- mitted to finding this balance between eco- nomic development and endangered species protection. To continue making progress in im- plementing the ESA, an increase in funding for our endangered species program is nec- essary.”

As of May 1, 1999, there were 1,181 do- mestic species on the List of Endangered and Threatened Species; this represents a 30 per- cent increase in just 5 years.”
Larry Bourett, WY Farm Bureau VP: "At this time there are no listings in Washington, D.C., that conform to the Nation’s need to come to the rescue of problems our farmers and ranchers are experiencing. To get a real flavor of what is happening daily to some of the nation’s citizens.

The Act is behalf for those who do not have to suffer the consequences of having a listed species on their private property. However, for those private property owners who happen to be within the identified range of, historic range of, habitat of or potential habitat of a listed species, it is an entirely different story. It is a story of frustration and fear.

Jack Finney, WY cattle rancher: "It seems to me that just as the rancher and farmer must strike a balance that allows him or her to make a living from the land today while preserving habitat and natural resources for generations to come, the endangered species requirements must be changed to work in harmony with the designation that dictates how land should be managed. The ESA requires landowners to leave the land around irrigation ditches in a natural state to protect the Preble’s meadow jumping mouse, but ranchers who fail to maintain those ditches may be faced with the loss of their water rights.

Under the Conservation Reserve Program, landowners contract with the federal government to protect land from erosion and curtail the resultant deterioration of water quality. However, the ESA may call for these lands to be opened up to overgrazing to create habitat for prairie dogs and mountain plovers. The Clean Water Act calls for the protection of water quality in streams, but this mandate contradicts ESA requirements that call for the overgrazing of land to develop habitat for the plover and prairie dog.

The federal government’s requirements must be changed to work in harmony with the designation that dictates how land should be managed. The ESA requires landowners to leave the land around irrigation ditches in a natural state to protect the Preble’s meadow jumping mouse, but ranchers who fail to maintain those ditches may be faced with the loss of their water rights.

The time of the gentleman from Colorado has expired.

The SPEAKER pro tempore.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TACCHINO). Mr. SCHAEFFER, the Majority Leader, the gentleman from Michigan may proceed, but not beyond midnight.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Speaker and I invite my colleagues to stay with me until midnight so that we can continue this dialogue on our agenda for securing America’s future, and I will yield to my friend from Colorado.

Mr. SCHAEFFER. Mr. Speaker, I was about to say that when it comes to the inheritance tax, we wonder why, when the gentleman from Arizona pointed out that the inheritance tax only generates a little less than 1 percent of the revenue to the Federal Government. It is relative inconsequential when you factor in the fact that the majority of the Federal Government’s revenue received from the Federal Government is squandered and wasted as a result of bureaucracy and other waste.

As consumers, rural Americans provide markets for goods and services, injecting much-needed capital into the marketplace. Rural purchases of trucks, tractors, houses, implements, fuel, computers, and other items contribute an enormous economic bounty of providing jobs and income for salespeople, waitresses, homeowners, real estate agents, feed dealers, mechanics, and bank tellers, just to name a few.

Still there are other reasons rural America matters. Colorado boasts over 24,000 farms and ranches, accounting for over half of our state’s $1 million acres are on the land are the best environmental stewards. Landowners work actively with soil conservation districts to protect water resources, manage wind erosion, reduce pollution, and control water runoff. In Colorado, farmers are credited with saving an additional 51 million tons of topsoil annually for the past 10 years. They have also seeded 1.9 million acres of private land to permanent grassland under the Conservation Reserve Program, thereby producing thriving wildlife habitat.

Most of all, America’s soul is found in its rural communities. A nation launched by farmers and ranchers, America’s founding strength was mustered and sustained by the moral character of rural people. Their values of hard work, honesty, integrity, self-reliance and faith in God thrive in abundance today.

It is truly unfortunate anyone finds such attributes offensive. These are the very values our country needs if the new Millennium is to be as prosperous as the present.

Clearly, rural America is the bedrock of our culture and the salvation of our Republic. It is more in our country needs if the new Millennium is to be as prosperous as the present.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, we stand at an epic juncture in American history, because despite the protestations from those who would belong to a third party movement, there is no clearer difference that exists in American political life than what exists in this Chamber. Because my friends on the left, so trusting of the powers of the Federal Government, powers that have grown excessive, that have grown overreaching, that have grown abusive throughout this century; so abusive, Mr. Speaker, to the point that the power of the Federal Government reaches into the pocket of every law-abiding American, my friends on the left place their faith in that burgeoning bureaucracy. Mr. Speaker, the contrast could not be clearer, because those of us in the common sense conservative majority take literally the first 3 words of this document, the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I would note, and not without some irony, especially given the tenor of the rhetoric from the White House and from the Vice President and from our friends on the left, those that were written millions of years ago are not they, the bureaucrats. No, Mr. Speaker, the first 3 words of this document read, “We, the people.” And despite the fact that a Fox News Opinion...
It does not belong to them, the bureaucrats. It belongs to the people.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, it is not only what the Constitution says, although we as a nation should do, is what the people want us to do; it is what the people are saying we should do, but the lessons as to why the Framers of the Constitution were so brilliant, we only have to go back to when we reformed welfare.

When welfare decisions were being made by bureaucrats in Washington, we were not moving people out of welfare. When we debated here on the floor of the House, and we took the examples of like the State of Wisconsin, that the State legislature, the Governor, they came up with a program to move people off of welfare into the work force, and the bureaucrats here in Washington said, no, you cannot do that; or even worse than that, they did not give them any answer at all.

I think it went on for over 300 days, when the State of Wisconsin was unified, Democrats and Republicans saying this is what we want to do to help our people in Wisconsin, and the bureaucrats did not even have the courtesy of sending them a reply.

But when we took the welfare program and gave it back to the States, we have seen phenomenal results. It is the same model that we want to put on one of our priority projects, education. We do not want more bureaucrats here in Washington telling people who know our kids’ names what they need to do, in the classroom. Let the people at the local level do it. Let us empower people at the local level.

It is why we are having a tax relief package that says, let people, let families, let moms and dads, decide what to do with an 800 or 1,000 or 1,500 hours a year. Let them decide how they want to spend that. Let us put aside to save social security and to save Medicare, to remove that stress from them.

I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO), and I thank the gentleman for joining us.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for recognizing me, to allow me to discuss the subject. Something has been bothering me ever since the debate on the bill that we had on the floor of the House on the issue of the tax reduction.

I was observing the debate. It was heated. It was, I think for the most part, articulate and to the point. But one member of the opposition, a very prominent Democrat, stood at the well and said that he had been in this body for a number of years and could remember, he said, that in 1981 we in fact put through a tax reduction package. It was actually I think in 1983.

He was talking about the fact that at that point in time, he was suggesting that he was under the same phenomenon, that we were going to put through a tax reduction package again and that we would see something similar occur.

He said what happened after we reduced taxes, essentially after the Reagan tax cuts, he said we saw an explosion of debt, and that the national debt increased dramatically. He was concerned, he said, because he believed the same thing was going to happen here.

I wanted to, at the time, come to the floor just to have the opportunity, and that is why I appreciate this moment now, to remind the gentleman that in fact what he said was accurate, we did have an explosion in debt, but it was not because we gave the people back their money, it was because there was such an increase in revenue to the Federal Government that it was, of course, spent by the Congress.

It was not a problem with the reduction of taxes, it was a problem in the increase in spending that caused the explosion in that debt.

That is exactly what we are trying to avoid with this tax cut proposal, because, Mr. Speaker, there are those in this town, principally in the other District of Columbia Avenue but also those who occupy the left side of this Chamber, who would earnestly yearn for a type of collective amnesia to embrace the American people.

The President of the United States has engaged in incredible revisionist history where he calls the largest tax increase in American history noble and justified; when he fails to recognize the contributions of this new commonsense conservative majority, which came in and reined in excessive spending, which led to this surplus; but also with his comments in January of this year, when again he stood at this podium and said, Mr. Speaker, it bears repeating, that it was his intent to save the social security surplus for social security, which meant, of course, that he intended to spend the other 38 percent; and how that stands in stark contrast, Mr. Speaker, with our lockbox to lock away 100 percent of the social security surplus for social security.

Mr. Speaker, it bears repeating, consider these three $1 bills again to represent $3 trillion. Take away the zeros.
This is what our commonsense conservative majority maintains should happen. Let us take two of those dollar bills, burn them today to save social security and Medicare, and Mr. Speaker, we are left with this dollar bill, representing roughly $1 trillion of additional surplus.

We have a choice, Mr. Speaker. If we leave it in Washington, given the proclivities of our president and the temptations which he cannot withstand, that money will be spent. We believe, as the commonsense conservative majority, that the money belongs to the people who sent it here. It should go back to those people.

For my friends on the left to claim these are tax breaks for the wealthy, it is an interesting definition of wealthy. Apparently they think folks who make $40,000 a year are wealthy because those folks pay almost four times as much in taxes as the folks who earn $20,000 a year.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, and I thank my colleagues for joining me this evening. Just on a final note, the problem here in Washington is not revenue. In 1999 we will collect $1,821,000,000,000. By 2009 that will have increased by 50 percent; that government revenues, if we do not provide tax relief, will have increased to $2,725,000,000,000.

The problem in Washington is not revenue, the problem is we are collecting too much. We need to give tax relief and we need to control spending. We are not cutting spending, we are just slowing the growth, so Federal programs can continue. We just need to control our appetites here in Washington and secure America’s future by giving American families and American individuals some of their money back.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. Fowler (at the request of Mr. Arney) until 1 p.m. today on account of official business at the Pentagon.

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 Ms. Eddie Bernice Johnson of Texas) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. Coyne, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. Tomney, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. Burton of Indiana, for 5 minutes, August 3.

Mr. Bilirakis, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. Morella, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. Kuykendall, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. Smith of Michigan, for 5 minutes, July 30.

Mr. Davis of Virginia, for 5 minutes, July 28.

Mr. Upton, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker’s table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 296. An act to provide for continuation of the Federal research investment in a scientifically sustainable way, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science.

S. 1402. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to enhance programs providing education benefits for veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs 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.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 604. An act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to complete a land exchange with Georgia Power Company.

S. 1258. An act to authorize funds for the payment of salaries and expenses of the Patent and Trademark Office, and for other purposes.

S. 1259. An act to amend the Trademark Act of 1946 relating to dilution of famous marks, and for other purposes.

S. 1260. An act to make technical corrections in title 17, United States Code, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at midnight), under its previous order the House adjourned until Thursday, July 29, 1999, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

3233. A letter from the Administrator, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule implementing the Preferred Lender Program and Streamlining of Guaranteed Farm Loan Programs Loan Regulations; Correction (HIN: 0560–AF38) received July 26, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3234. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Mexican Fruit Fly Regulations; Repeal of Regulated Area (Docket No. 98–682–0) received July 21, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.


3237. A letter from the Acting Chief, Enforcement Division, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule—Amendment of Policies and Rules Concerning Operator Service Providers and Call Agents (CCR Docket No. 94–158) received July 26, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3238. A letter from the Special Assistant 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, (Indian Springs, Nevada, Mountain Pass, California, Kingman, Arizona, and St. George, Utah, No. 96–171 RM–8466 RM–9145) received July 26, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3239. A letter from the Special Assistant to the 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, (Lufkin, Texas) [MM Docket No. 98–125] (RM–9301) received July 26, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3240. 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, (Genoa, Mt. Morris, and Oregon, Illinois) [MM Docket No. 99–64] (RM–9483) received July 26, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3241. A letter from the Special Assistant to the 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, (Llano, Texas) [MM Docket No. 99–333] received July 26, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3242. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State,